

## **BRIDGE Group Meeting**

**Date: 09.18.12**

### **Agenda**

- 1. Capital Project Funding & Approval Process**
- 2. DRAFT HEAPR List**
- 3. Ccure Card Access System**
- 4. SMART Asset Management Program Update**

### **1. Capital Project Funding & Approval Process**

Mike Berthelsen welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Brian Swanson, AVP for University Services Finance and JP Hagerty from the Office of the Vice President for University Services. They presented information on the process for funding and approving capital projects. They noted that the policy was approved by the President's policy committee after having consulted with the Debt Oversight Group, Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, CPPM, Capital Oversight Group and the Policy Advisory Committee.

Brian reminded BRIDGE members that this covers all capital projects greater than \$500,000 which are part of either the Six Year Capital Plan or the Annual Capital Improvement Budget. Any project in the latter must have a CPPM completed pre-design, funds in a plant account or approved finance agreement and must be ready to proceed with design and construction. He also said that in kind gifts cannot include design services or be counted towards project funding sources. In a further note of caution, Brian reminded the audience that only the Vice President of University Services or a specified designee (e.g. CPPM AVP) can sign Capital Project contracts, Chancellors, Deans and other Vice Presidents do not have the signature authority. Brian said he hoped that at some point the institution would raise that threshold to one million dollars.

### **Q&A**

What's the timeline for the approval limit being moved to one million dollars?

I would like to see it happen to bring it into alignment with other things like Real Estate, however I don't have a specific time nor am I aware of it happening soon.

When will the six year capital plan be updated?

We plan to present to the Board of Regents in February or March.

## **2. DRAFT HEAPR List**

Next Mike explained that even though it was an off funding year the University will make a HEAPR request. The request will be broken into two sizes, \$35 million and \$100 million, of which the Twin Cities Campus will submit \$29 million and \$89 million respectively. Mike distributed a draft list noting that the first 87 rows in the spreadsheet had already been funded and listed the source of the funds. He asked BRIDGE members to e-mail both he and the appropriate FM District Director their project priorities before the end of September to help inform the list.

## **3. Ccure 9000 Card Access System**

Bob Janoski, Director of the Department of Central Security, informed the BRIDGE group of the Ccure card access system upgrade. He reminded them this is the system that allows for central control and automation for locking and unlocking buildings. This upgrade is a long way from the system's humble beginnings in Mariucci area. It now covers more than 2,300 card readers, 2,800 doors in 176 buildings across the Twin Cities Campus, coordinate campuses and research stations. It's this growth that made the upgrade necessary. The database has been moved from one server to a master and four satellite servers. The new configuration allows for additional growth on the system and is more secure than having all the information in one place.

Bob then introduced Cassie Williams, Program Specialist and Steve Jorgenson Assistant Department Director who discussed the roles of Department Access Coordinator (DAC) and new after hours unlocking service. There are more than 600 DACs representing 300 departments that have been chosen by a Dean, Director, Chancellor or Department head to coordinate their unit's keys and card access. A full list of DAC responsibilities can be found on the web at <http://www1.umn.edu/dcs/dac.html>. The DAC will play a critical role for coordinating after hours lock and unlock events.

DCS is asking that any request be made by 4:00 pm three days in advance of an after hours event. As of September 21 and emergency after hours request will follow this procedure:

1. Caller must be a pre-authorized primary or secondary DAC
2. DAC required to send an email OR provide their password and budget number  
Budget number must be previously listed in Central Security's records.
3. Request is processed
4. Processing fee will be applied (\$80/hr)

5. Central Security sends a confirming email to the DAC describing the request that was completed
6. DAC responds to email confirming the request

For the first time, this new system will allow DCS monitoring staff the ability to unlock doors without having to have a DAC be on campus. By having a prearranged password, DCS will know the DAC has authorized the unlock and it also doesn't put DCS monitoring staff in a position of liability. In order to do the remote unlock, monitoring staff will leave their consoles to complete the transaction. To cover these costs DCS will be charging an \$80 fee which will only be applied if the request was not made three days in advance. The DCS team asked that DAC's stay on top of event scheduling, submit passwords and budget numbers to Cassie Williams ([willi434@umn.edu](mailto:willi434@umn.edu)) if they would like to enroll in the afterhours program as well as to go to DAC training. They said that departments do not have to participate but then should not expect an after hours monitoring person to unlock buildings for events.

## Q&A

Does it really take three days to process card access?

No we typically can do that the same day of a request.

I'm not clear on when the \$80 fee applies then. Will you charge that for all after hours events?

If you make your request 3 days in advance of an after hour event you will not be charged. It takes time to program doors and elevators and we want to make sure we are being fair. One customer's emergency shouldn't impact someone else's planned event. We are also looking to make sure you have an incentive to not wait until 4:30 pm on a Friday for events happening the next day. Should you make that choice, we will make every effort to meet it but that's when the \$80 fee could be applied. The \$80 is a flat fee for up to an hour of processing time, which would cover most requests. However, if your event had an unusually large amount of doors that needed to be programmed, an additional \$80 will be charged per additional hour of processing time.

Will you charge \$80 if someone locks themselves out of their building?

No. The fee is only for after hours events that don't have a 3 day notice. DCS will also not charge a fee if we have made a mistake and not programmed an after hours event. A real positive of this system is that it allows us to correct the problem from the monitoring station.

If we have customers how should we get you their EFS number?

I don't have an answer for you at this point.

Is the new system capable of handling the scheduling if we give you dates up to a year in advance?

Yes.

Can the system handle something like a delayed start due to bad weather?

Yes. The good news is that it is much more nimble. It is more automated than the old system.

This has been a good discussion concerning the DAC and at our next BRIDGE meeting we will be talking about what are the expectations for being a building contact. We will be sending an e-mail to BRIDGE members and Building Contacts as part of forming safety committees for each building. We would like BRIDGE members to weigh in on which Building Contacts volunteer for the Safety Committees.

#### **4. SMART Asset Management Program Update**

Mike reminded the group that FM is looking to replace the aging COMPASS CMMS system. They currently have an RFP to find a vendor to assist in the visioning process. The system won't be as large as EFS but will address coordinate campus needs and be an enterprise system. Mike said that a steering committee has been formed and includes both BRIDGE members and representatives from the coordinates.

#### **Q&A**

Will this align with CPPM's Skyre system or OCM's new product?

While it may not contain those systems, we need to make sure our processes align and all the software can communicate between the products. What we've heard so far is that CMMS systems just don't handle the construction side of things well. We will need our chosen program to somehow link or "talk to" Skyre.

Athletics is using ABI for scheduling but it doesn't interface with Peoplesoft very well. What are others using?

The police moved from Kronos to Workforce Director and besides allowing employees to bid for shifts, etc. it works well with Peoplesoft. If you would like more information contact either Deputy Chief Minor or U Services IT's Steve Levin.

**5. Misc.**

Mike closed the meeting by informing the group that FM's annual Sightlines customer survey would be coming out in October and that FM's SLA's would be reflecting the bi-annual budget process and be structured for two year periods.