

BRIDGE Group Meeting

Date: 05.21.13

Agenda

1. **Introductions**
2. **Planned Electrical Outages**
3. **Non-standard security systems**
4. **FM FY 14 Rates**
5. **Building Manger Position**

1. **Introducing Shane Stennes and Linda Weingarten**

Mike Berthelsen welcomed everyone to the meeting. He announced that Brad Hoff was leaving FM for a position at St. Olaf College. Weeping and gnashing of teeth lasted for approximately five seconds before Mike introduced Shane Stennes as the Interim FM CAO. Tears having turned to cheers, Mike said that he anticipated Shane serving for four to six months while the permanent position was posted in late summer. Shane's contact information is 6-2588 and Stennes@umn.edu.

He then turned to Bill Paulus who introduced Linda Weingarten the newly hired Associate Director of U Construction. Linda is a Mechanical Engineer with more than 15 years of design experience and project management experience. She will be leading the Sign Shop, Hazardous Waste Abatement, U Construction Design and U Construction. She can be reached at 6-8374 or weing020@umn.edu.

2. **Planned Electrical Outages**

FM's Energy Management Associate Director Erick Van Meter talked to the group regarding planned electrical outages. He said that it is important the equipment is maintained so the unplanned outages do not occur or are lessened. Erick mentioned that industry best practice calls for gear to be cleaned, lubricated and checked every six years. The U has some that has gone ten years. The delay occurs because it is difficult to schedule time for the outages due to many disparate customer needs. He appealed for the BRIDGE members help with the scheduling.

Erick explained that there are three different types of electrical infrastructure for University buildings. The first is a single feed to a building which means that to conduct work on the equipment you must take the entire building off line. The second is a building with redundant feeds which enable you to use one of two switches but the building can experience a short (less than a second) bump in power. This second configuration also has to be taken down completely to work on some of the equipment. The third set up is a completely redundant system which is

used in the most critical research buildings. This allows FM to work on the entire system without building occupants being aware or impacted. While this would be ideal for every building to have system type it is cost prohibitive.

Erick thanked St. Paul and West Bank customers for their help in scheduling the work that is occurring now. Dave Moore commented that the shutdowns started on Monday, are occurring from 1:00 am until 4:00 am and have gone smoothly so far. He said the District's biggest concern is when power comes back up that all systems start and function as designed. Erick noted this has been done with six week notice but that moving forward they plan to give six months notice so that researchers and programs can plan accordingly. They'll be targeting shoulder seasons of late spring/early summer and late fall/early winter because the University's electrical loads aren't as high for blocks of planned outages. FM will be doing discrete building outages by working with specific customers to minimize impacts. For example targeting Residents Halls for summer when they aren't hosting camps.

Q&A

When do you bring in backup gear?

That's done on a case by case basis. We need to ensure Fire/Life Safety codes are met. FM has a number of different sized generators but they also get used for projects while we're permanent solutions are being ordered. We are also shifting folks away from the practice of tying into the emergency backup system with non-FLS systems which isn't appropriate.

How long is the power off?

While it depends on the configuration, it is usually a minimum of two hours up to about eight.

Are you looking at the structures that house the equipment like the vaults?

We will check to see if this is being done via ISES inspections for FCA.

3. Non-standard security systems

Mike said that FM has learned quite a bit about the drawbacks to non-standard security systems in place throughout the University. He noted this often occurred during an emergent situation such as a flood where a water issue has occurred behind a locked door that FM doesn't have keys to unlock. In order to reduce or avoid this situation, FM has partnered

with DCS to create a DRAFT recommendation to discuss with BRIDGE members. Based on their feedback, Mike will take a more formalized version to VP Wheelock for her consideration.

He noted that a one-size doesn't seem to fit all the situations encountered at the U and that different menu options are being considered between the two ends of simple keys or the centralized networked card readers.

