

(2nd Revision) AGENDA OF THE UTAH STATE BUILDING BOARD

Wednesday, October 5, 2011
Room W030 Capitol Hill West Building
Salt Lake City, Utah
8:00 a.m.

- (Action) 1. **Approval of Minutes for August 3, and August 17 & 18, 2011** Tab 1
- (Action) 2. **University of Utah Dee Glen Smith Athletic Expansion (Revised Request)** Tab 2
- (Action) 3. **Utah State University Revolving Loan Fund Increase** Tab 3
- (Information) 4. **State-Funded Capital Development Presentations** Tab 4
- (Action) 5. **Rules of Procedure** Tab 5
- (Action) 6. **Request to Reallocate Improvement Funds for DAS Security Upgrades (Addressed during lunch session)** Tab 6
- (Information) 7. **Report on FTE Students (Addressed during lunch session)**
- (Action) 8. **Courts Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds** Tab 8

Notice of Special Accommodation During Public Meetings - In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify CeeCee Niederhauser 538-3261 (TDD 538-3260) at least three days prior to the meeting. *This information and all other*

Utah State Building Board information is available on DFCM web site at <http://buildingboard.utah.gov>



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: September 26, 2011
Subject: **Approval of Minutes for August 3, 2011 and August 17 & 18, 2011**

Attached for your review and approval are the minutes of the Utah State Building Board meetings held August 3, 2011 and August 17 & 18, 2011.

DGB: cn
Attachments

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

August 3, 2011

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in Attendance:

N. George Daines, Chair
Sheila Gelman
Jeff Nielson
David Fitzsimmons
Ned Carnahan
Gordon Snow
Chip Nelson
Ron Bigelow, Ex-Officio

DFCM and Guests in Attendance:

Kim Hood	Department of Administrative Services
Gregg Buxton	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cheryl Searle	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Lynn Hinrichs	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Attorney General's Office/DFCM
Kimberlee Willettee	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Rich Amon	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Ken Nye	University of Utah
Ralph Hardy	Utah Commission of Higher Education
Ben Berrett	Utah State University
Alyn Lunceford	Courts
Sherry Ruesch	Dixie State College
Malin Francis	Salt Lake Community College
Tiffany Woods	BHB
Andrew Carlino	Utah State Fairpark
Ken Hammond	EDA Architecture

David Tanner	Southern Utah University
Greg Lee	University of Utah, Red Butte Gardens
Colleen Connely	University of Utah Hospital
Kevin Hansen	Weber State University
Chris Coutts	Architectural Nexus
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
Lori Haglund	VBFA
Sara Kiehke	VBFA
Mark Halverson	Weber State University
Dan Lundergan	University of Utah
Ellen Parrish	VCBO Architects
Ralph Hardy	Utah Commissioner of Higher Education
Anna Heywood	Reaveley Engineers & Associates
Scot Olson	Utah National Guard
Clark Caras	Utah State Fair Park
Cynthia Cook	FFKR Architects

On Wednesday, August 3, 2011 the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting in Room 250 of the Utah State Capitol Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair George Daines called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 29, 2011

Chair Daines sought a motion for approval of the minutes.

MOTION: David Fitzsimmons moved to approve the meeting minutes of June 29, 2011. The motion was seconded by Sheila Gelman and passed unanimously.

FIVE YEAR NOTICE OF REVIEW AND STATEMENT OF CONTINUATION FOR RULE R23-25 ADMINISTRATIVE RULES ADJUDICATIVE PROCEEDINGS.

Chair Daines said he previously discussed this item with Alan Bachman, legal counsel to the Board. Mr. Bachman explained that this Administrative Rule has never been used but should remain in place just in case it is needed.

MOTION: David Fitzsimmons moved to approve the Continuation of Rule R23-25 Administrative Rules Adjudicative Proceedings. The motion was seconded by Ned Carnahan and passed unanimously.

Chair Daines introduced Alyn Lunceford from Utah Courts. Mr. Lunceford indicated he is the Facilities Director for Courts and manages all of their capital improvement projects.

The Building Board will be touring Ogden Juvenile Courts as part of their Capital Development Tour. This project was ranked third on the prioritization list last year. They are hoping to improve the ranking and receive funding this year. Chair Daines indicated that Mr. Lunceford is one of about fifteen individuals who represent different state agencies and work with the Building Board on a regular basis.

☐ WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY REALLOCATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Mark Halverson from Weber State University said the University is requesting that the remaining \$70,000 from the Miller Administration Building be transferred to the Dee Center Site Improvement Project (which bid a little higher than anticipated) to help with the needed repairs to paving. DFCM Director Gregg Buxton asked if the Dee Center was an auxiliary facility. Kevin Hansen from Weber State answered that it was not. The facility does generate some revenue; however it is a state funded facility which receives E & G Funds. (E & G is the general education funding which is provided by the Legislature for their facilities and operations).

MOTION: Ned Carnahan moved to approve the Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds for Weber State. The motion was seconded by Jeff Nielson and passed unanimously.

☐ SLCC REALLOCATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS – LARRY H. MILLER CAMPUS

Bob Askerlund from SLCC said they received very competitive bidding on Lot U at their Taylorsville/Redwood Campus. As a result, they saved approximately \$100,000 from the original estimate. They would like to request that the College be allowed to continue with other paving projects by applying this savings to an area on the Larry H. Miller Campus which needs patching and sealing of walks. They would like to start immediately while the weather is cooperative.

MOTION: Chip Nelson moved to approve the SLCC Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds. The motion was seconded by David Fitzsimmons and passed unanimously.

☐ REMODEL OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH HEALTH CENTER – BURN TRAUMA INTENSIVE CARE UNIT

Mike Perez introduced Dan Lundergan from the University of Utah and Coleen Connely, Nursing Director of Critical Care at the University Hospital. Senate Bill 204 mandates that any construction remodel for state agencies, which exceeds \$2.5 Million, should be presented to the Building Board for approval. The University Hospitals and Clinics

presented a project to remodel the Health Center Burn Trauma Intensive Care Unit. They would like to relocate the Hospital's Intensive Care Unit, build out the shelled space and remodel the existing space. Mr. Lundergan assured the Board there were no state funds for this project and O & M costs will be provided by hospital revenues. Ms. Connely said the Burn Center is in great need of expansion. They presently have some code concerns with the average room size at 154 sq. ft. Three of their patient rooms do not have windows which is a problem since some patients have to stay an extended period of time. There are only two patient bathrooms for the 12 rooms in the Burn Unit. The Burn Center is also dealing with some volume issues in that they do not have enough beds for all the burn patients which facilitate burn patients having to be housed in other units. This proposed project will be a 15 bed Burn ICU with 6 clinic room, rehab and therapy spaces, and will increase in size to 17,000 sq. ft. Chair Daines asked if this facility was the pre-eminent burn center in the intermountain area and if there was a plan in place in the event of a catastrophe. Ms. Connely said it was the only burn center in the area. They have worked with the Hospital Disaster Planning Committee and plans are in place in the event of a disaster. Mr. Lundergan said they can also coordinate with the Utah Hospital Association so they know how many beds are available. Sheila Gelman said she had visited the Burn Unit and observed a treatment room with at least 10 people working on a patient. She was amazing how efficient they worked and how they were not stumbling on each other. She felt there was definitely a need to expand the facility. Gordon Snow clarified that the O & M was paid through revenue from the hospital, and would not be state funded. The University was presenting this project because Senate Bill 240 required the University to present their project before the Board when costs were over \$2.5 Million. He also clarified that the project would be constructed in phases and the intention is to approve both phases. Jeff Nielson expressed concern that if they begin construction and the funds are not available what will happen? Mr. Lundergan said the University Hospital System has put aside the funds and made this project a priority for the next two fiscal years. The University would not return to the Board to request funding for this project. David Fitzsimmons asked if there was any forecast for future growth? Mr. Lundergan indicated that this project was part of the master plan. They do not see a significant expansion of the University Hospital from the in-patient perspective for the next 5 to 7 years. Their belief is they have enough ICU capacity to meet their needs during that period of time. Ron Bigelow clarified there are two issues here: the medical intensive care unit is expanding by moving to a new space (this was a previously approved project that is underway). The Burn Unit will take that space and do the remodeling in two phases in order to keep some of the space functional.

MOTION: Sheila Gelman moved to approve the Remodel of University of Utah Health Center Burn Trauma Intensive Care Unit to include both phases. The motion was seconded by Jeff Nielson and passed unanimously.

☐ EXPANSION OF RED BUTTE GARDENS – ROSE HOUSE PROJECT
Mike Perez introduced Greg Lee, Executive Director of Red Butte Gardens and Arboretum.

