

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

June 28, 2006

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Larry Jardine, Chair
Manuel Torres
Mel Sowerby
Katherina Holzhauser

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Keith Stepan	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Robert Franson	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Dana Edwards	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
S'ean Crawford	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Attorney General's Office/DFCM
Rich Amon	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Kim Hood	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Representative D. Gregg Buxton	Legislature
Colonel Scott Olsen	Utah National Guard
Dan Becker	Courts
Judge Sheila McCleve	Courts
Gordon Bissegger	Courts
Jason Miller	Department of Workforce Services
Gary Adams	Department of Workforce Services
Jerry Jones	Department of Human Services
Frank Romano	Department of Human Services
Don Rosenbaum	Utah State Hospital
Peggy Grusendorf	Utah State Hospital
Dallas Earnshaw	Utah State Hospital
Mark Spencer	Utah System of Higher Education
Stan Plewe	Dixie State College
Michael G. Perez	University of Utah
Ken Nye	University of Utah
Randall Funk	University of Utah
Gordon Storrs	Salt Lake Community College
Brent Petersen	Davis Applied Technology Center

Kent Thorsted	Davis Applied Technology Center
David Tanner	Southern Utah University
Jim Michaelis	Utah Valley State College
Kevin Hansen	Weber State University
Darrell Hart	Utah State University
Tony Lords	Henriksen Butler
RoLynne Hendricks	VCBO Architecture
Julee Attig	Jacobsen Construction
Jackie McGill	Spectrum Engineers
Chris Coutts	MHTN Architects

On Wednesday, June 28, 2006, the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting in Room W125 of the State Capitol Complex in Salt Lake City. Chair Larry Jardine called the meeting to order at 9:05am and welcomed Representative Buxton and Kim Hood who was sitting in for John Nixon, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 24, 2006.....

Chair Jardine sought approval of the meeting minutes of the May 24 meeting.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to approve the meeting minutes of May 24. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BUILDING BOARD CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT SCORING GUIDE AND REVIEW OF REQUEST PROCESS AND SCHEDULE.....

Kent Beers reviewed the Building Board Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide which was approved by the Board in May 2005. A revised copy of the document was also provided and identified the proposed changes to the scoring objectives and scoring anchors as recommended by the Board's appointed subcommittee.

Scoring Anchor One evaluates life safety and replacement deficiencies within an existing building. The proposed change allowed DFCM to provide the score for this category based on Facility Condition Assessments performed by architectural and engineering firms and DFCM staff. This will be the only category scored by DFCM and the Board may elect to accept or modify DFCM's score. This change is proposed because the score is based on assessment reports and mathematical calculations, and is a score that can actually be measured and computed. DFCM also does a life safety evaluation for the Board of Regents which is then used in their Q&P scoring process.

Scoring Anchor Two evaluates the essential program growth and capacity requirements in the agency or institution. The Committee proposed using the Board of Regents "Q" scores for higher education projects when analyzing this objective. The Commissioner's Office could provide the score for this category by using enrollment and space utilization data prior

to the preliminary scoring.

The Committee proposed changing the procedure which weighted objectives one and two based on the amount or percentage of new space versus existing space by not combining the scores on facilities replacing existing space at the same time they were adding new space. They proposed both objectives should be eligible to receive full points in both categories.

Scoring Anchor Three pertains to the cost effective solutions. The Committee proposed to change the weighting in this category from two to one, and eliminating the bonus point being given for bargain opportunities as it was already included in the definition of the objective. Last year most of the projects were given a score of three by DFCM in this objective, and changing the weighting will have the net effect of rewarding projects with cost savings in the design or construction area or a bargain opportunity purchase with an additional one or two points. It would penalize the projects with a more costly design and construction process by one or two points. The standard score would become a three in this category unless the project was demonstrated to be more costly, more cost effective, or a bargain purchase.

Scoring Objective Four improved the program's effectiveness and provided facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives. The Committee proposed combining objective four and five from last year into a single objective with a weight of two. Since the objectives from last year improved the program effectiveness and supported critical programs and initiatives, combining them would eliminate some of the overlap between these two objectives.

Scoring Objective Five is the alternative funding scoring anchor. It was proposed to award points for donations establishing an ongoing endowment for operations and maintenance. A score of five would be given to projects where 60% of the cost is through a donation or a significant endowment for O&M is established. A score of three would be given when alternative funding for the project is a considerable portion of the total cost, or an alternative funding has been set up to establish a moderate endowment for O&M. A score of one would be given when no alternative funding is available for the program. A number or percentage associated with the score would be needed in order to obtain a five and one would be the minimum score for this objective.

