



MEETING SUMMARY

Ad Hoc Joint City-Schools Facility Investment Task Force

Facility Maintenance & Operations Subcommittee

Monday, October 16, 2017

1 Task Force Members Present

- Amy Liu, Chair
- Micheline Castan-Smith
- Lynn Hampton

2 COA and ACPS Project Staff

- Dr. Lois Berlin, Interim Superintendent, ACPS
- Arthur Wicks, Budget/Management Analyst, Office of Management and Budget
- Erika Gulick, Facilities Planner / GIS Specialist, ACPS
- Dominic Turner, CFO, ACPS
- Katherine Carraway, Urban Planner, Department of Planning and Zoning

3 Consultants

- Kayla Anthony, Brailsford & Dunlavey
- Adam Shrivinski, A2 Services

4 Community Comment Period

- There were no comments submitted to the Subcommittee by community members.

5 Introductory Remarks

- Ms. Liu, Chair, gave introductory remarks and reviewed meeting goals.
- Ms. Anthony provided a high-level review of the previous meeting and reiterated the overall goals of this subcommittee.

6 Work to Date on Prioritization of the Facilities Capital Improvement Program

- Ms. Anthony reviewed work Task Force members have completed to date on prioritizing the facility projects under their purview. Work includes meeting discussions as well as homework each member completed between meetings.
- The next full Task Force meeting will continue the prioritization work.

7 Update & Key Take-aways for Discovery Phase of City, ACPS and Fire Department Maintenance and Operations

- Mr. Shrivinski provided an overview of this phase, which included:
 - Introductory interviews with the Department of General Services, ACPS Facility, and Alexandria Fire Department staff
 - Overview of departments
 - Current preventative maintenance practices
 - Staff involvement/structure
 - Deep dive interviews:
 - Meetings provided an in-depth review of building profiles; preventative maintenance systems, policies, and contractors; and facilities issues and concerns
 - Review of preventative maintenance documentation
 - Initial review of documentation notes that each entity has an engaged facilities program, but standardization has yet to be achieved and prioritization of resources can be improved.
 - cursory facility assessments and operational reviews
 - Reviews focused on mechanical, electrical and plumbing equipment, but noted various other issues to the facility staff
- Initial Takeaways
 - All three entities have implemented performance maintenance systems, but standardization and effectiveness can be improved.
 - Performance maintenance is accomplished in various ways, but resources (direct & indirect) are limited.
 - Overall performance maintenance systems are reactive with minimal ability to be proactive in providing “capital resource” decisions.
 - Procurement rules limit and underestimate performance maintenance needs.
 - Pre/Post construction coordination efforts need improvement.
 - FCA/FCI (Facility Condition Assessment/Index) process requires review and modifications to scope of work and review of in-process and end product(s).
 - Subcommittee questions:
 - Are there examples of existing cost-sharing?
 - IT services shares procurement (COA/ACPS) – each has its own procurement department, but they work together on IT services. Schools have more stringent requirements than City governments.
 - Can a procurement contract stipulate that responsiveness to one department is more urgent than another (e.g., repairs for a fire station may be more urgent than another facility)?
 - Service level agreements can stipulate that.
 - From a best practices point of view, how do cities staff performance maintenance or facilities management overall? Are there shared staffing arrangements? What is the industry standard?
 - BOMA (Building Owners and Managers Association) is the standard, but many can be applied. Schools are different.
 - Is it true that reactive maintenance costs more than performance maintenance?

- True – you pay a premium to get performance on an emergency basis.
- How do our recommendations take into account that some facilities are newer than others? What are the budget investments tied to latest building technologies?
 - Smart buildings / technologies – the City’s LEED process is already in place and can accomplish that.
- Subcommittee members discussed considerations around shared services agreements, procurement reform, staffing structures, opportunities for new standards/pilot programs and resulting system-wide implications; as well as any associated cost implications, timing and staging.
- Members reiterated the importance of maintaining facilities and that well-maintained facilities cost less in the long run.
- Discussion included the feasibility of consolidating maintenance functions.

8 Next Steps

- Subcommittee meeting – October 30, 5pm, City Hall
- Procurement staff from ACPS and the City will attend the next subcommittee to answer any questions about current processes.
- A2 will provide subcommittee members with data and preliminary analysis