Mr. Lee said the Rose House would be a multi-purpose building and part of their master plan. This project will be funded by donations and will not require state O & M. The purpose of the building is to accommodate the 15,000 school children and 500 summer campers who visit the gardens each year and may need shelter in case of inclement weather. This is the only space they could use as a classroom in their lower garden area. Other uses would be garden society meetings, a location for wedding receptions and storage space. This facility would also provide public restrooms for the lower garden area. Mike Perez pointed out this project was approved as part of the amphitheater construction back in 2006 but construction costs were high and Rose House, which at that time was 750 sq. ft., was postponed. This specific request is to let the Board know that the project has increased to 4,000 sq. ft. and at \$1.4 Million. They are seeking approval for the larger facility. There were extensive questions concerning funding for the Rose House, utility capacity, and the profitability of the wedding catering business which the University is now about to expand. Ex-Officio, Ron Bigelow wanted clarification why the University of Utah would expand their wedding business to be in direct competition with private industry. Would they still build the Rose House if they were not in the wedding business? Mr. Lee said the catering kitchen in the building would serve other groups other than weddings such as the Governor's Reception, etc. Traditionally weddings are usually performed at non-profit organizations – churches, temples or garden space. Mr. Bigelow asked if they were implying they only charge actual costs for providing weddings at a non-profits institution as do churches or do they charge fees comparable with the private industry. The cost of operating and maintaining the garden space is more than what they charge. Mr. Bigelow expressed concern that it is difficult to get state support for a building that will be used to host weddings rather than house school children. Mr. Lee indicated their school programs never pay for themselves. They have to be subsidized in some way whether it is by donations, state support or other types of operations or use of space. The University will be using the building for many purposes and they feel they have to find other activities to cover the expenses. George Daines asked what percentage of their O & M budget is received from weddings. Mr. Lee said \$330,000 was received from rental events last year which includes weddings, memorial services, business meetings, etc. out of a budget of about \$5.5 Million. Sheila Gelman clarified that Red Butte is not in the catering business and many businesses benefit from this wedding facility. Ron Bigelow clarified that the purpose for building or expanding the kitchen area is to assist private businesses (caterer who come to the U) so that it is easier and cheaper for them to provide their services. It somewhat reinforces and clarifies they are doing this to subsidize some businesses in the Valley. They could still cater (and they currently do) without the facility. His concern is that if the Board authorizes this are they also endorsing the University of Utah to subsidize those certain businesses? Gordon Snow asked if a project was approved five years ago, how long would the approval commitment last. Gregg Buxton responded that approval was given for the project at a smaller size and now they are seeking approval to enhance the project. Mr. Snow asked if schools are charged to visit the gardens. Mr. Lee said, students from public schools are not charged a fee, however private school are. Jeff Nielson asked what percentage of use would the University use the catering equipment vs.

the private sector. Mr. Lee said the University rarely uses the equipment. Approximately 98% is used by outside caterers.

MOTION: Sheila Gelman moved to approve the Expansion of Red Butte Gardens – Rose House Project. The motion was seconded by David Fitzsimmons and passed unanimously.

☐ SUU REQUEST TO PROGRAM THE NEW BUSINESS BUILDING

Dave Tanner from Southern Utah University reported the new Business Building as the number one request for the University. Their current building was programmed and designed in the late 1970's. When the University hired a consultant to look at the existing building for remodel, it became very apparent that adding onto the building would be extremely difficult and as costly as a new building because of ceiling heights and the way the structure was built. The existing building was built to house classes such as shorthand, typing and model offices with no technology in the original plan. Over the years the University has tried to adapt the building to their use but now feels a new building would be more suited for their purposes. It usually takes approximately six to eight months to program a facility. SUU has a donor who will pay for the programming and would like to engage their present faculty, students and others from the community in this process. They are requesting a fairly long programming process in order to accomplish this task. Chair Daines pointed out that SUU's Business Building was ranked 23 last year which means it probably would not be funded unless it moves significantly higher on the priority list. Would the purpose of early programming be to attract donor attention to this project? Mr. Tanner indicated that was a small part but not the motive. It is one way to show donors the internal workings of the building and helps identify the site and the impact on the campus. Ron Bigelow had concerns with moving forward with programming since the building is not approved for construction. There could be changes in construction costs, and scope of the work that would facilitate re-doing the programming phase. Why would the Board want to authorize funds to do planning in an environment where there is no approval for a building or guarantee that it will be approved? Mr. Tanner said SUU was not requesting authorization of funds. There is a donor who will pay for programming. The University is prepared to pay the cost of additional programming if needed in the future. Ned Carnahan asked about the growth of SUU's Business program. Mr. Tanner said they have 646 undergraduates, 132 graduates, and 27 members of faculty in the Business School which has more than doubled in size since the program began. The present Business Building is the hub for the School of Business. Jeff Nielson asked if planning was part of the process of getting their building approved. Mr. Tanner explained that it is definitely part of the process. Planning becomes vital as the University looks to the Building Board and Legislature to move their project forward. They feel it is vital to have an extended programming phase which gives adequate time for study and planning. Chair Daines said that his concern isn't with authorizing programming but the implied consent

that this would possibly give this project a higher priority. This approval is not an implied consent in his opinion and SUU's Business Building would not move up in the ranking.

MOTION: George Daines moved to approve SUU's Request to Program the New Business Building. However the discussion continued and the motion did not move forward.

The discussion continued regarding SUU's request and the possibility this authorization could be used to strengthen their priority ranking. Ralph Hardy from the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education said this would not influence the Board of Regents' decision concerning this project. Ron Bigelow felt that if there were two building requests and one had completed programming, why wouldn't preference be given to the institution who had completed the programming. Chip Nelson expressed concern that a donor's money would be wasted if the programming is completed and the building not funded. He suggested that the Board evaluate the need for the building and after the Building Board determines final ranking then SUU could return with their request.

MOTION: Chip Nelson moved to table SUU's Request to Program the New Business Building. The motion was seconded by Gordon Snow. The motion failed with 2 in favor and 5 opposed.

MOTION: George Daines' original motion to approve SUU's Request to Program the New Business Building was again proposed. The motion was seconded by Sheila Gelman. The motion passed with 5 in favor and 2 opposed.

Chair Daines advised Mr. Tanner that he may want to wait to see the priority ranking for next year before SUU invests monies for programming.

☐ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Ken Nye from University of Utah indicated there were ten design agreements and two other types of agreements awarded during the past month. Under construction contracts, there was one new space contract, eleven remodeling contracts and four site improvement contracts. The HCI Floor was a sole source contract associated with the basketball floor. Another sole source situation was the CNG Slow Fuel Filling Station for natural gas for their internal busing system. Questar required them to use a specific contractor for installations. There were no increases to the Project Reserve but one decrease which involved the transfer of \$74,000 to cover the amount by which the construction bid exceeded the budget for the Fletcher Building Fume Hood Upgrade. The overrun was the result of unanticipated elements that had to be included in order to achieve the project's purpose such as the replacement of fan units in order to control noise. In addition, there

were also some unanticipated code requirements and the cost of hazardous material abatement was higher than expected. The Contingency Reserve fund had one small draw for the Develop Secondary Water System for Landscaping Irrigation which involved a transfer of \$12,000 to cover the costs associated with unknown conditions with the location of the gas line. David Fitzsimmons asked if the issue with the fume hoods had been resolved. Mr. Nye said there were thousands of fume hoods on campus and many of them need to be replaced. He estimated they were approximately one-half to two-third complete with fume hood replacement. Gordon Snow questioned if a private enterprise (Questar Gas) has the ability to supersede state law that requires a bidding process. Mr. Nye explained that one of the provisions in the procurement code regarding bidding is that utilities have a unique status in a sole source requirement. The contractor's estimate for this project was considered reasonable. Director Buxton explained that the University has a sole source committee which determines if projects should be approved so there are some controls on selection.

MOTION: George Daines moved to approve the Report for the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Ned Carnahan and passed unanimously.

Ben Berrett, Director of Planning, Design and Construction at Utah State University gave the monthly report. Mr. Berrett indicated they have 7 professional contracts and 21 construction contracts. Of special interest was the Maeser Steam Replacment for the amount of \$51,000 needed from the Project Reserve. This project is to replace the steam and condensation line under the Geology and Animal Science Buildings. These are the second and third oldest buildings on campus and were built in 1917. The amounts specified in the Contingency Fund include all increases for the new Capital Improvement Projects this year and a few minor draws from the fund. Page one lists seven professional contracts for this month. Most are Capital Improvement Projects. Of particular interest is the contract for design of the Tremonton Campus Classroom Remodel which is an old medical clinic the University purchased last year for renovation. Approximately two-thirds of the building will be used as classrooms for the Regional Campus Distance Education Program. Page two lists the new Capital Improvement Projects. Project #8 involves a tunnel demolition that was contracted out. The University did the asbestos abatement on all the seam lines in the tunnel and all the demolition of the piping so designers were able to view the interior to determine their work. For Medium Voltage Upgrades, the University requests a significant budget each year to continue to upgrade the older transformers in the sub-stations. Project #19 was an asbestos abatement on the building purchased in Tremonton. Director Buxton asked Mr. Berrett if UCI had been given opportunities to bid on asbestos projects. Mr. Berrett said they had not recently used them but would consider it in the future. The increases to the Contingency Reserve Fund are from 2012 Capital Improvement Projects that have each contributed 5% to the Fund. There were six very small draws from the fund.

MOTION: Ned Carnahan moved to approve the Report for Utah State University. The motion was seconded by David Fitzsimmons and passed unanimously.

