

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 ad litem, 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 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.