

## Gina Anderson

---

**From:** Molly M. Theodossy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2012 9:35 AM  
**To:** Gina Anderson; Richard E Battersby; Matthew Carmichael; Gary Neil Cherr; James Fitzgerald; Wendi Delmendo; Cindy M Kiel; Eric P Kvigne; Andrew Majewski; Yvonne Sundahl; Michael F. Sweeney; Roxie Weaver  
**Subject:** PPM Review Request; Due 2/24  
**Attachments:** 290-82.docx

### Policy and Procedure Manual Review Request

**Date:** February 7, 2012

**Response requested by:** February 24, 2012

**To:** G. Anderson, Academic Senate/Academic Federation  
R. Battersby, Fleet Services  
M. Carmichael, Police Department  
G. Cherr/J. Fitzgerald, Bodega Marine Laboratory  
W. Delmendo, Compliance and Policy  
C. Kiel, Office of Research  
E. Kvigne, Risk Management  
A. Majewski, Environmental Health and Safety  
Y. Sundahl, UCDHS Policy  
M. Sweeney, Campus Counsel  
R. Weaver, Administrative and Resource Management

**Section:** 290-82, Boating Safety

**Purpose:** This section describes the policy and procedures governing the safe use of motorized watercraft (boats) for all research and educational activities.

A draft of the section is attached for your review. Please review the draft, entering your edits and comments in the attached file.

Return the edited file directly to me, via email, by the response date indicated above. In your return email, indicate any additional individuals in your office who have reviewed the draft.