❑ **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT FOR DFCM**

Lynn Hinrichs, Deputy Director for DFCM reported there were eleven new leases and eighteen amendments. Seventy-one new architect/engineer agreements were awarded last period due to the new Capital Improvement Projects. Forty-eight of those were full service design agreements and 23 were professional service contracts. There were 48 construction contracts awarded. Significant ones included the San Juan Campus Administration Building Replacement, which was particularly difficult to get in budget. The Weber State Davis Campus Professional Classroom Building CMGC Agreement was awarded and they are in the design phase on that project. The CUCF Prison Perimeter Security System, which was needed to replace a failed system, was awarded and is under construction. Snow College South Campus Fire Sprinkling HVAC Upgrades is underway. Under Contingency Reserve, they are in the middle of construction season and there are a lot of large projects in process resulting in decreases to the fund. DFCM started with a contingency budget at \$10.3 Million and ended with just over \$9 Million. The bulk of those were being spent on the Salt Lake Community College South City Campus, the UVU Health Science Building, University of Utah USTAR Building and some other minor projects listed in the report. The Project Reserve Fund started with \$5.3 Million but ended with \$4.8 Million. A large portion of this decrease was for the UVU Health Science. This project was originally bid with an alternate (the roof-top greenhouse) and wasn't concluded with the contract. UVU later decided they wanted to include this alternate so the decision was made to take the money out of the Reserve Fund. During the last month, DFCM made a presentation to the Executive Appropriations Committee about improvement projects and the importance of funding them on a statutory level. This presentation was well received and there seems to be a growing commitment by the Legislature to focus more on improvement and less on new construction.

Ron Bigelow asked about the zero cost lease which appeared on the DFCM Report. Mr. Hinrichs called DFCM Real Estate Manager, Cheryl Searle, from the audience to explain this question. Ms. Searle said that usually a no cost lease means that they are allowed to use a defined area in a building at no cost to the state. They have a few leases that consists of landlords who allow the state to set up office in their building without charging O&M or rent. An example on this month's report is the Workforce Services Building which was renewed at no cost increase. Mr. Bigelow said that the report actually indicates "new location – zero cost lease". Ms. Searle clarified this was free space. There are probably ten to fifteen properties in the state portfolio which are similar. Mr. Bigelow clarified that if some properties are "renewal zero cost leases" that would indicate the same rate; however if it is a "new location zero cost lease" then it means zero. Ms. Searle said that when the

state reviews a lease that is no cost to them (for rental space or for operation and maintenance) the state still has to renew it. The lease is usually made for five years and then reviewed so the state does not have unlimited use forever.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF BOARD RULES OF PROCEDURE

Alan Bachman, Assistant Attorney General provided a copy of the Rules of Procedure for the Board and highlighted in yellow the changes to the rule which included a description of electronic meetings. DFCM Director, Gregg Buxton and Chair Daines suggested one change to this part of the rule and clarified that if Board members wish to attend a meeting electronically, the initial call should be to Director Buxton to determine if it is feasible. Notification would be given to Chair Daines who would then determine if it would be appropriate to hold an electronic meeting. Chair Daines stated that the Board has had appropriate time to look at the changes to the Rules of Procedure and asked if there were other areas to be discussed. There were no discussion items; therefore Chair Daines suggested the Rules of Procedure come before the Board for approval at the next Building Board Meeting in September. Chair Daines also asked Director Buxton to determine if there is a better facility which would enhance electronic meeting capability in the future.

DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ron Bigelow indicated there was a motion to approve a property transfer long term lease for construction in Vernal during the previous Building Board meeting on June 29. Approval was given for this project subject to legislative and legal issues. Mr. Bigelow determined that there is a legislative issue that should be dealt with so this project should come before Legislative Management for approval before completion. Cheryl Searle explained that in all DFCM lease agreements a provision is made that the lease cannot exceed 90% of the cost of the building. When this item was previously brought before the Board, the money being brought forward for this project was \$1.5 Million. The property the building will sit on is currently owned by the state but will be transferred to Uintah County for a period of time (up to fifty years) and then ownership of the property and the building will revert back to the state. The value of the Building is \$1.5 Million. Natural Resources will be paying \$25,000 per year for operation and maintenance costs; however by doing this, the state is slightly below the 90% level. Another part of state statute that applies to this property is the requirement that the property must revert back to the state and be approved by the Legislative Management Committee. Chair Daines clarified that this project will now be taken to the Legislative Committee and requires no further action from the Board. Mr. Bigelow said this proposed contract will receive heightened scrutiny from the Committee. He advised the Board that the Legislative Committee's review process is more detailed and suggested that Director Buxton work with him to determine the best way this project should be presented to the Committee. He believes the Executive Branch, as well as the Division

of Parks, support keeping the museum open and adding this addition to the property.

☐ ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Chair Daines moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:15 am.

Chip Nelson asked about the Capital Development Tour. Director Buxton explained that Board members would be traveling together in Suburbans with about five to six people per vehicle. There are members of the Legislature also attending. Dress is business casual. They are traveling to Northern Utah and Salt Lake area. The tour will be a full day on the first day and half day the second. Lunch will be provided by BATC's culinary school in Logan. Cee Cee will help with travel arrangement for the Board.

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

August 17 & 18, 2011

MINUTES OF THE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT TOUR

Utah State Building Board Members in Attendance:

N. George Daines, Chair
Sheila Gelman
Jeff Nielson
David Fitzsimmons
Ned Carnahan
Gordon Snow
Chip Nelson
Ron Bigelow, Ex-Officio

DFCM and Guests in Attendance:

Senator Stuart Adams	Utah State Senate
Representative Gage Froerer	Utah State House of Representatives
Kim Hood	Department of Administrative Services
Gregg Buxton	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Lynn Hinrichs	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kurt Baxter	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Rich Amon	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Jonathan Ball	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Kimberlee Willettee	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Ralph Hardy	Utah Commission of Higher Education
Gregg Stauffer	Utah Commission of Higher Education
Brian Fay	Department of Administrative Services

On August 17 & 18, 2011 the Utah State Building Board held their yearly Capital Development Tour. This year the Board visited Northern Utah and Salt Lake areas. Their agenda consisted of visits to the following sites.

Day One of Tour:

Weber State University New Science Lab Building
1500 Edvalson Street, Ogden

Ogden Juvenile Court Building
444 26th Street, Ogden

BATC Health Science and Technology Building
1301 North 600 West, Logan

Southwest ATC
Presented at the BATC
1301 North 600 West, Logan

Utah State University Regional Campus
265 West 1100 South, Brigham City

DATC Medical Building Expansion
ATK Aerospace Structures, Freeport Center Bldg C14, Clearfield

Day Two of Tour:

Department of Environmental Quality Technical Support Center
2861 West Parkway Blvd, West Valley

Public Safety, Agriculture, Health – Unified State Laboratories, Module 2
4431 South 2700 West, West Valley

University of Utah Infrastructure
451 South 1400 East, Salt Lake City

At the conclusion of the Capital Development Tour, Board members met for lunch at the DFCM Office, Room 4110-A. Chairman George Daines called the luncheon to order at 11:39 a.m.

Building Board Members, DFCM and Guest in Attendance at Luncheon:

N. George Daines, Chair
Sheila Gelman
David Fitzsimmons
Ned Carnahan
Gordon Snow
Chip Nelson

Kim Hood	Department of Administrative Services
Gregg Buxton	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Lynn Hinrichs	Division of Facilities Construction & Management

Chair Daines instructed the Board that the purpose of the meeting was to have an informal discussion about the Capital Development Sites recently visited and to itemize some information that might be needed from the various agencies and institutions.

Gordon Snow asked if Director Buxton could give an estimate of how much money would possibly be available for Capital Development projects. Mr. Buxton said he spent time yesterday with Ex-Officio, Ron Bigelow from the GOBP concerning cash flow and budgets. The actual figures will not be available until February, 2012; however the state is at maximum bonding capacity and he doesn't see where the funding will be obtained this year. His guess is that there may be funds for Capital Improvements only. He doesn't see there will be a lot of interest in buildings because there are no funds, possibly \$30 Million at the most.

Chair Daines talked about the Weber State Science Lab Building and indicated that it was probably a design issue. He did not see a lot of flexibility in the building. He asked for the Board's reaction to this site visit. Chip Davis said that he asked Weber State to supply information on enrollment. Although the University indicates their enrollment has increased, his concern rests with how many of those students are involved in the sciences. Chair Daines asked Director Buxton to initiate a practice for the Building Board whereby the Board can make specific requests for information resulting in all members of the Board receiving the same information. Chair Daines would like to look at the enrollment growth in Universities over the past ten years. His perception is that the present economic conditions have forced a significant spike in enrollment. Ned Carnahan said that all this information is readily available from the Universities, specifically with enrollment, majors and utilization of classrooms. Director Buxton indicated that the Board should determine how many full-time equivalent students are enrolled in the Universities which would give a better idea if the facility is being used to its maximum capacity. Chair Daines added that with the requested information, he would like to see a breakdown as to majors. He suggested that Ned Carnahan work with DFCM to obtain this information so that Board members could make a comparison that is fair and equitable. Gordon Snow said that the Commissioner of Higher Education publishes a book with all this information included. Kim Hood added that UCAT administration also has this information. Gordon Snow clarified that the ATC's don't use "full time equivalents"; but use training hours to measure their enrollment. Chair Daines said the Board would like this formation for the Universities and Technical Colleges as well. Lynn Hinrichs reminded the Board that the Board of Regents also will provide their own ranking and will publish the information to justify their ranking. The Regents will supply this information before the Building Board does their ranking in

October. Mr. Hinrichs said he was not sure how much research should be done. Chair Daines indicated that he would like the Building Board, with the help of DFCM, to conduct their own study. Director Buxton added that the study should make sure that the information is in consistent format for every University. Kim Hood asked if the Building Board had ever had a joint meeting with the Board of Regents. Mr. Buxton said yes, the Board of Regents has at times held joint meetings with the Building Board, but not recently. The rankings from the Board of Regents and the Building Board are sometimes quite varied.