Mike turned the meeting over to Bob Janoski who first walked through the pros and cons of keys, standalone card readers and networked card readers (see attached). He noted the upfront cost for each solution per door was \$50 for keys, \$1500-2500 for standalone systems and \$5,000-8,000 for networked card readers. Bob said it was important to find a solution that matches the program needs and asked BRIDGE members to remember the total life cycle costs when they make a choice, noting that standalone systems have many long-term maintenance issues.

Bob said that developing standards will be critical as the institution moves forward and suggested the following for BRIDGE members to consider.

- Eliminate punch code entry because they can't be monitored or controlled
- Require any system to have either a Best or Medeco key override
- Include the following if a standalone system is selected
 - Serve fewer than 50 people on 5 or less doors
 - Record Data for minimum of 90 days
 - Work with the U Card
- Prohibit standalone systems for use to protect (cash, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, BSL labs, HIPPA info, etc)
- Require a maintenance program to include
 - Data uploads and programming and data extraction for investigative purposes
 - Monthly testing, including audit verification and cardholder troubleshooting
 - Battery replacement, preventative maintenance program
 - Project management responsibilities for installations and equipment orders
 - Training

Bob estimated the DCS cost to be approximately \$1,000 per year to per reader to conduct onsite testing, preventative maintenance and one data update. He said that working with DAC's could potentially reduce those costs.

Q&A

Aren't there wireless units that could dramatically drop the costs?

Three different organizations represented by BRIDGE members have tried wireless and found them to be unreliable and have poor or non-existent vendor support. Many companies have sold systems to U departments only to go out of business or fail to perform up to the claims of their systems. Someday a wireless technology will work but it's not here yet. DCS/FM should pilot it so we don't have others waste money chasing different solutions. If you are approached by a vendor, please share with DCS.

Can the institution look at lowering the cost through the cost pools?

Since 9-11 we have invested annually in installing networked card readers on external doors - starting with \$1.5m and now in the range of \$500k per year. FM has matched departmental funds in these efforts. There are approximately 25 buildings left. We will continue to figure out ways to try and lower the costs. Note that after the initial panel is installed, the per door costs drop dramatically.

How do you feel about Keytrack system in each building?

After securing all external doors, DCS would make getting a Keytrack in each building the next priority. Those systems are currently in 12 buildings.

How long will it take to create new security standards?

We would look to accomplish over the next 6 to 18 months and will bring an update to the July BRIDGE meeting.

At first blush the standalone maintenance plan seems too expensive.

We know we need to create standards and that the systems need to be maintained but haven't cemented a plan yet. That's part of today's discussion. We'll continue to work on that and make sure that beside working any standalone system can provide an audit trail.

4. FM FY14 Rates and SLA

Mike pointed out that FM is moving to a two-year SLA which can be found at http://www.facm.umn.edu/prod/groups/userservices/@pub/@userservices/@fm/documents/content/userservices_content_443602.pdf

FM Directors and Associate Directors will be contacting BRIDGE members to review and sign the new SLA's during the next couple of months. The SLA's contain FM FY14 loaded rates (see attached).

BRIDGE Summary Minutes

05.21.13

4

5. Building Manager Position

The final item discussed by the BRIDGE group was the proposed Building Manager position. Mike distributed the DRAFT Building Manager position description (see attached) that was based on the roles BRIDGE members supported at the March meeting as well as job descriptions submitted by Paul Wright, Fred Clayton and Peg Brown. Mike asked that BRIDGE members send either he or Shane Stennes edits to the position description during the next two weeks. He then plans to review with VP Wheelock to get her input with the next step being the OP Ex Committee. If they support the idea the final step would be to review with the Deans.

How would it be funded?

We don't have an answer at this point. Different groups currently fund it differently with ISO's including it in their rates, the AHC through an internal tax structure and some Deans making it a priority and setting aside budget. Most, if not all of the functions are currently being performed but often by a number of different people.

It would be nice to have a matrix to identify exactly who is doing what roles in different organizations so we can find either gaps or overlaps.

That's something that might make sense to create. We also need to keep plugging away at emergency plans. FM will be working with DEM to help get them established in every building.