**No response by the deadline above will be interpreted as your concurrence with the proposed manual section.**

Reviewers' comments and suggestions will be compiled, and I will work with the policy/process originator to resolve any issues. Once the comments are reconciled, I will prepare a final draft for approval by the originator, the department head and the appropriate vice chancellor or vice provost prior to publication.

~~~~~  
Molly M. Theodossy

University Investigator & Policy Coordinator  
Compliance and Policy Unit  
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616  
530-752-2407 (tel)/530-752-0853 (fax)  
[mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu](mailto:mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu)  
<http://manuals.ucdavis.edu>

**Chapter 290, Health and Safety Services**

**Section 82, Boating Safety**

**Date:** Draft 2/7/12

**Supersedes:** New

**Responsible Department:** Office of Research

**Source Document:** N/A

---

**I. Purpose**

- A. This section describes the policy and procedures governing the safe use of motorized watercraft (boats) for all research or educational activities, regardless of the location of the activity, source of funding, or boat ownership.
- B. This section does not apply to boats used in UC Davis sponsored sports or recreational activities.

**II. Policy**

Boats used for UC Davis research or educational activities must be operated in a safe, legal, and prudent manner, meeting appropriate standards for safety, reliability, and suitability for the environmental conditions under which the boat will be operated.

**III. Roles and Responsibilities**

- A. Boat operators
  - 1. Each boat used for research or educational activities must have a designated boat operator. Operators of vessels larger than 65 feet must have a U.S. Coast Guard Captains License.
  - 2. The boat operator is responsible for the following:
    - a. Ensuring the safety of the boat and all of its occupants, including but not limited to abiding by the following standards:
      - 1) Operating only in areas appropriate to the size and limitations of the boat.
      - 2) Knowing and adhering to the correct loading, stability, and passenger limitations of the boat as established by the boat manufacturer, the U.S. Coast Guard, or other appropriate authorities.
      - 3) Scheduling operations only when the environmental conditions are safe for the limitations of the boat.
      - 4) Consulting available resources (e.g., Google Earth, bathymetric charts, other boat operators) for new or unfamiliar areas to assess the potential of the environmental conditions prior to departure.
      - 5) Maintaining contact information for local emergency services for the area of operation.
    - b. Possessing training sufficient to ensure the safe operation of the boat in the area of operation.
    - c. Maintaining the boat and all of its safety equipment and gear as appropriate for the mission and area of operation at all times.
    - d. Ensuring that all boat occupants have received an appropriate safety briefing regarding the location and proper use of safety, navigation, and communications equipment aboard the boat prior to departure.

- e. Providing trip notification to the supervisor and safety supervisor prior to a trip that may include boating (see IV.B, below).
  - f. Complying with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations in the operation of the boat.
  - g. Reporting any boating accidents or incidents as defined in IV.C, below.
- B. Boat occupants are responsible for the following:
1. Participating in a safety briefing regarding the safety procedures and equipment aboard the boat prior to departure.
  2. Attending a boating safety course when required by the boat operator or Principal Investigator (PI).
  3. Using life jackets and the appropriate safety equipment as required by law or the boat operator.
  4. Complying with instructions given by the boat operator.
  5. Completing the appropriate waiver of liability and release form if not a UC employee operating in the scope of his/her employment (<http://safetyservices.ucdavis.edu/programs-and-services/risk-management/risk-management-1/risk-management-forms-1/waivers/risk-management-forms-1/waivers/waiverelect.pdf>).
- C. The Boating Safety Officer is responsible, through the Director—Bodega Marine Laboratory, to the Vice Chancellor—Research, for the following:
1. Providing boating safety training and education in accordance with NASBLA-approved course standards.
  2. Providing annual boat safety inspections for vessels as requested by departments or boat operators.
  3. Providing technical advice regarding the proper selection of boats, boat operation, safety equipment, mission specific operational guidelines, and emergency management strategies.
  4. Maintaining records for the boating safety program.
  5. Providing support or assistance to boaters, the trip notification shore contact person, and rescue authorities, should a boat crew become disabled, overdue, or stranded.
  6. Filing reports with agencies as required by local, state, and federal regulations.
- D. Fleet Services is responsible for the following:
1. Paying boat and trailer registration fees.
  2. Forwarding the original vessel certificate of number and registration stickers to the department operating the boat.

#### **IV. Procedures**

- A. Annual boat safety inspections
1. Boats must undergo an official annual safety inspection, or receive inspections as requested by the boat user's department following periods of storage, maintenance, or recent vessel modifications.