Chip Nelson specifically requested that the Board receive more cost data from the agencies and institutions with breakdowns of costs for the shell structure as a specific amount, and a breakdown for a completely furnished structure/per square foot. Lynn Hinrich responded that DFCM is presently putting together the budgets for these projects. Presently, the Board is experiencing the cycle where DFCM receives the needs requests in August. By mid-September, DFCM will have all the estimates generated through their office with the help of a third-party consultant to try to bring parity between all these requests so that a classroom building at USU should be similar to a classroom building at UVU for example.

Mr. Hinrichs answered questions from the Board concerning programming and indicated that some of the projects visited on the Capital Development Tour may have had some programming already completed. If an institution has programming that is old, a program re-verification needs to be completed. That is when the Board will see a variation in programming amounts. Presently, the Board may see a "ball-park" figure from the agencies. DFCM's staff generates the detailed estimates for these projects into a one page summary which is bound together to form the Five Year Book. The Governor's Office looks at the Five Year Book, considers the Building Board's ranking, and then comes up with their budget for Capital Development. The Legislature then takes the Governor's and Building Board's ranking to generate their ranking. Kim Hood asked how much does the Five Year Book changes from year to year. Mr. Hinrichs said that whatever is funded drops out of the book, of course. State statute requires the Building Board to come up with a plan for five years of what it will take to accomplish the facility needs of the state, both for development and improvement. In order to accomplish this, all agencies with "need requests" inform DFCM (five years into the future) what they will require. There are a considerable number of projects that are unfunded so the bulk of the book stays the same and is updated every year.

Director Buxton mentioned that there are many influences which affect when a project will be funded. For example the Board of Regents has their own process which results in one institution getting favored over another based on their institutional analysis and preference of the Chairman of the Board of Regents. Chair Daines reaffirmed that it is still the Building Board's job to meet and collectively evaluate what they think are the priorities and then put them before the Legislature to decide what they would like to do with the information.

Chip Davis said he would like to know (as part of the statistical information) the geographical areas students are coming from, the radius they will drive to in order to use those facilities.

Chair Daines asked if there were any additional questions for Ogden Juvenile Courts. Director Buxton feels that Ogden Juvenile Courts will probably receive funding this year. David Fitzsimmons asked if there was programming for this building and Mr. Hinrichs said yes; he can supply this to the Board. Ned Carnahan asked what the construction costs were for the Courts. Mr. Hinrichs said that the Five Year Book summarizes the costs.

Chair Daines said that he sees a lot of architectural deficiencies in state buildings. He was not referring to recent buildings but structures built fifteen to thirty years ago seem to have very inefficient designs with functional problems. Director Buxton said that over the last few years the state has implemented energy codes to make their buildings more efficient. Chair Daines made reference to the ATK Facility which seemed prepared to dramatically change functionality of the building as composites evolve. There were huge, open, spaces, not attractive but very functional. His concern was that the state has to retrofit their buildings on a continual basis because of changes in technology and equipment. Lynn Hinrichs explained that the state has improved significantly with space design. An example is the new USTAR Buildings which are configured and developed so there are incubator spaces that programs can plug into which develop their technology and then move out of so another group can take over that space with minimal changes. The recently construction Unified State Lab is very institutional and the design more fixed because they do the same tests over and over again. DFCM struggled to keep this project on budget. They had to cut 20,000 sq. ft. out of the building but had to fit every needed in the building as well. Chair Daines pointed out that the present Ogden Juvenile Court Building is a very expensive, beautiful building but functionally obsolete. David Fitzsimmons reminded the Board that it was the function that changed and not the building. The Juvenile system has evolved. Mr. Hinrichs explained that when the present Ogden Juvenile Courts Building was constructed, adjudication was about truancy and shoplifting. It has now evolved into more serious crimes. Previously, State Court Houses were built to custom fashion; however in 2001 the state adopted a standard for all court facilities which is used today. Chair Daines felt that state building should be designed and built with more flexibility so they can be used for longer periods of time. Director Buxton reminded the Board that functionality is the prime consideration when building state buildings. David Fitzsimmons noted that the state is also following the LEED's standard and some of the functionality is being dictated now by a code item. Chair Daines asked how much flexibility could be designed into the Ogden Juvenile Court. From a standpoint of a lawyer, he recognized that many of the laws affecting juveniles are going to change in the next 10 to 15 years. The legal system is starting to do arraignments via teleconferencing and many of the procedural hearings that involve personal appearances will be changed to eliminate travel. Mr. Hinrichs added that the St. George Courthouse is the most technically advance Courthouse in the state because it is the latest one built. The Court House in Logan has one audio visual court

room. Sheila Gelman asked if the state could retrofit audio-video systems in all state court houses if the funds were available. Chair Daines informed the Board that juvenile court rooms were designed to be smaller and more intimate so as to not be intimidating to the juvenile. Functionally these types of buildings have changed. DFCM has a standard for juvenile court houses. Now there are so many entities that have to have a say at the juvenile's hearing such as the parents, the guardian alidum, the attorneys for both sides and they all need a table. Recently a law was passed that requires space for a jury trial for a juvenile court. The ADA requirements are also an issue and require us to have handicap accessibility for every location in the court room. DFCM has been following the Uniform Accessibility Standard since 1985. All of this affects the flexibility and square footage of the facility. Chair Daines said he would like to see more flexibility in the design of court rooms so that they could be resized. Director Buxton suggested Alyn Lunceford call Chair Daines concerning this issue.

Chair Daines talked about the BATC Health Science and Technology Building Site in Logan. Gordon Snow felt that the need at Bridgerland ATC was not urgent at this time. The ATC is planning for the future. Chip Nelson said that the LDS Church owns some the land all around the BATC and if they were to contact the Church concerning the properties they could get first right of refusal concerning the property which doesn't cost anything. Chair Daines expressed concern about the size of the project and the current needs of the school. He was interested in knowing how much BATC paid for the land they presently own.

Chair Daines asked for questions concerning Southwest ATC. He reminded Ned Carnahan of his assignment to gather information on this project. Mr. Carnahan told the Board that the SWATC is in a situation where they have already acquired property and they are looking for a an identity other than what they have now. Mr. Carnahan will visit with representatives from SWATC to discuss their needs. Specifically to determine placement, full time equivalent, etc. Director Buxton clarified that 8 hours equals a full time equivalent student. David Fitzsimmons said that of course all students would not be in the classroom at the same time, it would give an idea of how the facility is being used. Mr. Carnahan also expressed concern that the colleges and universities quoted statistics that there were "x" number applicants and students waiting to be accepted into a program. He felt that their capacity and placement has a great deal to do with their waiting lists. In addition, he would like to obtain information concerning seasonal demand.

For the DEQ Air Monitoring Center, Chair Daines said he felt he had much to learn about this project and wanted to educate himself concerning the overall program with labs and various components.

Concerning the Unified State Lab, Module 2, Chair Daines would like an outline of the state's concept concerning the future use of their laboratories. Chair Daines also would like to have the users of the crime lab sit down and talk about what they want from the

crime lab. The present model is that the county attorneys receive services from the lab for free so there is no real cost benefit analysis by the users as to how much they use the crime lab. Since there is no real cost to the users therefore there are a lot of requests for tests that are marginal. He acknowledged that the crime lab has some problems and would like to see further research in this area. Chip Davis indicated there are crime labs owned by cities, counties and some state colleges. How much is needed and is the state duplicating efforts? He questioned the location of the crime lab. Lynn Hinrichs clarified the reason it was located in West Valley is because they work together with the Department of Public Safety which is located in the Calvin Rampton Building. Ned Carnahan clarified that they are looking to unify their services and that is why it is called the Unified State Lab. They are requesting funding for the second phase of their project. There previously was three phases and they have combined the second and third module into one. This resulted in plans for an 80,000 square foot building. Chair Daines questioned if any research had been completed concerning who is using their own facilities and who is using the crime lab. Lynn Hinrichs said there was not. Gordon Snow said there has to be some good faith in the agency and felt that this was out of the purview of the Building Board.

There was discussion concerning the credibility of the priority list with the Legislature and the influence it should have in decision making. Chair Daines added that the Building Board's evaluations of the projects should be complete and reliable so that the priorities reflect accuracy and trustworthiness.

The University of Utah Infrastructure was also discussed. Chair Daines was concerned about the lack of progress with this project. He expressed concern that the University's lack of funds had turned a struggling O & M project into a capital improvement project. He asked for a review of the various schedules and amounts of return. He requested that a private consultant review the project and report to the Board. Ned Carnahan said he has been involved with replacements of infrastructure and felt the U's project was extremely valid. Some of the switches should have been replaced years ago and felt there was a valid need for this funding. Director Buxton informed the Board that the national average spent on improvements is 4.5 percent however the state only funds ½ percent for capital improvement requests.

