BRIDGE Group Meeting
Date: 05.15.12

Agenda

1. Waste & Recycling Business Review
2. Building Emergency Plans
3. Review custodial survey of BRIDGE & Bldg contacts
4. Arbitration Update
5. Team Cleaning Update

1. Waste & Recycling Business Review

Mike Berthelsen welcomed everyone to the meeting and turned the floor over to Paul Drews and Dana Donatucci of FM’s Central Service group. They are responsible for handling the U’s waste and recycling streams. Dana pointed out that the waste stream is divided in to Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), Recycling, Debris, ReUse items and Biohazardous waste. Dana said that of the 8461 tons of MSW, 5188 tons were incinerated, while 3273 tons were recycled. Of the 2306 tons of debris, 1150 tons were either landfilled or incinerated while 1156 tons were recycled or reclaimed. In looking at the 537 tons of biohazardous waste 298 tons were disposed through an outside vendor while 239 tons was handled by our tissue digester.

FM compared rates with a leading national waste hauling company and found that the U was about the same cost but are able to provide more flexible service to meet specific campus needs.

Q&A

What is the biggest revue producer for the program?

Most people think it would be aluminum but office paper generates the most income for our program.

Is theft of recycling a major issue?

We know there are some community members who take our aluminum. We don’t think it’s a major issue.

What’s the difference between single stream and multistream recycling?

Single stream means the material is all collected at once and then sorted at a different location, multistream means the material is first separated where it’s collected, like in our quad system. We get a better price for our office paper because it hasn’t been contaminated in anyway with, for example, liquids from cans.
Do students get a chance to work in the program?

Yes we have both internships and work study positions.

How do you keep material dry to keep shipping costs down?

We’ve figured we pay approximately $15,000 in additional costs because of moisture. While we do have lids on our containers, we explored building shelters but it was cost prohibitive.

One service BRIDGE members should be aware of that’s been helpful to my department has been confidential shredding you provide.

We’re looking at getting an industrial size shredder that would allow ups to also handle documents governed by HIPPA regulations. We believe this would be a valuable addition to our suite of services.

Another thing I appreciate about your service is that the drivers know how to operate on a busy college campus. I’d be a little nervous if an outside firm began driving big trucks on our busy streets while school was in session.

2. Building Emergency Plans

Mike introduced Lisa Dressler the new Director of the Department of Emergency Management (DEM). Lisa joined the University after serving in a similar capacity with the City of Minneapolis. Lisa was joined by Gary Hendrickson, DEM’s Assistant Director and Kate Garsombke who walked through Building Emergency Plans with the group.

Kate said that DEM manages three types of emergency plans including Emergency Operations for the entire campus, Operational Continuity plans for individual units and finally Building Emergency Plans (BEP) for individual structures. She said that BEP’s typically give instruction for building tenants in case of an emergency, outlines their roles, identifies where gathering/shelter points are located and list building contact information.

DEM would like to have a BEP established for every building by within 12 months (half done by January) along with a working safety committee who has met at least once by January. They are prioritizing their efforts on buildings with the highest occupancy and risk of hazards.

The University will be a safer institution when they are completed because BEP’s get occupants thinking about safety preparation, increase their safety knowledge as well as signaling to students, faculty and staff that safety is important.
Because DEM is a small department tasked with covering the entire campus, they need to enlist BRIDGE members to help establish building safety committees and identify ideal meeting/sheltering points on campus.

There are three key roles within each BEP that Kate said DEM would like BRIDGE members to help find within their buildings and units. The first is a Work Area Rep who will:

- Maintain current employee list
- Ensure employees leave the building or shelter in place
- Assist or direct employees to safe rooms or down stairs
- Check off accounted-for employees on list
- Collect info on missing employees

They will be joined by a Floor Monitor who is responsible for:

- Monitor hallways on assigned floor and ensure employees are moving to exits
- Check restrooms
- Make sure fire doors and exits are closed and not blocked open
- Assist or direct employees to safe rooms or down stairs
- Prevent re-entry into building

Finally each building safety committee will need to identify an Emergency Coordinator who performs the following functions:

- Collect information on building occupants known or suspected to still be in building from Floor Monitors and/or Work Area Reps
- Meet emergency responders at building entrance
- Report information on occupants needing assistance or others still in building to On-Scene Commander

Kate concluded by laying out next steps for the BEP project which included:

- Start assembling building committees
- Hold a meeting with committees
- Begin work on BEP template
- Start a planning cycle with annual updates and exercises
Q&A

Will Athletics be handled differently?