2. The U.S. Coast Guard Vessel Safety Check form used for inspections is available at <http://forms.cgaux.org/archive/a7012.pdf>.
3. The Office of Boating Safety will schedule and provide the inspection on request of the department.
  - a. The Office of Boating Safety will accept third party inspections from a qualified vessel safety examiner or surveyor.
  - b. Documentation of the inspection shall be provided to the vessel manager and the original document of inspection will be kept on record in the Office of Boating Safety.
  - c.
4. Boats that fail to meet inspection criteria will be suspended from service until the deficiencies are remedied and the boat can pass inspection.

**B. Trip notification**

1. Prior to a trip that may include boating, the boat operator must notify his/her supervisor and safety supervisor of the trip details, including the following:
  - a. Purpose of trip.
  - b. Planned dates and times of travel.
  - c. Names of participants.
  - d. Expected area of boat operation.
  - e. A means of contacting pre-designated local authorities and Office of Boating Safety if the boat operator does not return or check-in by the expected arrival time.
2. The boat operator must notify his/her supervisor as soon as possible after normal communication options are available (e.g., email, phone access) as follows:
  - a. For single-day trips, following the boat's safe return.
  - b. For multi-day trips, following conclusion of the trip.
3. The supervisor will contact the designated authorities and Office of Boating Safety if s/he does not receive the expected notification from the boat operator.

**C. Accident and incident reporting**

All accidents and incidents must be reported by the boat operator or the supervisor or manager as follows:

1. Accidents resulting in disappearance, death, amputation, or hospitalization must be reported to the UC Davis Police Department (530-752-1234), UC Davis Environmental Health and Safety, and the Office of Boating Safety as soon as possible.
2. All accidents and incidents involving personal injuries requiring medical attention beyond first aid or total property damage in excess of \$500 must be reported to the Office of Boating Safety within 24 hours of the event.
3. The Office of Boating Safety will report boat accidents to the appropriate authorities as required by law, and will retain records.
4. Pls, Directors, Lab Managers, and Supervisors must follow notification procedures provided in Section 370-20 for all personal injuries requiring medical attention.

5. Departments must take corrective action for accidents and near misses as part of their department Injury and Illness Prevention Program, prior to resuming boating operations (see Section 290-15).

## **V. Further Information**

- A. Contact Risk Management for information on chartering boats
- B. For additional information on this policy, contact the Office of Boating Safety; (707)875-1933, 875-2032; [boating@ucdavis.edu](mailto:boating@ucdavis.edu).

## **VI. References and Related Policies**

- A. United States Code of Federal Regulations:
  1. Title 33, Navigation and Navigable Waterways.
  2. Title 46, Shipping.
- B. U.S. Coast Guard Navigation Rules.
- C. California Code of Law:
  1. Harbor and Navigation Code.
  2. Vehicle Code.
- D. California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3389, Life Rings and Personal Flotation Devices.
- E. UCD Policy and Procedure Manual:
  1. Section 290-15, Safety Management.
  2. Section 290-80, Diving Safety.
  3. Section 370-20, Workers' Compensation.
- F. UCD Boating Safety Manual.

## Gina Anderson

---

**From:** Molly M. Theodossy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2012 9:09 AM  
**To:** Gina Anderson  
**Cc:** Academic Senate Chair  
**Subject:** RE: Boating Safety Policy Consultation

Dear Gina:

I am preparing to send PPM 290-82, Boating Safety, for its formal campus review. I write to advise you of some of the changes made to address concerns from your committees, as well as to advise on reasons why other changes were not made.

Most significantly, the policy was modified to clarify that the Boating Safety Officer's authority is granted through the Director of Bodega Marine Laboratory (who is a faculty member). This parallels the language used in the Diving Safety Policy (PPM 290-80). There are other minor modifications to the language throughout to clarify (e.g., clarifying that the Office of Boating Safety **will** accept third party inspections, rather than **may** accept).

Both 290-80 and 290-82 establish similar safety regulations, which are significantly different from the level of oversight and authority delegated to IACUC. The boating safety regulations do not provide any administrative oversight for faculty research projects. They are simply regulations to ensure the safety of the vessels used in educational and research activities. This policy does not apply to recreational boats because there are other regulations in place for those activities.

The regulations regarding the reporting of incidents and damage over \$500 come from state regulations. While I appreciate that the committee believes that \$500 is too low, that is an issue that would need to be taken up with the California Department of Boating and Waterways.

Finally, because there were concerns regarding the section on chartering boats, and because it wasn't really appropriate for the topic of this policy, it was removed from the draft.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Otherwise, I will look forward to your response to the formal review.  
Molly

