

BRIDGE Group Meeting

Date: 01.17.12

Agenda

- 1. CAT Tag Process**
- 2. Building Specific Energy Measurement**
- 3. FM FY13 Budget Presentation**
- 4. Team Cleaning Update**

1. CAT Tag Process

Mike Berthelsen welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained that CPPM's Suzanne Smith had a schedule conflict and would be introduced at the March BRIDGE meeting. He encouraged BRIDGE members to contact and welcome her to the University.

Next Jim Green presented information on the CAT Tag Process (see attached). Jim began by explaining that the Building Systems Automation Center or BSAC had been moved under his direction. The group has started an overnight report (which BRIDGE members can sign up for) that records issues occurring on the second and third shifts and how they were resolved.

Reviewing that report for the period of July through December revealed that FM staff had 13 instances where they answered alarms for issues in freezers, incubators, cold rooms and RAR areas. This means that on average, research is being saved every 10 days. Jim said typical issues encountered were freezer doors left ajar, refrigeration systems failures, incubator O2 or CO2 failures and malfunctioning air handlers in RAR rooms.

Jim noted that during the same period of time there were 23 false alarms where an alarm was received, FM staff were dispatched and there was no real issue. For example, a researcher has removed product from a freezer to defrost the unit but not contacted anyone. These false alarms are a waste of resources and Jim explained what FM is doing to reduce them.

If FM is dispatched and finds a unit that has no product in it that has been in alarm they attach a bright orange CAT tag to the unit which states that the unit is no longer being monitored. This cuts down on the alarm traffic that BSAC must keep track of. The tag also has instruction to call FM's Call Center (4-2900) if a researcher would like to have the unit monitored again. He said that despite the CAT tags, each month units are discovered running that have research product inside. This means a researcher has ignored the tag and may be under the impression that the unit is being monitored. The long-term issue is that if the unit fails, no alarm would be received and invaluable research could be lost.

Jim requested BRIDGE members communicate with researchers about the CAT tag process and help ensure that contact information on individual units like freezers is kept up to date. Correct information ensures that when issues are discovered, then the appropriate person can be contacted quickly. Then in a shameless effort to curry favor with BRIDGE members Jim distributed CAT tags so everyone could take one with them.

2. Building Specific Energy Measurement

With BRIDGE members contentedly cradling their CAT tags, Jim shifted subjects to the how they can monitor energy usage in specific buildings. He displayed a sample e-mail from a BRIDGE member who had noticed a significant jump in their building's energy use and asked how to address the situation.

Jim said this is exactly the response FM would like to have. With additional eyes monitoring the data we are more likely to catch discrepancies and then be able to address issues. Jim directed BRIDGE members to the following page on FM's website

<http://www.facm.umn.edu/about/energy-management/building-dashboards/index.htm>

This page contains dashboards to monitor energy usage in real time, compare how a building is performing against itself year to year and, in a soon to be added feature, a building energy report card that determines how a building performs against the state of Minnesota's B3 energy guidelines. Jim said this data helps FM decide where to invest resources.

Q&A

How do you arrive at the numbers for the scorecard?

We take the B3 formula and divide it by information from the Space Management database. The B3 guidelines are written as if a building has a single use, e.g. labs. What we know at the University is that most buildings have mixed use so we apply a percentage based on how many square feet are designated for a particular use. While not completely accurate it does give us a good order of magnitude.

Will you add recommissioning information to the scorecard?

We hadn't thought about that but it's a good idea.

How's recommissioning going?

We've decided to change our strategy somewhat in that we're not using outside firms any longer but rather doing all the work ourselves. This makes getting to 40 buildings a year much more difficult. We think it makes sense because in spending the money on outside

consultants all we were getting were reports of general obvious things which are issues for most buildings, this way we know the work is getting done and the building is buttoned up before we leave. As we look at the recommissioning list we also try to leverage dollars that departments can bring to the table.

Has the mild winter helped with energy consumption?

Yes. Overall the University has saved money but Energy Management's ISO budget has taken a bit of a hit. One part of the budget is fuel costs and so those are down but the other are the fixed infrastructure costs that remain constant regardless of how much energy we sell. This translates into our losing money this year because we aren't selling as much energy.