We’ll still need to have a BEP in place even though athletic venues have a number of occupants who don’t “work” in the building.

How do we communicate with faculty who may switch buildings from year to year?

We’ll want to make sure we’ve got clear signage in buildings, store the BEP’s on-line and work with OCM to communicate with instructors.

It is also important to create plans for 7 days a week since many of our buildings are in use beyond the typical work week.

At the libraries we’ve created a binder kept at the main circulation desk.

It also might be good to include a QR code on signage so folks can quickly find the BEP.

We are working with the GIS project to include this type of information on the web site.

Have you scheduled a check of tone alert radios. I find the messages are garbled.

We are going to be replacing all the tone alert radios, in addition we got 17 outdoor speaker locations and Txt U to help notify folks.

It would also be good to leverage the U’s digital signage network.

3. Custodial Survey Results, Arbitration and Team Cleaning Update

Brad Hoff discussed the survey FM conducted of both Building Contacts and BRIDGE members. The survey was administered in April and was a follow up to the initial one conducted in November of 2011. The questions were the same. Building Contacts were asked to rate the cleanliness of their buildings, to list one area that building occupants identify as having the most issues and if they would like to meet with an FM representative to discuss issues. In addition, the April survey provided an open field for respondents to enter any information they liked, although they were asked to include building and floor information in order to make comments actionable.

The fall survey had 219 responses compared to 137 in the spring with a higher percentage saying their buildings had remained the same, improved or improved dramatically in the spring survey. FM clearly has ample room to improve their services but the needle has
begun to move in the right direction. Brad noted a troubling trend in that the percentage of Building Contacts identifying “uncertainty regarding services” jumped in the spring survey despite cleaning schedules being posted on the website, shared at the BRIDGE meeting and in customer advisory groups. In answering the same question on the BRIDGE survey the percentage of BRIDGE members listing “uncertainty regarding services” fell dramatically but Brad also said that the number of BRIDGE members responding to the survey had gone from 29 in the fall to 11 in the spring. The smaller sample of BRIDGE respondents also identified bathroom cleanliness as the most significant area for custodial service improvements.

Mike said that there had been no word regarding the Team Cleaning arbitration between the University and Teamsters but he was hopeful it would arrive in the next several weeks. He noted that FM would be forming a standing continuous improvement team for custodial issues and one of their first tasks will be to review the tour notes being turned in by all levels of supervisory staff to identify specific changes that can be made to the program. Mike said this year has been about implementing a new system while the next year will focus on standardization and quality improvements. Mike also handed out the HEAPR list to BRIDGE members.

**Q&A**

As much as the schedule of when offices are being cleaned is important, it is also critical to share what should be cleaned.

Along those lines, I think it is important those tasks get placed on custodial crew task cards so they know what they should be doing. I have some members of my department doing their own dusting in offices. I think FM needs to improve on the office cleaning. I will say that the clinic and lab cleaning has gotten better.

I wonder how the U compares with others in terms of supervisory staff. Do we have enough?

We are in the ball park with industry standards. Part of how we’re trying to address that is to empower the Senior on each crew to take more responsibility as the lead worker to make sure crews have their equipment and assignments. In looking at our changes, I’ve been thinking about the transition to team cleaning being one year to plan, one year to implement and then one year to develop a quality assurance program that helps FM improve overall custodial performance. We have had a tremendous amount of churn because in rebidding the campus folks were in new positions. They were deciding if they liked working where they bid and then have the right under the contract to bid into openings as they occur, which is further complicated by having a 10-day trial period. Fully nine months into the new program most of that has settled out. While our model
got 95% of coverage right, we have identified hot spots where we plan to add additional custodial staff in FY 13. This summer we’re also taking a larger number of UDS workers to increase our reach and catch up on work.

What’s the timeline for the HEAPR list?

It will be solidified next month and we’ll take time to review it in depth at the July BRIDGE meeting.