

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

August 21, 2013

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in Attendance:

Ned Carnahan
David Fitzsimmons
Chip Nelson
Bob Fitch
Fred Hunsaker
David Tanner
Gordon Snow

Guests in Attendance:

Rich Amon	Department of Administrative Services
Jeff Reddoor	Utah State Building Board
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Jim Russell	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
John Harrington	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Representative Kay Christofferson	Utah House of Representatives
Representative John Westwood	Utah House of Representatives
Greg Stauffer	Utah System of Higher Education
Ralph Hardy	Utah System of Higher Education
Mark Bleazard	Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Mack McDonald	Department of Human Services

On Wednesday, August 21, 2013 the Utah State Building Board held a Business Meeting prior to their departure on the Capital Facilities Tour. The scheduled meeting was held in Room 4112 of the Utah State Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair Ned Carnahan called the meeting to order at 8:00 am. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to prepare, train and clarify any issues prior to the regular Board meeting.

BUILDING BOARD TOUR NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION

Chair Carnahan said the Board will divide up and travel in three SUV's. Board member Chip Nelson will also travel in his own vehicle with some attendees traveling with him. The Chair

explained that the purpose of this tour is to observe, listen and learn. The tour is strictly to give Board members an up close look at projects requesting funding this year. He reminded the Board that no more than 3 Board members can ride together in a vehicle (3 constitutes a quorum for the Board).

REVIEW CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS REQUESTS

Jeff Reddoor explained the notebook of information and handouts that were distributed to Board members. This notebook contains data from the 26 project requests that will be presented this year. These are broken down into 3 categories: State Funded, Non-state Funded, and Land Banking Requests. Included are needs statements, costs, and details for each project. He suggested that Board members may want to read this on the tour. Chair Carnahan commended Mr. Reddoor for providing this information to the Board at such an early date which gives Board members a better opportunity to learn about each project in order to make informed and knowledgeable decisions. He expressed appreciation for this support and reminded Board members of the open door policy for questions or thoughts concerning these projects or any issues that may arise. In addition, Mr. Reddoor distributed a list of projects which had previously obtained funding for design or programming. This was discussed later in the meeting.

REVIEW SCORING SHEET

Jeff Reddoor distributed the scoring matrix which will be used for the prioritization process. He explained this is a complex process as the 26 projects are listed and rated in each category and some categories have more weight than others. In addition to this matrix, CBE's will be provided (Construction Budget Estimates) in order to assist you with your decisions. Board members expressed concern with the complexity of the scoring matrix. They requested that the Board meet during the scoring process to make sure this was being completed correctly. They also expressed concerns that they wanted the outcome of their scores to accurately express the decision of the Board and not have any surprises due to the weight of the different categories in the scoring process. They felt that if the Board worked together on this assignment at a "work meeting" then the scores would be correctly tabulated to reflect the sentiment of the Board. Chair Carnahan agreed to research this request to see if this would be possible.

Dave Tanner asked how empowered are DFCM Project Managers in helping to guide these projects so that they don't get too far out of scope? Rich Amon suggested this is something that should be clarified with the Legislature. He explained that DFCM's role is primarily to support and serve and not necessarily a regulatory function. DFCM should look to the Legislature and the Board to help define what the scope of the project will be. The dollar amount generally controls the scoping of a project, however when non-state funds are involved state funded portions should be conserved. Chair Carnahan reminded the Board the DFCM project managers, agencies and institutions should be called upon for explanations and additional information when needed. Greg Stauffer from the Utah Office of Higher Education explained that the Board of Regents scoring procedure has an analytical part of the process where they match need with request. It encourages campuses to diminish their requests to score better in the prioritization process. Projects tend to start out really big but then the Regents process begins to right size them. DFCM

Project Manager Jim Russell explained that there are agencies and institutions that control the scope and make sure it is right sized but that depends largely on the funding source. If the building is funded with donor funds, then DFCM has little control over scoping. However, if it is state funded, then project managers have a much larger role in making sure that agencies are not adding too much additional square footage. It all depends on the funding source.

❑ DISCUSSION OF CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT HEARING PROCESS

Jeff Reddoor explained the details of the Capital Development Hearing which takes place on October 9, 2013. Agencies will give presentations on their projects and the Board will have an opportunity to ask questions. The scope should follow what has been provided in the needs statement along with updated costs. After the Capital Development Hearing, then Board members will receive their scoring matrix through email with instruction on scoring these projects.

In addition, Mr. Reddoor distributed a handout showing which projects had received prior funding for programming and/or design. There was extensive discussion as to what impact design or planning money should have on the Board's recommendations and if this should be considered when determining future funding for a project.

The Board discussed that if the Legislature approved programming and/or design, should the Board support their actions by moving a project into cue based on their actions. Rich Amon expressed the idea that one of the roles of the Board is to provide an independent and different perspective for the Legislature and the Governor. The Board can't ignore projects that are designed because someone thought the project was important enough to move it to that point, but if the Board demonstrates independence, then it helps promote the right perspective for government. He explained the Building Board can be part of a triangle -- consisting of the Legislature, agencies and/or institutions, and the Building Board -- which exist by statute to provide independent decisions.

Chip Nelson felt this information should be made available before the scoring process. His perspective was that if the previous Board felt that a project was worth funding for programming then the Board should probably take a little harder look at it and then make an independent decision. However, it is a different issue if an institution privately funds their programming in order to give their project the advantage for later legislative funding.

Additional information was requested. Dave Tanner asked that the following information be provided concerning program/design funds:

- Who approved the funds
- The date it was approved
- Whether it was design or planning funds
- The phase or date of completion of design or programming

❑ OTHER

There was no other business.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 am.

ITINERARY OF CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT TOUR OF NORTHERN UTAH AREA

At the conclusion of the Business Meeting, members of the Board attended the Capital Development Tour, visiting the following sites:

Day 1:

Public Safety/Unified State Laboratories	Calvin Rampton Building 4431 South 2700 West, Taylorville	9:30 am
Camp Williams Infrastructure	Utah National Guard 178000 South Camp Williams Rd., Bluffdale	10:45 am
<i>Lunch provided by the Davis Applied Technology in Kaysville</i>		12:15 pm
Project from DATC, SWATC, DXATC	Davis Applied Technology 550 East 300 South, Kaysville	1:00 pm
USU Brigham City Regional/ USU Eastern	USU Brigham City 265 West 1100 South, Brigham City	4:00 pm
<i>Overnight stay at Holiday Inn Express</i>	<i>Ogden</i>	

Day 2:

New Science Building	Weber State University Science Lab Building, off of Edvalson St.	8:00 am
Weber Valley Multi Use Youth Center	Department of Human Services 5470 South 2700 West, Roy	9:15 am
SLCC CTE Meadowbrook Campus	Salt Lake Community College 250 West 3900 South, Salt Lake City	11:00 am
<i>Lunch provided by University of Utah at the Olpin Union Building, Parlor A in SLC</i>		12:15 pm
Crocker Building	University of Utah Olpin Union Building off of Central Campus Dr.	1:00 pm