Chair Daines thanked the Board for their participation in the discussion.

☐ ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Chair Daines moved to adjourn the luncheon at 1:06 pm.



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: September 27, 2011
Subject: **University of Utah Dee Smith Athletic Center Expansion (Revised Request)**
Presenting: Mike Perez

Recommendation:

DFCM recommends that the Building Board review the revised capital development request from the University of Utah.

Background:

At the March, 2011 Building board meeting the University of Utah sought and received approval for a \$20 million expansion to the Dee Glen Smith Center. Since that time the budget for the project has risen to \$30 million. The University seeks approval for the expanded scope for the project.

DGB:kb:cn

Attachment:



Office of the Vice President
for Administrative Services

August 29, 2011

Mr. David G. Buxton, Director
Division of Facilities Construction and Management
State Office Building Room 4110 PO Box 141160
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-1160

Dear Gregg:

**RE: UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
DEE GLEN SMITH ATHLETIC EXPANSION**

On February 16, 2011, the Utah State Building Board approved the issue/sell of State of Regent – University of Utah Revenue Bonds, in an amount not-to-exceed \$20 million, adding increasingly critical space for sports medicine, dining, assembly, and study facilities for Athletic programs.

During the programming for this project, it became apparent that required facilities for University of Utah Athletics, as members of the PAC-12 Conference, require additional scope and substance. Added features include a full-scale dining facility, specialized media rooms, additional support spaces, and integration with exterior practice facilities. Heery International, the professional services firm engaged to produce programming, estimates project cost at \$30 million.

Approval is requested to increase the project cost an additional \$10 million, to \$30 million, and obtain authority to issue/sell State of Regent – University of Utah State Revenue Bonds, in an amount not-to-exceed \$30 million plus amounts necessary for issuance costs, debt service reserve, and capitalized interest, as applicable.

Revenues resulting from athletic operations, including PAC-12 proceeds, have been identified to retire debt. State funds will not be required for design, construction, or operations & maintenance of this facility.

I, or any number of University administrators, are available to answer questions.

Sincerely,

Michael G. Perez
Associate Vice President

c: Ken Nye, University of Utah
John McNary, University of Utah
David McKay, DFCM

I:/DFCM Buxton.DeeGlenSmith Athletic Expansion.08-29-11

Associate Vice President Facilities Management
1795 East South Campus Dr Rm 222
V. Randall Turpin University Services Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9404
(801) 581-6510
FAX (801) 581-6081



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: September 27, 2011
Subject: **Utah State University Revolving Loan Fund Increase**
Presenting: John Harrington, Energy Director

Recommendation:

DFCM recommends that the Building Board review the request from Utah State University regarding an increase in the borrowed amount of revolving loan funds to complete their campus wide steam jacket insulation project.

Background:

The Building Board approved \$447,000 on January 5th, 2011 for USU to use for their campus-wide Steam Jacket Insulation project. Upon start of the project it was found that the initial survey of the space missed several areas that were in need of insulation. The contracted loan amount was \$398,000. USU would like to add \$187,000 to the current loan amount bringing the total amount borrowed to \$585,000.00.

The proposed repayment will follow the original timeline of repayment but the 14 quarterly payment amounts will be revised to an increased amount of \$41,000.00 and one final quarter payment of \$11,000.00, beginning March 31, 2012 and ending September 30, 2015.

DGB:bs: cn

Attachments: Request Letter w. supporting documentation
Original January 5, 2011 Building Board Application



UtahStateUniversity
FACILITIES

Stanley G. Kane, Director
Operations & Maintenance
1295 E 700 N
Logan, UT 84322-6600
(435) 797-3755 Phone
(435) 797-3512 Fax
stan.kane@usu.edu Email
<http://www.usu.edu/facilities/>

Bianca Shama
Contract Analyst
State of Utah DFCM
4110 State Office Building
450 North State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

RE: DFCM STATE FACILITY ENERGY EFFICIENCY REVOLVING LOAN FUND AGREEMENT 117354

Dear Bianca

On February 1, 2011 Utah State University entered into a loan agreement with DFCM to borrow money to install insulation jackets in mechanical rooms across campus. The loan amount was based on the low bid for work that had been identified by a survey. The work has been proceeding well and we anticipate lower steam consumption this next heating season; however we have discovered that the survey did not pick up all the needs and in fact completely missed some buildings.

Attached to this letter is a breakdown of the entire need indicating the original project amount based on the survey as \$362,841.60 and the estimated project total based on actual field conditions as \$557,250. The difference between the two amounts is \$194,409.00, so we would like to add another \$187,000 to the loan amount of \$398,000.00 bringing the total to \$585,000.00.

The revised loan request will be as follows:

Material and Labor	\$557,250.00
Contingency	\$27,750.00
Total Project Cost	\$585,000.00

The Return on Investment or payback period for all the buildings will average 27 months.

The proposed repayment schedule will follow the original timetable but the amounts will be revised to 14 quarterly payments of \$41,000.00 and one final quarter payment of \$11,000.00, beginning March 31, 2012 and ending September 30, 2015.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Stanley G. Kane AIA
University Architect
Director, Facilities Operations and Maintenance



Master Building Totals

Building Name	Opp Number	Invoice #	QTY	Labor & Patterns	Material	Project Total	Original Project Amt	Original QTY	Yearly Savings	ROI
			1398	\$ 309,863.45	\$ 72,657.60	\$ 557,250.00	\$ 362,841.60	1818	\$308,305.57	21.69
HRSC	2002	2	47	\$ 7,919.75	\$ 1,699.40	\$ 9,619.15	\$ 9,615.60	34	\$5,008.83	23.05
Geology	2004	2	33	\$ 7,005.85	\$ 1,537.40	\$ 8,543.25	\$ 5,923.95	31	\$3,688.34	27.80
Junction	2006	2	79	\$ 16,599.55	\$ 3,659.20	\$ 20,258.75	\$ 15,238.20	86	\$10,523.37	23.10
Public Relations	2008	3	11	\$ 2,189.60	\$ 480.00	\$ 2,669.60	\$ -	0	\$994.62	32.21
Animal Science	2016	3	10	\$ 1,977.35	\$ 435.40	\$ 2,412.75	\$ 1,889.55	9	\$1,037.60	27.90
Edith Bowen	2017	3	24	\$ 5,649.45	\$ 1,248.20	\$ 6,897.65	\$ 2,712.45	15	\$4,403.47	18.80
Education Bldg	2018	3	32	\$ 7,775.75	\$ 1,708.80	\$ 9,484.55	\$ 6,942.30	34	\$5,937.05	19.17
TSC	2019	2	107	\$ 23,717.30	\$ 5,274.80	\$ 28,992.10	\$ 17,590.65	98	\$16,918.84	20.56
Maser Lab	2020	3	54	\$ 10,747.95	\$ 2,413.60	\$ 13,161.55	\$ 7,562.55	26	\$4,512.10	35.00
Widtsoe	2021	2	99	\$ 18,252.80	\$ 4,208.60	\$ 22,461.40	\$ 3,776.25	12	\$10,763.83	25.04
Eccles	2023	3	16	\$ 4,413.60	\$ 992.00	\$ 5,405.50	\$ 5,655.30	28	\$3,095.81	20.95
Ray West	2167	3	28	\$ 5,273.55	\$ 1,140.20	\$ 6,413.75	\$ 4,008.90	14	\$3,071.79	25.06
Family Life	2168	3	23	\$ 4,940.85	\$ 1,109.00	\$ 6,049.85	\$ 3,011.10	13	\$3,016.73	24.07
Old Main	2169	3	20	\$ 7,102.55	\$ 1,723.60	\$ 8,826.15	\$ 11,452.95	44	\$10,443.09	10.14
University Inn	2170	3	13	\$ 3,489.25	\$ 771.00	\$ 4,260.25	\$ 10,562.55	44	\$2,266.39	22.56
Sci-Tec	2171	3	53	\$ 12,750.15	\$ 2,739.20	\$ 15,489.35	\$ 6,054.45	25	\$10,362.90	17.94
WW Lundberg	2172	4	6	\$ 731.65	\$ 190.00	\$ 921.65	\$ -	0	\$397.57	27.82
Gun Shed	2173	4	6	\$ 1,127.90	\$ 242.40	\$ 1,370.30	\$ -	0	\$741.32	22.18
Fine Arts	2174	4	85	\$ 22,623.40	\$ 5,146.80	\$ 27,770.20	\$ 13,868.25	59	\$14,078.19	23.67
Merrill Cazier Library	2175	4	50	\$ 10,507.65	\$ 2,709.80	\$ 13,217.45	\$ 6,742.95	38	\$8,966.85	17.69
Vet Science	2279	4	46	\$ 11,050.70	\$ 2,403.00	\$ 13,453.70	\$ 11,621.25	59	\$7,582.50	21.29
Old Vet Science	2281	4	6	\$ 1,814.75	\$ 382.00	\$ 2,196.75	\$ -	0	\$1,180.60	22.33
JUNCTION PIPE INSULATION	2166	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,113.93	\$ -	0	\$3,500.00	24.39
PUBLIC RELATIONS PIPE INSULATION	2305	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,784.64	\$ -	0	\$1,350.00	24.75
VET SCIENCE PIPE INSULATION	2306	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,258.80	\$ -	0	\$2,100.00	24.34
OLD VET SCIENCE PIPE INSULATION	2307	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,071.92	\$ -	0	\$1,500.00	24.58
GREAVES PIPE INSULATION	2308	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,668.00	\$ -	0	\$1,800.00	24.45
REEDER HALL PIPE INSULATION	2309	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,561.05	\$ -	0	\$2,800.00	23.83
MOEN HALL PIPE INSULATION	2310	4	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,287.88	\$ -	0	\$1,800.00	21.92
BNR	2286	4	155	\$ 30,783.55	\$ 6,696.60	\$ 37,480.15	\$ 22,116.45	99	\$15,969.00	28.16
Reeder Hall	2372	5	32	\$ 5,643.55	\$ 1,209.80	\$ 6,853.35	\$ 10,239.15	58	\$3,302.35	24.90
Greaves Hall	2373	5	31	\$ 6,191.20	\$ 1,344.00	\$ 7,535.20	\$ 9,668.25	52	\$4,375.66	20.66
Moen Hall	2377	5	28	\$ 5,616.65	\$ 1,218.40	\$ 6,835.05	\$ 8,813.25	51	\$3,542.81	23.15
Business Building	2378	5	26	\$ 5,362.30	\$ 1,212.40	\$ 6,574.70	\$ 4,235.40	20	\$3,897.95	20.24
Merrill Hall	2379	5	18	\$ 3,995.25	\$ 939.40	\$ 4,934.65	\$ 6,198.30	32	\$2,486.76	23.81
SER	2380	5	37	\$ 9,168.50	\$ 2,036.00	\$ 11,204.50	\$ 7,337.25	31	\$5,178.83	25.96
Performance Hall	2381	5	23	\$ 4,825.20	\$ 1,069.60	\$ 5,894.80	\$ 303.75	1	\$3,053.02	23.17
CPD	2382	5	35	\$ 7,072.05	\$ 1,561.80	\$ 8,633.85	\$ 8,565.00	46	\$3,861.80	26.83
Field House	2385	5	14	\$ 3,823.25	\$ 843.80	\$ 4,667.05	\$ 6,740.25	43	\$2,871.36	19.50
Natural Resources	2378	5	54	\$ 11,314.05	\$ 2,420.60	\$ 13,734.65	\$ 20,264.40	89	\$5,583.09	29.63
Sant Engineering	2388	5	10	\$ 1,963.95	\$ 462.40	\$ 2,426.35	\$ 513.75	1	\$1,498.43	19.43
New Engineering	2389	5	55	\$ 12,744.95	\$ 2,828.00	\$ 15,572.95	\$ 8,639.70	36	\$8,446.52	22.12
Power Plant	2390	5	32	\$ 13,697.75	\$ 3,312.00	\$ 17,009.75	\$ -	0	\$25,216.17	8.09
Balance of Travel	2422	5	0	\$ -	\$ 3,288.40	\$ 3,288.40	\$ -	0	\$0.00	0.00
Boiler Room	xxxx					\$ 24,274.35	\$ 24,274.35	61	\$15,000.00	19.42
Chase Fine Arts	xxxx					\$ 4,137.45	\$ 4,137.45	19	\$2,000.00	24.82
Industrial Science	xxxx					\$ 7,073.25	\$ 7,073.25	26	\$3,500.00	24.25
NFS	xxxx					\$ 14,892.90	\$ 14,892.90	55	\$7,500.00	23.83
Old Engineering	xxxx					\$ 46,065.90	\$ 46,065.90	225	\$23,000.00	24.03
Spectrum	xxxx					\$ 8,533.65	\$ 8,533.65	29	\$4,200.00	24.38
Misc Expected Overage	xxxx					\$ 40,005.25	\$ -	175	\$20,000.00	24.00