Katherina Holzhauser stated the committee tried to simplify the process and be able to use this to help drive desired behavior for the state. They hoped the revisions would provide for some flexibility.

Mr. Beers distributed handouts identifying mock scenarios. He asked the Board to look at the different scenarios including a project with 50% existing space to be demolished and 50% of new space. Another mock scenario showed a project that was 100% new space. He hoped this would simulate some of the projects in the upcoming year and their scores based on the proposed changes. He asked for input on a difficult scenario where an existing facility was severely worn and dilapidated. The small 10,000sf building needed to

be replaced, but the agency wished to add 90,000sf of new space. There was 10% dilapidated existing space and 90% new space which would allow them 10 points for the little existing space and six points for the moderate growth they are experiencing. This would be a very high ranking project although a trivial amount of space would be replaced. He requested direction from the Board on how to handle the scenario.

Katherina Holzhauser felt it should not receive a three in space needs growth; it should only receive a score of two. Even though it is moderate, the new space way outweighs the growth needs.

Keith Stepan commented the Board could come to a baseline of scores and then determine if adjustments are needed as part of a subjective discussion.

Mel Sowerby felt the life safety issues should be paramount in this consideration and felt they would be weighted heavier.

Manuel Torres asked how the projects from last year would rank with the proposed changes. Kent Beers stated it very difficult to assess since several assumptions need to be built into this type of analysis. He referred to the document with of last year's rankings of the projects with the new scoring applied. He used DFCM's previous score on the existing deficiencies, and the Building Board's average score for space growth needs, and then combined the averages of the two categories. He applied the recommended formula to the alternative funding. When the projects were resorted, the DNR Midway Fish Hatchery was the first priority, the Unified Lab was priority two, the Weber State University Classroom project was priority three, USU Agriculture Building was priority four, and the fifth priority was the St. George Courthouse. Some of the projects would have been reordered with the caveat that it is somewhat impossible to take scores from last year's system.

Mel Sowerby stated each entity is limited to the purchasing stipulated by the state. He questioned how those entities could gain points in cost effectiveness without a bargain purchase. Kent Beers stated construction alternatives have been discussed, along with design alternatives. The agencies could be penalized if their design is not cost effective.

Mark Spencer, Utah System of Higher Education, felt combining objective one and two were positive changes. He felt flexibility would bring challenges with objective five. Chair Jardine recognized the need for the two Boards to come together while still maintaining separate ranking systems.

Darrell Hart, Utah State University, applauded the Board's efforts in taking care of the current facilities. The higher education system identifies the O&M with when the building was built. Campuses with older buildings have numbers that were established several years ago and the number is only adjusted if the building is renovated. The older campuses are working with significantly less cost per square foot than the other agencies and institutions. He thought it was important to continue the trend of taking care of the existing facilities.

Ken Nye, University of Utah, reminded the Board that this process was consciously termed an evaluation guide as a way of analyzing projects and using the information to arrive at a priority list. The Board still had the ability to score projects and then change the order that came from the scoring in order to address their concerns. Mr. Nye also addressed prorating the points on objective one and two. He recalled the reason it was initiated was due to projects that were primarily new space and involved a smaller amount of renovation and replacement not being able to rank high on the list based on the justification of the minor part of the project which involved poor quality space. He was concerned the proposed change would cause projects driven entirely by growth to not reach the top of the list. Buildings in very serious need of replacement due to their poor condition would also struggle if there is not a strong growth component. He felt agencies and institutions would only submit projects that are a combination of growth and renovation as a way to maximize points. He suggested retaining the prorated points and increasing objective one, and possibly objective two, to allow them to carry more weight compared to other criteria. After completing the scoring, the Board would have the latitude to adjust the priority order.

Kent Beers referred to the Capital Development Request Scoring Process handout outlining the steps for the proposed process. The Building Board hearings would be step one and the agencies and institutions would give their presentations to the Building Board on proposed projects. At this time, the Board members could ask questions, take notes and begin to evaluate the potential of each project.

During the period between the hearings and the rankings, the Building Board members would spend time analyzing each project and formulating their individual preliminary scoring for each project using the scoring matrix guidelines.

At the Building Board ranking meeting, the Board members would turn in their individual preliminary scores at this time and DFCM staff would post the preliminary scores on a screen. The Building Board will review the individual preliminary scores and begin the deliberation process noting individual scores that are "outliers". The Board will deliberate until a consensus score is arrived at for each of the objectives (one through five). DFCM staff will tally the Board score for each objective for each project. The Board will review the ranking produced by totaling the Board score for each objective for each project and then deliberate whether there are reasons to move the projects in the ranking before finalizing their rankings.