~~~~~  
Molly M. Theodossy  
University Investigator & Policy Coordinator  
[mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu](mailto:mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu)

---

**From:** Gina Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2011 12:15 PM  
**To:** Molly M. Theodossy  
**Cc:** Academic Senate Chair  
**Subject:** RE: Boating Safety Policy Consultation

Dear Molly,

On behalf of Chair Bisson, I have enclosed the Davis Division's response to the referenced consultation item.

Best,  
Gina Anderson

**From:** Molly M. Theodossy  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 27, 2011 11:11 AM  
**To:** Gina Anderson  
**Subject:** Boating Safety Policy Consultation

Dear Gina:

Thank you for meeting with me this morning regarding the draft boating safety policy.

The committee who was working on development of this policy has turned the draft over to me to conduct consultation with the Academic Senate prior to formal review. I made some minor modifications to their draft to address a few lingering comments and I believe it is ready for your committees' review. After I receive your response, we will move forward with the formal campus review.

Let me know if there are any questions or concerns.  
Molly

~~~~~

Molly M. Theodossy  
University Investigator & Policy Coordinator  
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616  
530-752-2407 (tel)/530-752-0853 (fax)  
[mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu](mailto:mmtheodossy@ucdavis.edu)  
<http://manuals.ucdavis.edu>

December 19, 2011

**MOLLY THEODOSSY**

Policy Coordinator

**Re: Davis Division Review: DRAFT UCD PPM Section 290-82 Boating Safety**

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate forwarded the referenced review request to all of the divisional standing committees as well as Faculty Executive Committees within each college/professional school. Comments were received from the Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Faculty Welfare and Research as well as the Faculty Executive Committees from College of Letters and Science.

The Division appreciated receiving the policy in advance given the proposed policy's impact to teaching and research. I have enclosed the responses so they may be considered as the policy is revised into a final draft for campus wide review.

Both the Committee on Research and Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR) raised issues with the translation of written policy into practice in the field. We believe these are important considerations that should be weighed carefully and woven into final policy language.

Additionally, CAFR provided a thorough and thoughtful response to the draft. CAFR's response indicates a violation of APM 010 based on review of faculty policy compliance by a non-tenured faculty member. We ask the campus to correct this issue through use of faculty advise such as referenced in the CAFR examples of RE89 and IACUC before the policy is issued for final campus review.

Sincerely,



Linda F. Bisson, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Viticulture and Enology



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **DRAFT UCD PPM Section 290-82 Boating Safety**

**December 12, 2011**

The subject draft UCD PPM section is provided "in advance" of distribution campus wide. Specifically, Academic Senate comments are being sought to ensure the impact on teaching and research is evaluated officially by the Academic Senate in advance of campus wide review. Based on advance review results, the draft policy could be returned to the Academic Senate again during the official campus review period.

# **Academic Freedom & Responsibility**

**December 15, 2011 3:55 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

## CAFR review of proposed PPM 290, section 82

UCD CAFR established review procedures for the 2011-2012 academic year on October 9, 2011. After CAFR review, the proposed policy change was found to raise significant concerns related to academic freedom.

### 1. Background

UC Davis has been attempting to develop a boating policy since deaths occurred in an accident in 2000, with intermittent drafts and meetings now extending over an 11-year period. CAFR has a long history of review and concern over iterations of this proposed policy dating back to May 31, 2006 when an early draft was first brought to the attention of CAFR. CAFR has actively sought to collaborate with the administration on drafts of the proposed policy, even going so far as to provide a comprehensive boating policy and manual for the administration to consider, but which has not been adopted. Recent precursor drafts of this latest administration-generated proposal for a policy limited to motor boating were reviewed and feedback provided in summer and early fall 2011.

### 2. Academic Freedom Context of Boating

Motor boating is subject to laws that all people must obey. This proposed PPM policy goes well beyond legal requirements to institute administrative controls on motor boating and academic activities at UC Davis. The basis of concern over this proposal with regard to academic freedom stems from the University's long-standing policy on academic freedom, which is articulated in APM-010 and APM-015. According to APM-010, "The exercise of academic freedom entails *correlative duties of professional care* when teaching, conducting research, or otherwise acting as a member of the faculty." Also, APM-010 "establishes that faculty have primary responsibility for articulating the professional standards by which academic freedom may be sustained." There are also sentences in sections APM-015 B and C that give Academic senate members the rights and freedoms to pursue their research and use their best professional judgment in their activities. Thus, it is clearly stated in University policy and practice that faculty are responsible for oversight of their professional activities.