State of Utah State Facility Energy Efficiency Fund Loan Application

A. State Agency:

Utah State University (Facilities)
1295 East 700 North
Logan, UT 84322

B. Building name & location:

The scope of this project is installation of insulating thermal blankets on steam pipe fittings located across Utah State University's main campus. 1,643 fittings in 40 buildings are included in this scope. See attached documentation for a list of all buildings.

C. Building description (use, seasonal variations, square footage):

This is a campus-wide project and the buildings included in the scope cover a wide variety of types, uses and sizes.

D. Existing building systems and energy usage:

This project is limited to steam pipe fittings that are currently uninsulated and does not involve any other building systems. Total steam usage has not been provided in the project documents, only an estimate of total BTU/hour loss at the uninsulated steam fittings. The total estimated annual loss is 3,129,064 BTU/h.

E. Project Description:

Eligible Measure / Materials to be installed	Estimated Cost of Measure	Projected Annual Energy Savings	Projected Annual Cost Savings
Insulate steam pipe fittings	\$447,585	23,550 MMBTU	\$182,487
5% contingency	\$22,380		
TOTAL	469,965	23,550 MMBTU	\$182,487

F. Rebates and Incentives:

Provider and type of rebate or incentive	Estimated Amount of incentive
Questar Gas	*n/a
Rocky Mountain Power	*n/a
TOTAL	*n/a

G. Payback [payback = (total cost – incentives) / annual savings]

- \$469,965 / \$182,487 = 2.58 years

H. Description of energy costs savings measurement and verification:

Energy and cost savings will be tracked on a campus level by comparing future steam use data with baseline steam use data.

I. Commissioning procedures:

Visual inspection to make sure all jackets are installed correctly.

J. Other benefits to the environment, community, agency, or State of Utah

Fewer steam losses will reduce demand on natural gas.

K. Total eligible costs to be financed by this loan:

Estimated costs:	\$470,000 (rounded up from \$469,965)
Other funds to be used on project:	\$0
Total proposed loan amount:	\$470,000

L. Attachments

Summary of survey conducted by Shannon Enterprises.

SHANNON ENTERPRISES of W.N.Y., Inc.
Work Summary Matrix REV-4/16/10

Qty	Tag	Description	Survey Date:	04/01/10	Insulation Thickness:	1"	1 of 31
Proposed By: <i>Shannon Enterprises of W.N.Y., Inc.</i> represented By: <i>Midstates Supply</i> Project: Utah State University Location: Logan, UT Quote #:							
Fuel Cost (\$/mmBTU): \$7.75 Operating Hours per Year: 8760 Survey Completed By: Ron Smith							
Design: LT450SS Amb. Temp: 80 Wind Speed: 0 MPH							
Qty	Tag	Description					Insultech Total Cost
34		<u>Education Building</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$5,972.00 \$2,584.00
15		<u>Edith Bowen School</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$2,309.20 \$1,140.00
86		<u>Junction 104</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$13,388.68 \$6,536.00
34		<u>HSRC-51</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$8,443.26 \$2,584.00
46		<u>CPD</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$7,580.00 \$3,496.00
29		<u>Spectrum</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$7,562.69 \$2,204.00
44		<u>Old Main</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$10,265.34 \$3,344.00
14		<u>Ray B. West</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$3,586.40 \$1,064.00
13		<u>Family Life</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$2,777.79 \$988.00
42		<u>Natural Resources</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$7,385.03 \$3,192.00
28		<u>Eccles Conference Center</u> Fittings Installation					Sub Total: \$4,896.80 \$2,128.00

Energy Survey Summary

Total Heatloss - Bare (BTU/HR): 3,129,064.35
 Total Heatloss - w/ Insulation (BTU/HR): 106,441.19
 Heatloss Savings - W/ Insultech (BTU/HR): 3,022,623.16
 Total Annual Operating Cost - Bare: \$212,432.18
 Total Annual Operating Cost - w/ Insulation: \$29,944.86
 Annual Savings - W/ Insultech: \$182,487.32
 Total Cost (INSULTECH Blanket System): \$447,585.00
 Payback (Months): 26.98
 Number Of Fittings: 1,643

Per Year
Per Year

Heatloss Calculation

$Q = K (\Delta T) / L + (K/Ht)$
 Q = Heatloss (BTU/Hr. / Sq. Ft.)
 K = Thermal Conductivity (.40)
 L = Insulation Thickness
 Delta T = Surface Temp - Ambient Temp.
 Ht = Combined Coefficients (3.2)
 (Radiation, Convection, & Conduction)

There are a number of highlights to point out regarding this proposal for INSULTECH Thermal Blanket Insulation. The conditions for energy savings proved to be quite impressive. With the estimated energy cost and numerous uninsulated areas, INSULTECH Blanket Insulation offers a significant return on investment.

Please Note The Following Survey Data Summary:

*Initial Investment: \$447,585.00
 *Lifetime Savings (15 Year Life): \$2,737,309.81

Product Benefits Which Should Be Noted:

By removing an INSULTECH blanket one time it has been installed, the blanket will pay for itself from savings in labor costs and added material cost, compared to other insulation systems.

After installation there will be a recognized annual savings year after year throughout the service life of the blanket. The survey represents an annual savings of..... **\$182,487.32** Estimating a 15 year service life, life **INSULTECH™** will produce a remarkable savings of..... **\$2,737,309.81** at current estimates.

