

Utah State Building Board Business Meeting



October 10, 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:

Matt Lund	Governor's Office of Management and Budget
Rich Amon	Department of Administrative Services
Kim Hood	Department of Administrative Services
Jeff Reddoor	Utah State Building Board
Cee Cee Niederhauser	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Joshua Haines	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Ralph Hardy	USHE
Dana Miller	SWATC
Tyler Brinkerhoff	UCAT
Kurt Michaelis	Mountainland ATC
Mack McDonald	Department of Human Services
Ben Berrett	Utah State University

On Thursday, October 10, 2013 the Utah State Building Board held a Business Meeting in Room 4112 State Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting was called to order at 8:05 am.

Chair Ned Carnahan welcomed members of the general public as well as Board members to the meeting. He announced the agenda for the day and said that the Board could have a motion at the end of the meeting if they were in agreement on the Capital Development Prioritization.

❑ **DISCUSSION OF CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FOR FY 15**

Chair Carnahan said that the Board had received all information needed for the prioritization before the meeting. Jeff Reddoor clarified that the information on the Huntsman Cancer Institute, State Archives and USDB were distributed separately and were not included in the book previously distributed to the Board. There are needs statements and CBE for every project. The numbers on the score sheets are the current numbers reflected on the CBE's and reflect the current construction costs today. There is a total \$822, 956,415 in projects being requested this year.

Chair Carnahan asked for discussion concerning the Capital Development Projects presented at yesterday's hearing. David Fitzsimmons said he was satisfied with the process. Fred Hunsaker said that his concern was how to identify real need – he thought it difficult to interpret and measure relative need for every project on the list. Gordon Snow discussed whether a project should receive a higher score because it has been programmed and how to indicate that a project should receive programming for this year. In addition, he had concerns that the U of U Infrastructure was not on the list. Chip Nelson said he agreed with Fred Hunsaker that the overwhelming focus should be need but is uncertain the scoring sheet reflects this priority. He would like to see some changes in the scoring process to reflect this. Bob Fitch said all the information collected and distributed to the Board has been very helpful. He is looking forward to the scoring process. Dave Tanner said he was unclear as to the mission of the state of Utah in regards to the real needs of the state. In addition, he questioned if there were legislative mandates unfamiliar to the Board. He would like to respect those who have gone before and who previously approved programming for some of these projects. Mr. Tanner said our predecessors obviously would like to see certain projects moved forward. He also feels a need for cost effective solutions. State buildings do not have to be architectural monuments; they just need to be effective buildings. Board members were encouraged to act independently when scoring

Matt Lund from the GOMB reported that their office recommended funding for projects that had already received prior funding from the Legislature, namely; DOC Expansion Gunnison, the Unified State Lab, the USU Project and then the Weber State Science Lab. Jeff Reddoor reported that future collaboration with the GOMB, the Governor's Office and the Building Board will be helpful in the future, working hand in hand with the state planner, Alan Matheson.

Chip Nelson explained that three members of the Board were at a disadvantage because they had not visited the projects in the southern Utah area due to the fact that Building Board Tours alternate between north and south areas each year. He encouraged the Board to include all areas of the state during their tour next year. All Board members were in agreement with touring the entire state. Josh Haines suggested that DFCM Project managers may want to be consulted to give a history of each project.

There was discussion concerning some specific projects and Board members questioned the types of funding available for these projects. There were concerns about the Land Banking priority, specifically the parcel of land requested by Dixie College which had received partial funding by the Legislature. Bob Fitch asked for clarification on the National Guard Project, specifically if the money had been allocated by the Federal Government and if those funds could be receded. Dave Tanner questioned about the Agriculture Building and why they are combining

a portion of their needs in the Unified Lab and if two buildings were really needed. In addition, Jeff Reddoor clarified life/safety issues in some of the projects. Mr. Reddoor said if a Board member was not familiar with life/safety issues on a project they may want to following DFCM's recommendations on this project.

SCORE SHEET OVERVIEW, QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Chair Carnahan and Jeff Reddoor answered questions concerning the scoring process. Mr. Reddoor reminded the Board of the weighting factor associated with the scoring matrix: Column 1 is weighted as 2, Column 2 is weighted as 4, Column 3 is weighted as 1, Column 4 is weighted as 2, and Column 5 is weighted as 1. As Board members enter their scores in the columns, their rankings are tallied on the right side so that they can see how their project scores are being ranked in comparison with other projects.

As the discussion continued Board members decided they should score the projects based on the requests and the information gathered and then let the process move forward. Board members agreed that they should be an independent voice, using their best judgment as to which projects should move forward. In the future, they would like to see some clarification and possibly an Administrative Rule concerning the process of phased funding (which is planning and design).

ADJOURNMENT FOR INDIVIDUAL SCORING

Motion: **Chip Nelson moved to adjourn to separate locations for individual scoring of projects for FY 2015. The Motion was seconded by Dave Tanner and passed unanimously.**

The Board adjourned to separate locations to complete their individual prioritizations at 10:50 am.

After individual prioritizations were complete the Board met for lunch in room 4112 SOB.

COLLABORATION SESSION

At 1:55 pm the meeting reconvened. Jeff Reddoor distributed printed copies of the prioritization and opened the meeting up for discussion. The Board members reviewed the final scores. Gordon Snow said he was satisfied with the results of the rankings on Land Banking Requests. Chair Carnahan asked if anyone would like to discuss any parts of the Capital Development Ranking.

CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT RANKING

Chair Carnahan ask for a motion from the Board.

Motion: **Fred Hunsaker moved to approve the FY 2015 Capital Development**

Ranking as presented. The Motion was seconded by Dave Tanner. The voting was unanimous.

Motion: Chair Ned Carnahan moved to table the FY15 Land Banking Requests until the next Board meeting. The Motion was seconded by Dave Tanner. The voting was unanimous.

Chair Carnahan announced that the Capital Development rankings will be made public.

☐ ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Chip Nelson moved to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was seconded by Bob Fitch.

The meeting adjourned at 2:08 pm.