3. FM FY13 Budget Presentation

Mike talked walked through FM's proposed FY 13 budget with the BRIDGE group (see attached). He started by explaining FM had been busy reducing costs during the previous six years. After moving to a property services model and redefining and hiring all FM Supervisor and Manager positions, FM reduced expenses by \$18 M from the FY09 budget and created a balanced budget for the first time. In addition FM:

- FY10 Implemented a new Custodial staffing model with revised standards that prioritize public spaces reducing staffing by 63 through attrition and a voluntary severance plan
- FY12 Implemented team cleaning, improving efficiency, reducing custodial staff by 52 while maintaining service levels without any involuntary lay offs.
- Streamlined and reduced Preventive Maintenance Program to target critical equipment and programs
- Initiated an Energy Conservation Program saving \$4.6M in 2 years
- Reduced Administrative expenses, consolidating from 5 to 3 districts

Mike explained that for FY13 FM's three key objectives would be:

- Sustaining and improving the team cleaning model
- Planning for the Combined Heat and Power installation and renovation at Old Main
- Continuing business planning, building off the success of fire alarm testing to next examine waste stream management as well as elevators maintenance.

Turning to the budget, he noted that of the \$196.4M in expenses, there are three main buckets where roughly \$104M accrues to utilities, \$25M to custodial and \$45M to maintenance. For FY12 FM's allocation was \$145M and the FY13 request is for \$143M. The request is lower for two reasons; FM has reduced headcount and saved significant amounts of energy. Mike

displayed a slide that charted campus square footage and its growth beyond 15M sq.ft. and contrasted it with the reduction in FM staffing which has been reduced by nearly 300 positions during the last six years. Recommissioning and the It All Adds Up campaign have helped save \$4.6M during the last two years. Taken together this helps explain how FM's portion of the O&M cost pool has held steady or dropped during the last three fiscal years.

Mike also touched on the FCA database and how FM uses it to help guide investment decisions with HEAPR and R&R funds as well as which buildings need to be taken down.

Q&A

Will there be any reorganization of the maintenance staff?

Not on the scale of our custodial program. As we've built our staffing model we try to have more work on hand than people to do it so that we don't have staff looking for things to do. For example if a district team needs help they first can go to a district labor pool, then U Construction and finally to outside contractors if necessary. We're working to keep our staff up to date by having both on-line and hands-on training for our mechanics.

4. Team Cleaning Update

Mike updated members on team cleaning implementation. He said that in past years with larger staff size there were floater pools to address absences due to custodians calling in sick or FMLA. With reduced staffing this is no longer the case and so each absence creates a larger impact. FM has instituted the Kronos timekeeping system to help clearly identify attendance issues.

Mike also said that after not hiring a custodian for three years FM has been hiring to make sure staffing doesn't dip below the 425 position mark. He explained that as part of the Teamster contract, custodians can bid into different positions and then try them for up to 10 days before accepting the bid or returning to their old position. This occurs with some frequency during a "normal" year. In FY 12, since the entire campus had to be rebid (again according to Teamster contract) in August, there has been even more movement than normal. Staff will take several more months before settling into a more "normal" pattern. Additionally, FM is also making adjustments where possible when building occupants have asked for certain tasks to be performed at different times of the day.

Mike shared that the annual Sightline survey scores were down this year and that they will be reviewed with BRIDGE members at a later meeting. In addition, FM will be surveying both

BRIDGE members and building contacts again this spring specifically on the custodial program.

Q&A

When is the Teamster contract going to be resolved?

We go to arbitration February 16-17 and then hope to have a ruling within 30 days. We feel we have a strong case but so do they which is I guess why we're in arbitration.

Do you have any update on the State audit?

Typically the audit is specific, such as review reading proficiency for home schooled students. This audit has been fairly vague. They would like to determine how the U manages the FCA process as well as how our PM program is run. We've made significant improvements since the earlier audits of '88 and '91. At first they'd asked for all the work orders in COMPASS but after getting a sense of the volume they reconsidered. We've given them all the PM records for the past ten years as well as full access to the FCA database. We'll give them everything they want but we don't know what their timeframe to complete the audit is.