

BRIDGE Group Meeting

Date: 11.19.13

Agenda

1. **Building Access and Security**
2. **Research Safety Program**
3. **Facilities Condition Assessment**

1. Building Access and Security

Mike Berthelsen welcomed everyone, reviewed the agenda and turned it over to Brian Swanson to introduce new Building Access and Security Initiatives. Brian presented a slide with current U Services Goals (1. Optimize Physical Assets, 2. Ensure a safe campus, 3. Provide a memorable student experience) for background, and oriented the discussion around goal 2. Ensure a safe campus. Given the recent spate of crime adjacent to campus, University leaders, led by VP Wheelock have launched three work groups to address the following;

- a) Campus Design Improvements
 - Lead: Suzanne Smith
 - Scope: Develop an improvements plan for lighting, landscape, sightlines etc. focusing on improving major student circulation routes after hours between major campus and neighborhood destinations. Identify staffing, funding and schedule options and requirements.
- b) Building Access
 - Lead: Brian Swanson with Paige Rohman
 - Scope: Develop a plan for improving building access control including building hours, access zones (public, University, restricted), access approval processes, gap analysis, and priority project list. Identify staffing, funding and schedule options and requirements.
- c) Exterior Surveillance
 - Lead: Chief Hestness
 - Scope: Review existing external camera coverage on campus and on campus edges, develop a list of priority areas for additional coverage. Identify funding and schedule options and requirements.

After a summary of all initiatives, Brian focused discussion on Building Access. Staffed by select BRIDGE members (Paul Wright, Scott Elton, David Crane), FM, Central Security, Finance, CPPM and Student Affairs, planning will kick-off on December 2, 2013. The team will

generate recommendations and the full BRIDGE group will serve as a sounding board. Anticipate routine updates over the next two quarters.

Q&A

What is the plan for resolving wi-fi coverage issues? Students, staff, faculty in dead-zones may not receive TEXT-U notifications.

Wireless coverage is managed by a separate OIT initiative. Refer to the following links for additional information;

- Coverage Maps: <http://www.oit.umn.edu/wireless/coverage-map/index.htm>
- Enhancement Schedule: <http://www.oit.umn.edu/wireless/campus-implementation/enhancement-schedule/index.htm>

Another suggestion for follow-up concerned the use of the voicemail system for emergency notification. Is it viable? Who should we talk to?

Are there established roles & responsibilities for various stakeholders during an emergency event? For example, what are instructors expected to do, staff, DCS, emergency management, etc?

Planning and procedures for emergency events are handled by the Department of Emergency Management. Bob Janoski offered the comment that in the event of a lock-down (a topic of much discussion due to the recent event in Anderson Hall), DCS or the responding officer has the authority to issue a lock-down.

It would be beneficial to invite Emergency Management (Lisa Dressler?) to a future meeting to continue this discussion. Agenda should include, at a minimum, a review of the Emergency Operations Plan (overall plan that guides U Administrators in event of emergency), the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and a status update on Building Emergency Plans.

2. Research Safety Program

Joe Klancher, DEHS – Research Safety Program Manager, provided an overview of the Research Safety Program. The goal of the program is to establish a robust safety culture and eliminate unnecessary risk of harm to employees in the research community. Joe's group provides a consultative approach through day to day interactions with RSOs, supervisors/managers, safety committees and other leadership contacts. Joe focused on two current initiatives and discussed the 2013-2014 activities;

Current Initiatives

- Research Safety Manual – “how to” resource for lab personnel that will assist with designing/implementing/sustaining lab safety. Ready by end of year 2013.
- Laboratory Safety Audits – Educate and train lab personnel, augment supervision in the research community, instill accountability for safety with lab personnel, and build safety advocacy among all participants.
 - Initial audit spanned approximately 900 labs and identified compliance with Chemical Storage, Chemical Labeling, Chemical Waste, PPE, Eye Washes, Hoods and Safety Training.
 - Audit provides a baseline for continuous improvement. Annual visits will target high risk areas or those in need of improvement, while all other areas will be re-assessed every 2 years.
 - An electronic audit management system will be implemented to store, analyze and report on data. Team is in requirements phase – system launch date TBD.

2013-2014 Activities

- Laboratory Signage
- 1-page Safety Plans (Fire and Severe Weather)
- Safety Committee Development
- Administrative Policy for Research Safety
- Chemical Inventory System (2-3 year project, if accepted/approved)
- College Specific Activities
- Particularly Hazardous Chemical Segregation (AHC/CBS)
- Hazard Assessment and SOP development in Chem/ChemE (CSE)
- Develop resources for Fieldwork and Process Safety (CFANS)

Q&A

How does your group define lab spaces (for audits, etc) – by bench, PI space assignment, other?

A "Lab" can be a room or connected group of rooms under the control of a single PI.

A "Lab" can also be a bench or benches within a shared space.

A single PI can have one or several "Labs".

Usually one program will have one lab, but some research programs are split into more than one lab depending on how those spaces are managed.

Our goal is to cover all of the real estate where research involving potentially hazardous activities takes place. We have completed our initial round of audits and have identified and visited approximately 900 "labs" on the Twin Cities Campus. This includes some but not all Independent Service Organizations (ISOs or core labs) and teaching labs. We

expect to increase our scope to include all ISOs and teaching labs at some point in the future.

How are lab evacuation plans being developed – by individual labs or centrally?

The fire plans and severe weather plans we are implementing are intended to provide direction (and a means of training) to lab workers on how to immediately respond should either of these events occur. The plans will be done by individual labs. These are one page fill in the blanks and should take no more than 10 minutes for a lab to develop. My staff along with the departmental Research Safety Officers are visiting (auditing) the labs and will make sure the plans are maintained and communicated to the lab workers.

The plan templates have been reviewed by the Department of Emergency Management and will augment the DEM building plans whenever they are developed.

The DEM plans identify Floor Monitors, Emergency Evacuation Personnel, Work Area Reps and assign them all duties intended to assure an orderly and complete evacuation. The DEM plan also assigns reassembly locations. The average lab worker doesn't need to know all of that. So my plans instruct lab workers on how to immediately report emergencies, shut down critical operations, attend to the hazardous situation if safe to do so, and where to go if they must evacuate. The reassembly location is the primary overlap for the DEM and my plans.

Will your group develop standards or specifications for certain lab safety equipment, like eye washes?

My group is developing general guidelines for when certain types of equipment are necessary as well as guidelines on safe operation of some types of equipment.

We would rely on CPPM or FM design, equipment, or purchasing standards to specify brands or model numbers that perform best operationally. My team would likely be able to contribute to these types of discussions as they occasionally hear complaints and are becoming more closely connected with the end users.

3. Facilities Condition Assessment

Andrew Chan, FM – FCA Program Manager, provided an update on the FCA program and 2013 results, focusing on Program Background, 2013 FCA Update Project, impact of persistent funding challenges and new approaches to prioritizing renewal investments. The deck presented was originally prepared for the Board of Regents and can be found on the FCA website at the following link; <http://z.umn.edu/fca>

BRIDGE Summary Minutes

11.19.13

Page 4

Discussion focused on new initiatives for FY14, specifically the Draft Investment Model that combines various data/metrics to bucket buildings into investment portfolios (e.g. “Keep Up”, “Defer and Do Not Reinvest”, “Dispose or Replace”) and develop a multi-year investment strategy that aligns needs with actual funding. FM is planning to finalize and communicate a plan for all TC Campus buildings within the year.