Boating activities of all types (including but not limited to motor boating) involve skills that fall within the professional domain of faculty who use those skills in their research and teaching. As a result, responsibility for and oversight of boating (including but not limited to motor boating) activities lie with faculty. There is a welcomed and important role for the administration to assist faculty through the provision of information, services, and indirect cost returns that support faculty boating activities, but there is no role for superseding faculty responsibility for their correlative duties of professional care. Even where a legal obligation exists for the University to have oversight of faculty professional activities (e.g., scuba diving), there is no legal requirement that the oversight be

empowered to non-faculty, and in fact the faculty should lead all oversight of professional activities, with participation and collaboration by administrators and staff.

There are substantial differences in the education and training of motor boating skills across faculty. Some faculty are trained motor boaters who regularly teach motor boating skills and use these skills in research and teaching. Other faculty are not trained in motor boating skills, but ask their students and /or employees to have them. Still other faculty are not using motor boating skills in research and teaching at all, but require motor boats as a means of transportation for research and teaching. Thus, there exists differential needs for information and services for faculty, but the variation does not change the foundation that faculty oversee professional activities, of which motor boating is one.

Notably, the same variation in professional skills exists for many other outdoor-related activities (e.g., such as driving, hiking, and swimming) as well as many indoor laboratory activities (e.g., instrumentation and chemical usage). As a result, it is feasible and more efficient to have universal policies and procedures to cover all activities in similar fashion to the extent possible, while also respecting the policy on academic freedom.

It is important to bear these concepts in mind as a foundation for Academic Senate review of policies and procedures that affect professional faculty activities.

### 3. CAFR Concerns With Proposed PPM 290.82

In I.A. "...for all research or educational activities...". To be consistent with I.B. and the PPM overall, it should read "...for all University research or educational activities...". Obviously the policy can only regulate things that the University is involved in.

In I.B. the policy excludes motor boats used in sports and recreational activities from regulation and oversight. The same conditions, hazards, and risks exist for motor boats used in sports and recreation, so we do not understand why they are excluded from rules about operation, training, and inspection? This exclusion implies that a differential ability to perform these functions exists at the University, with those involved in research and teaching incapable relative to those involved in sports and recreation. How can that be justified?

In II. and throughout the proposed policy sentences reads, "Boats used..." Previously in I.A., "motorized watercraft" were given the parenthetical "(boats)". The problem is that these sentences present the perception that each sentence is true as written (without requiring additional interpretation), when in fact the policy intends to limit its applicability to just motor boats; it is not intended to apply to non-motorized boats. It is common in policy practice when jargon is used to have a simplified word, phrase, or acronym to make text shorter, but a

problem arises when the simplified word already has a common usage that is different and fundamentally changes the policy. As written, many sentences imply that the policy regulates all boats and boating activities, whereas I.A. intends that the policy only regulate motorized watercraft. The risk of taking sentences out of context and over-regulating all boating as well as causing people within and external to the University to misunderstand the policy far outweighs the very minor reduction in text from “motor boat” to “boat”. Therefore, it is important and necessary to amend the text to add the word “motor” in every instance where “boat”, “boats”, and “boating activity” (and similar usages that risk misconstruing the policy) are used in the text.

III.A.1. “Each boat...must have a designated operator.” It is unclear from this wording whether only one person may use a motor boat. It is common practice for several people to share ownership and use of a motor boat, with different people serving as the operator on different days. A simple edit to the text would be to replace, “Each boat used for...” with “Each motor boating activity for”.

III.A.2.f. By law, everyone must comply with all laws and governmental regulations. This sentence is wasteful text and should be deleted.