As a safety benefit, all hot surfaces are covered thereby eliminating the potential for employee burns. Additionally, the work environment is improved by lowering the ambient temperature. This is especially valuable in confined spaces such as small mechanical rooms and moist manholes or vaults.

INSULTECH Blanket Insulation is easy to install. Blankets are self-contained insulation systems whose wretwist fasteners are integral to the design of the product. The blanket can be installed and removed within minutes, and there is no need for additional tools or materials.

Proprietary This material is the property of *Shannon Enterprises of W.N.Y., Inc.* and is loaned upon condition that it is not to be reproduced or copied in whole or part for furnishing information to others for any purpose detrimental to our interests and will be returned upon request. Any and all confidential, proprietary and other rights, in the subject matter being retained including any exclusive rights of use and/or manufacture and/or for sale possession of this material does not convey any permission to reproduce this material, in whole or in part, or manufacture the subject matter shown therein or use the confidential or proprietary information thereon, such permission to be granted only by specific authorization in writing signed by an authorized agent of Shannon Enterprises of W.N.Y., Inc.

F.O.B.: N. Tonawanda, NY 14120 (Shipping Cost Estimate: 8%)
 (Shipping costs can be added to survey upon request)

Delivery: 10-12 Weeks ARO
Terms: Price on this survey is valid for 12 months from date of survey.

Survey By: Shannon Enterprises Inc.
 Attn.: Dave Alcorn
 Ph. #: (480) 748-9847
 Fax #: (480) 983-6045
dialcorn2@msn.com

INSULTECH Rep. By: Midstates Supply- Salt Lake
 Attn.: Mike Crane
 Ph. #: 801-401-0200
 Fax #: 801-401-0199
 Email: Mike.crane@midstate.com

REVISED Utah State Building Board
FY 2013 State-Funded Capital Development Prioritization Hearings
October 5, 2011

Start Time	Minutes	Priority	Agency/Institution	Project	Presenter
8:45 AM	0:10		DFCM	Orientation	Lynn Hinrichs, Asst. Director DFCM
8:55 AM	0:10	1	UDAF/UDH/DPS	Module #2 Of The Unified State Laboratory	Lance Davenport, Commissioner DPS
9:05 AM	0:05	2	UDAF	William Spry Agriculture Building	Leonard Blackham, Executive Director
9:10 AM	0:10		Courts	Ogden Juvenile Court	Alyn Lunceford, Facilities Director
9:20 AM	0:05		Courts	Utah County Land Banking	Alyn Lunceford, Facilities Director
9:25 AM	0:20		DNR	Parks Wasatch Mtn. SP Campground Renovation	Dan Clark, Construction Manager
9:45 AM	0:20		UDC	CUCF West-1 192 Secured Housing	Tom Patterson, Director
10:05 AM	0:10		DFCM	Multi-Agency State Office Building II	Lynn Hinrichs, Asst. Director DFCM
10:15 AM	0:15		Break		
10:30 AM	0:10		UCAT	Overview of UCAT Priorities	President Rob Brems
10:40 AM	0:10		SWATC	SWATC: Health Science & Information Tech. Bldg	President Dana Miller
10:50 AM	0:20		DXATC	New Main Campus Building	President Rich VanAusdal
11:10 AM	0:20		MATC	Central Utah County Campus	President Clay Christensen
11:30 AM	0:10		BATC	Health Science & Technology Building	President Richard Maughan
11:40 AM	0:05		BATC	Land Banking Requests	President Richard Maughan
11:45 AM	0:10		DATC	Medical Building Expansion	President Michael Bouwhuis
11:55 AM	0:05		DATC	Land Banking Request Morgan	President Michael Bouwhuis
12:00 PM	1:20		Lunch		
1:20 PM	0:10		Board of Regents	Overview of Higher Ed Priorities	Comissioner William Sederburg
1:30 PM	0:10		U of U	Utility Distribution Infrastructure Replacement	Mike Perez, Assoc. Vice President
1:40 PM	0:10		WSU	New Science Lab Building	Norm Tarbox, Vice President
1:50 PM	0:10	1	USU	Brigham City Regional Campus Academic Building	David Cowley
2:00 PM	0:05	2	USU/CEU	Arts & Education Building-Price Campus	Joe Peterson, Chancellor
2:05 PM	0:20		SUU	New Business Building	President Mike Benson
2:25 PM	0:05		SUU	Land Banking Request	President Mike Benson
2:30 PM	0:15		Break		
2:45 PM	0:20		UVU	Classroom Building	President Matthew Holland
3:05 PM	0:20		Snow	Science Building Remodel	President Scott Wyatt
3:25 PM	0:20		Dixie	New General Classroom Building	President Stephen Nadauld
3:45 PM	0:05		Dixie	Land Acquisitions	President Stephen Nadauld
3:50 PM	0:20		UNG	Statewide Capital Developments	Col. Scott Olson
4:10 PM					



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: October 3, 2011
Subject: **Rules of Procedure**
Presenting: Alan Bachman

Please find in your packet the Rules of Procedure with modifications made as a result of your last meeting when this was on the agenda. We are seeking your authorization to file this with the Division of Administrative Rules for publication. If you have modifications, you may do so at your meeting. If you authorize us to file the Rule, and if there are no negative comments filed during the comment period, then we request that we be able to finalize the rule without having it on the agenda again.

DGB:ASB

Attachment

R23-31. Rules of Procedure for Conduct of Utah State Building Board Meetings. 8-21-11

R23-31-1. Purpose.

The purpose of this Rule R23-31 is to establish procedures for the conduct of Utah State Building Board meetings and to assist the public and anyone wishing to address the Building Board, whether in person or by other establish means.

R23-31-2. Authority.

This Rule R23-31 is authorized under Subsection 63A-5-102(2) which directs that the Building Board “adopt rules of procedure for the conduct of its meetings.” The Building Board has administrative rulemaking authority under Subsection 63A-5-103(1)(e).

R23-31-3. Definitions.

- (1) “Attendance” means that person attending a Board meeting, either in person or through electronic means as authorized by this Rule.
- (2) “Board” means the Utah State Building Board established under Title 63A, Chapter 5, Utah Code.
- (3) “Chair” means the person appointed as Chair of the Board by the Governor pursuant to Title 63A, Chapter 5, Utah Code.
- (4) “Director” means the Director of the Division of Facilities Construction and Management or duly authorized designee.
- (5) “Division” means the Division of Facilities Construction and Management.
- (6) “Electronic meeting” is as defined in Section 52-4-103.
- (7) “GOPB Official” means the Director of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget or duly authorized designee.
- (8) “Open and Public Meetings Laws” means those laws provided by Title 52, Chapter 4, Utah Code.
- (9) “Presiding Officer” means the Chair. The Chair may choose, either because of unavailability or other reason, an alternate Presiding Officer.

R23-31-4. Composition of Board.

- (1) The Board consists of eight members, seven of whom are voting members appointed by the Governor for terms of four years.
- (2) The GOPB Official is a nonvoting member of the Board. As a nonvoting member, the GOPB official shall not be considered as part of the quorum requirement for Board determinations. The GOPB Official shall advise the Presiding Officer of any designee appointed prior to any meeting that the designee will be attending.

R23-31-5. Calling for Meetings.

The Chair or any 3 voting members may call meetings of the Board. The Executive Director of the Department of Administrative Services, Director or GOPB Official may also call for a meeting upon consent of the Chair.

R23-31-6. Compliance with Open and Public Meeting Laws.

All meetings of the Board shall be conducted in accordance with the Open and Public Meetings Laws. All meetings are open to the public unless closed in whole or in part pursuant to the requirements of the Open and Public Meeting Laws.

R23-31-7. Presiding Officer and Basic Responsibilities.

- (1) The Chair shall be the Presiding Officer at all Board meetings when present in person or through electronic means.
- (2) The Chair may choose, either because of unavailability or other reason, an alternate Presiding Officer.
- (3) The Presiding Officer shall be able to make motions and have a vote on each matter before the Board. The Presiding Officer may second motions.
- (4) Unless otherwise directed by vote of the Board, the Presiding Officer shall be responsible for the operation of the meeting, shall have control over the items on the agenda, the order of the agenda, time limits that are needed, and other matters that relate to the orderly running of the meeting.

R23-31-8. Secretary to the Board.

- (1) The **Director shall** serve as Secretary to the Board. The Secretary shall be present at each meeting of the Board, shall provide the posting of notice, minutes, any required recording, and all secretarial related requirements related to the Open and Public Meetings Act. The Secretary shall coordinate with others that are needed for such compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act.
- (2) The Secretary shall maintain a record of Board meetings which shall include minutes, agendas and submitted documents, including those submitted electronically, that shall be available at reasonable times to the public.

R23-31-9. Meetings.

Meetings shall generally be held on the first Wednesday of the month at 9:00 a.m. at the Utah State Capitol in Salt Lake City, Utah. During Legislative Sessions, the Chair and Director may determine another location. The date, time and location may also be modified by the Chair and Director at any time when it is in the interest of the Board and the public.

R23-31-10. Notice and Agenda.

- (1) Notice shall be given of all meetings in accordance with the Open and Public Meeting Laws.
- (2) The Director and Presiding Officer shall confer a reasonable time prior to any Board meeting as to the items to be on the agenda. The Presiding Officer shall ultimately determine the matters to be on the agenda, unless a vote of the Board has been undertaken to direct an item to be placed on the agenda. Board members may also contact the Chair about any request for agenda items.