III.B.3. change “as required by law” to “when required by law”. The sentence presents the false supposition that life jackets are always required to be used by law, when in fact law only requires that each motor boat be equipped with life jackets, not that motor boat participants use them at all times.

III.B.5. Please clarify in the text if non-employee University students are required to complete the waiver.

III.C. “Office of Boating Safety” should be “Office of Motor Boating Safety”. As presented, there is no indication that this unit will have any expertise outside of motor boating, and so it should not be granted authority or the external perception of authority over non-motorized boats. This correction should be made throughout the proposed policy text.

III.C.2 and IV.A. The proposed policy text related to inspections violates APM-010, does not conform to University practices and standards, and is not acceptable as written. As a policy context, consider two existing policies that relate to administrative oversight of faculty research: RE-89 and IACUC.

Reference policy #1: RE-89 was imposed by a vote of the Board of Regents (with the Assembly of the Academic Senate voting against its adoption) and requires special review, approval, and reporting procedures for proposals to obtain research funding from the tobacco industry, but it does not assign that important job to a staff person and without any faculty participation or oversight, as proposed in the boating policy. The actual campus-based RE-89 procedures vary, but the policy suggested that “The scientific review committee will be

composed of at least three faculty members with expertise in areas of science relevant to the proposal being submitted, and will advise the Chancellor regarding whether the proposed study uses sound methodology and whether it appears designed to allow the researcher to reach objective and scientifically valid conclusions.” The actual decision was proposed to be made by the Chancellor on the basis of the faculty oversight report. The 2009 Chair of the systemwide University Committee on Academic Freedom requested that a representative from the divisional Committee on Academic Freedom be an ex officio member of RE-89 review committees.

Reference policy #2: IACUC is a committee required by law to oversee animal use and care. University policy requires that IACUC is chaired by a tenured faculty member and vice-chaired by a faculty member. The committee includes the Attending Veterinarian, who is a professional.

Relative to those two established policies that both rely on faculty to assess professional activities of faculty, the proposed motor boating policy (a) lacks faculty participation in oversight of motor boat inspections, let alone faculty control of it, and (b) gives total authority to an unspecified staff person with unspecified qualifications to determine whether faculty use of a motor boat for academic activities is permitted. Even if the proposed Office of Motor Boating Safety would actually be or include a certified professional motor boat operator on par with the qualifications expected of the Attending Veterinarian on IACUC, it is still an unacceptable violation of APM-010 to grant that individual total authority over academic activities. This was already ruled on by CAFR back in 2006 and has been explained to the administration several times. Nothing has changed. Authority should be invested either in a faculty body in totality or in a committee chaired and vice-chaired by faculty with participation by the professional motor boater employed by the proposed Office of Motor Boating Safety. There is no role for any staff without demonstrated professional expertise in boating to serve on this committee. This faculty-led committee would then oversee inspections.

The U.S. Coast Guard Vessel Safety Check form referenced in IV.A.2 is not required by law, but is offered to the public on a courtesy basis. The “requirements” on the form and proposed by the policy are actually used to obtain a decal and include many items that may not be applicable for most motor boats used at UC Davis. In fact, all but four “requirements” have the option of “N/A”, which means that they are not requirements at all, as confirmed by the explanatory second page after the form. The policy is unclear as to whether those optional items will be required or not (if so, when?) per policy and procedures, which allows for capricious oversight of academic professional activities by non-faculty staff.

In addition to having faculty oversee inspections, the inspection process should include an appeals process if there is a lawful academic reason to operate and maintain a motor boat according to different standards than those indicated on

the checklist. The appeal should be to a different faculty body than the regular oversight committee, wherein a higher faculty authority, such as the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility or the Academic Senate Executive Council reviews the inspection dispute.

IV.A.3.a introduces for the first time the existence of a “vessel manager” who is not defined as having any Roles and Responsibilities in section III. Who is this person and what is the role relative to those listed for boat operators?

IV.C. The dictionary defines an “incident” as an event or occurrence. What does the usage of that word mean in this policy? Exactly what incidents must be reported? It seems like that word can be deleted from this entire section with no loss of meaning to the policy.