- (3) The order of business shall be in the order placed on the agenda, unless the Presiding Officer or vote of the Board alters the order of business and there is no prejudice to interested persons that may have intended to attend the meeting.
- (4) Members of the Board, the Division, governmental agencies and the public may submit a request to the Secretary to the Board that an item be placed on the agenda subject to review and approval by the Presiding Officer.
- (5) Each agenda shall have an item on it regarding whether there are any matters to be placed on a future agenda.

R23-31-11. Attendance, Quorum and Voting.

- (1) The quorum requirement for the Board is set forth in in Utah Code Annotated Title 63A, Chapter 5.
- (2) For any determination of the Board, it must be approved by a majority vote of those voting members present and it must receive an affirmative vote from at least three members.
- (3) Voting shall be expressed publicly when called for by the Presiding Officer. An affirmative vote shall be recorded for all Board members present that neither vote negatively nor specifically abstain. The number of affirmative, negative and abstaining votes shall be announced by the Presiding Officer, and the specific members of such votes shall be recorded by the Secretary.
- (4) Members must be in attendance, including by electronic means in accordance with this Rule, in order to vote.

R23-31-12. Motions, Second to a Motion, Discussion, Continuances and Resolutions.

- (1) The GOPB Official may make and second motions, but shall not vote on any motion.
- (2) Items may be continued to any subsequent meeting by vote of the board.
- (3) A second to a motion is required prior to discussion by Board members.
- (4) After a motion is seconded, the Presiding Officer shall ask for discussion of the matter. The Presiding Officer shall call upon those that request to discuss the matter. The Presiding Officer retains the authority to place reasonable restrictions on the discussion that assure that the discussion is orderly and relevant to the motion. After the discussion, or if no Board member desires to discuss the matter, the Board shall proceed to vote on the matter without the need for a formal call to question.
- (5) The Board may enact resolutions as are appropriate under their authority.

R23-31-13. Committees.

The Board may appoint committees to investigate or report on any matter which is of concern to the Board.

R23-31-14. Order at Meetings.

- (1) The Presiding Officer shall preserve order and decorum at all meetings of the Board and shall determine questions of order, which may be subject to a vote of the Board.
- (2) A person or persons creating a disturbance or otherwise obstructing the orderly process of a Board meeting may be ordered to be ejected from the meeting.

R23-31-14. Robert's Rules of Order.

All matters not covered by this Rule R23-31 shall be determined by either Robert's Rules of Order, latest published edition, an abbreviated edition of Robert's Rules of Order as determined by the Presiding Officer; or with abbreviated procedures as determined by the Presiding Officer.

R23-31-15. Electronic Meetings.

(1) Purpose. Section 52-4-207 requires any public body that convenes or conducts an electronic meeting to adopt a rule governing the use of electronic meetings. This Rule R23-31-15 establishes procedures for conducting Board meetings by electronic means.

(2) Procedure. The following provisions govern any meeting at which one or more Board members appear electronically pursuant to Section 52-4-207:

(a) If one or more members of the Board desire to participate electronically, such member(s) shall contact the Director. The Director shall assess the practicality of facility requirements needed to conduct the meeting electronically in a manner that allows for the attendance, participation and monitoring as required by this Rule. If it is practical, the Presiding Officer shall determine whether to allow for such electronic participation, and the public notice of the meeting shall so indicate. In addition, the notice shall specify the anchor location where the members of the Board not participating electronically will be meeting and where interested persons and the public may attend, monitor, and participate in the open portions of the meeting.

(b) Notice of the meeting and the agenda shall be posted at the anchor location. And also provided in accordance with the Open and Public Meetings Act.

(c) Notice of the possibility of an electronic meeting shall be given to the Board members at least 24 hours before the meeting. In addition, the notice shall describe how a Board member may participate in the meeting electronically.

(d) When notice is given of the possibility of a Board member appearing electronically, any Board member may do so and any voting Board member, whether at the anchor location or participating electronically, shall be counted as present for purposes of a quorum and may fully participate and vote. At the commencement of the meeting, or at such time as any Board member initially appears electronically, the Presiding Officer shall identify for the record all those who are appearing electronically. Votes by members of the Board who are not at the anchor location of the meeting shall be confirmed by the Presiding Officer.

(e) The anchor location is the physical location from which the electronic meeting originates or from which the participants are connected. The anchor location shall be identified in the public notice for the meeting. Unless otherwise designated in the notice, the anchor location shall be a room in the Utah State Capitol Hill Complex where the Board would normally meet if the Board was not holding an electronic meeting.

(f) The anchor location will have space and facilities so that interested persons and the public may attend, monitor and participate in the open portions of the meeting, as appropriate.

R23-31-16. Suspension of the Rules.

By a vote of the Board, and to the extent allowed by law, any requirement of this Rule R23-31-16 may be suspended when necessary to better serve the public in the conduct of a Board meeting.



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: October 3, 2011
Subject: **Request to Reallocate Improvement Funds for DAS Security Upgrades**
Presenting: Sal Petilos

The security upgrades that the above-referenced improvement funds were intended to address, were completed and already paid for with agency funds. Consequently, DAS is requesting that the \$20,000 for security upgrades be reallocated to a proposed remodeling project designed to address operational needs resulting from: a) internal program transfers, and b) the creation of the Consolidated Budget and Accounting group (CBA) which services the entire department.

As you know, the department has offices on the 1st through the 5th floors of the State Office Building. The internal program transfers joined the Office of State Debt Collection (5th Fl) with the Division of Finance, Accounts Payable (1st Fl), and the State Travel Office (1st Fl) with The Division of Fleet Operations (4th Fl). The CBA brings together budget and accounting staff, who are stationed on different floors because they were previously assigned to specific divisions.

Management of Fleet Operations, Finance, and the CBA, have expressed a desire to have their respective employees co-located in one area for operational efficiency. The proposed remodel will allow the co-location of: 1) OSDC with Finance, Accounts Payable on the 1st floor; 2) State Travel Office with Fleet Operations on the 4th; and 3) all CBA staff on the 4th floor. While the remodel will require Administrative Rules to move to the 5th floor, it also allows DAS to meet requests from other agencies like the Attorney General's Office, to house staff assigned to DAS in the State Office Building.

The critical issue for DAS is funding the project. Specifically, that portion of the remodeling cost that can be ascribed to the CBA. A new program created in May 2011, the CBA has no budget of its own at this point. Reallocating the security update funds to the remodel project will permit CBA staff to be housed together on the 4th floor of the State Office Building.

DGB:SP

Attachment

DFCM Capital Improvement Reallocation Request

Date: Sept. 27, 2011
Agency: DAS
Requestor: Kim Hood/Sal Petilos

Allocated From

Project Name: State Office Bldg DAS Security Upgrades
Project No.: 11153310
DFCM PM: Brian Bales
Completion Date:
Project Savings: \$ 20,000

Allocated To

Project Name: State Office Bldg DAS Various Floors Remodeling
*Project No.: NEW
ISES No.:
Amount: \$ 20,000

Description of Work/Justification:

These funds are not needed for the requested work as the security work was accomplished with agency funds. DAS is now requesting that the \$20,000 be reallocated by the State Building Board for remodeling needs on the 4th of the State Office Building. This work is for the new DAS Shared Services program, Consolidated Budget and Accounting, which consists of DAS accounting personnel to be consolidated on the 4th floor. This new program has no budget of it's own at this point, a building block is being requested for the FY'13 budget request. We are requesting these funds to be used to remodel space for this new group to be consolidated together.

Allocated To

Project Name:
*Project No.:
ISES No.:
Amount:

Description of Work/Justification:

*If applicable



Gary R. Herbert
Governor

Utah State Building Board

4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3018
Fax (801) 538-3267

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: David G. Buxton
Date: October 3, 2011
Subject: **Courts Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds**
Presenting: Alyn Lunceford

Recommendations

DFCM recommends that the Building Board review the request from Courts regarding reallocation of capital improvement funds.

Background

Due to savings from a concrete project, Courts desires to transfer those savings to the boiler burner units at the Matheson Courthouse. See attached work description.

DGB:kfb

Attachment:

DFCM Capital Improvement Reallocation Request

Date: 9/6/2011
Agency: Courts
Requestor: Lucas V. Davis/Alyn Lunceford/Nick Radulovich

Allocated From

Project Name: Matheson Courts Concrete Replacement
Project No.: 10039150
DFCM PM: Sean Crawford
Completion Date: N/A
Project Savings: \$68,000.00

Allocated To

Project Name: Matheson Courts Boiler Burner Unit Replacement
*Project No.: 11090150
ISES No.: 8356PL02
Amount: \$68,000.00

Description of Work/Justification:

The boiler burner units at the Matheson Courthouse are the original units from 1996. Through the engineering process it has been identified that as part of the burner unit replacement, that additional components will need to be replaced and purchased as well including VFD's (Variable Frequency Drives). The new units will be of much higher efficiency (5-7 year payback) and much more reliable than the previous units. Due to a favorable bidding climate, the concrete replacement project has excess funds that could be utilized on the boiler burner units.