IV.C.2 sets a property damage standard that is too broad and a dollar limit of \$500 that is too low, potentially requiring unnecessary and excessive reporting. With regard to “property”, if a delicate, small but expensive scientific sensor is damaged while boating, say an employee drops it on the deck of the boat when the boat is stationary, how is that relevant to the Office of Motor Boating Safety? Scientific activity includes many simple but costly damages that have nothing to do with motor boating safety. The policy should limited property damage reports to only damages (a) to non-University property caused by the motor boat and (b) to the motor boat itself when damages to the boat are in excess of \$3000 or half the value of the motor boat, whichever is smaller. Recall that the University used to call every thing that cost >\$500 “equipment”, but changed that to \$5000 because it was too burdensome and inconsistent with external grant sponsors usage of the word. With a boat, a simple bump at a dock could cause \$1000 of minor cosmetic damage, and it does not make sense to have to report that.

IV.D. This entire section of the policy needs more thought and specification for different kinds of charters as well as in the U.S. and abroad. For example, what is the policy for when University personnel rent a small <16’ motor boat with no captain or crew on a nearby reservoir- the policy implies a requirement to have a USCG operators license for this kind of “bareboat charter” of a small boat, which does not make sense? What is the policy for riding on commercial ferries and other passenger transportation over water in the U.S. and abroad?

What is the policy for chartering vessels in foreign countries? In many developing countries where faculty do teaching and research, there may not exist vessel insurance for “Protection and Indemnity, and Hull and Machinery”, especially for chartering small boats, so what then? This unclear proposed policy has the potential to terminate all research and teaching related activities in developing nations, which is not appropriate or acceptable. Whatever proposed policy is developed in revision of this draft, foreign boating oversight for academic activities should also fall under faculty purview and not be delegated to a staff person. Staff can offer information and services.

VI.F. refers to a “boating manual”, which presumably is for motor boating only. No such manual exists. A policy should not refer to resources that do not exist, as the policy may be amended in the future with such information when and if it becomes available. If a motor boating manual exists, then it should be made available for review. The policy does not explain what the role of the manual would be relative to existing laws and regulations as well as University policies.

#### 4. CAFR Review Conclusions

The proposed policy on motor boating violates APM-010 for the many reasons listed above, such as the transference of authority over research and teaching from faculty to non-academic, unspecified staff. The proposed policy requires revision to address the concerns raised by CAFR.

# **Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)**

**December 7, 2011 5:38 PM**

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the draft UCD PPM Section 290-82 (Boating Safety). The new policy seems reasonable and the committee supports its adoption, although we are confused on one point. On page 3, section B2, the policy states "The boat operator must notify his/her supervisor as soon as possible....". Since in many cases the boat operator is a faculty member, to whom must the faculty member report following the completion of a trip? Clearly, it would be helpful to resolve that ambiguity before the final policy is issued.

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair  
Executive Committee  
College of Letters and Science

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (VETERINARY MEDICINE)**

**November 18, 2011 11:47 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**November 28, 2011 4:17 PM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Faculty Welfare**

**November 28, 2011 4:44 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

Submitted on behalf of 2011-12 Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Stuart Hill.

The Faculty Welfare Committee has reviewed the proposed policy on boating safety and has no comment at this time.

# **Planning & Budget**

**November 28, 2011 4:17 PM**

*No response at this time.*

# Research

**November 28, 2011 4:17 PM**

The Committee on Research discussed PPM 290-82: Proposed Boating Safety Policy. Overall, the committee agrees with the new policy. However, the committee does note the following concern:

**Item III.A.2.d "Ensuring that all boat occupants have received a safety briefing regarding the location and proper use of safety, navigation, and communications equipment aboard the boat prior to departure."**

COR agrees that may be impractical and unnecessary if the trip is a simple one, such as in California inland waters. COR agrees that all passengers should be familiar with safety equipment, but truly learning how to operate navigation and communication equipment can require hands-on practice, which is impractical if a large group is taking a short one-time trip. Even on a longer ocean-going voyage, COR assumes that the main concern is that the boat pilot/captain may become incapacitated, due to a heart attack or stroke. In that case, it seems sufficient that one "co-pilot" know how to operate all the equipment, rather than all the passengers.