Kent Beers previously visited with Professor Ernie Nielson who assisted in developing this process. He stressed that opinions from both sides should be able to come to the forefront in a public debate in order for the Board to come to a consensus. Professor Nielson suggested that this process will facilitate a more open and public discussion of the pros and cons of the projects. He also stressed that this should not be a simple mathematical computation and this is simply a tool to facilitate a discussion between the Board members. At any given time, if the Board feels that there is a need to move a project, those points could be argued or discussed and voted upon by the Board. The new adopted process

should include the deliberation for a final consensus as a Board score.

Manuel Torres expressed concern with new building space and growth compared to the existing buildings. He felt the changes would favor older schools with older existing buildings. He felt some institutions were stalemated as far as growth. Keith Stepan felt the weighting would help those with older buildings. He thought the projections for this coming year called for a stabilization of growth.

Mike Perez, University of Utah, proposed another consideration in changing the weights as opposed to separating the remodel space or tear down. The weights are currently proposed at two each and the remodel component could potentially be changed to a three or four in order to address current facilities. A project with no remodel could get the full weight for growth. Katherina Holzhauser felt she could support it but had a concern with it being mathematically cohesive.

Stan Plewe, Dixie State College, pointed out there is local differences, and local communities cannot address local building needs. It was difficult to apply a fair system while still recognizing growth across the state. He felt it was important to address growth issues as they occur within the local communities.

MOTION: Mel Sowerby moved to accept the changes as recommended by the Committee.

Manuel Torres asked how Corrections would address new growth because he did not feel they would ever score high. Representative Buxton explained the Board would have to consider higher education and state facilities equally. Although the objectives and weighting didn't fit perfectly for every project, the Board needed to consider all funding requests.

Mr. Torres was also concerned that the objectives were being changed to appease only higher education. All of the other agencies were going to score low under the new process since they typically requested new space. He also did not want to penalize communities with a lot of growth.

Katherina Holzhauser requested clarification on splitting the objectives with a weight of four.

Kent Beers responded they would score lower if there was a split with higher weights.

MOTION: Katherina Holzhauser moved to amend the motion to accept the draft evaluation guideline with the change to increase the weights to four on objectives one and two, but keep the combined scoring and the new scoring process. The motion was seconded by Mel Sowerby and passed unanimously.

Kent Beers stated the projects coming forward this year for the tours seemed to be primarily based in southern and central Utah. The projects being requested in northern Utah would be examined on August 2. The Board will relocate their meeting to the Weber

Valley Detention Center in order to provide a better opportunity to see the facility and the Davis Applied Technology College and the Ogden Weber Applied Technology College. The Board will tour the other requests with the Capital Facilities Appropriation Subcommittee on August 21 and 22.

AMENDMENTS TO R23-1 AND R23-2.....

Alan Bachman stated the Board previously moved to accept the amendments and allow DFCM to proceed with procedures to make them effective if no comments were received during the comment period. There were no comments received and the amended rules became effective on June 1.

LONG TERM LEASE REQUEST FOR DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ADULT PROBATION AND PAROLE AND DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY UTAH HIGHWAY PATROL

Alyn Lunceford stated Washington County has agreed to construct a Public Safety and Adult Probation and Parole building for the State at the Purgatory Flats site. Over the past few years, DFCM has been focusing and trying to promote cooperation with Public Safety, Highway Patrol and Adult Probation and Parole with the county jails and the county sheriffs. This tends to be a very good working relationship and the counties have found it favorable to have these facilities located near their county jail. The request is for the Board to approve this at \$15.50/sf for an initial 10 year lease with a 10 year renewal option which is relatively automatic at this rate. This will lock the rate in place with the variability of operations and maintenance costs going up over time.

Mel Sowerby asked if the lease was full service or net and if there were any escalations over the ten years. Alyn Lunceford responded it will be partial service as Adult Probation and Parole and Highway Patrol tends to do their own janitorial service. Variable items also include the landscaping, building maintenance, and utilities. There are no escalations in the rent costs.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to accept the lease with Washington County. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

REQUEST FOR LEASE PURCHASE AGREEMENT WITH CARBON COUNTY ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Alyn Lunceford stated in 2002 the Legislature authorized DFCM to enter into a lease purchase agreement with Carbon County for the construction a building for Natural Resources operations. Dennis Carver, Natural Resources, was present to address issues with regard to the statutory requirements which included that the money in the existing budget be sufficient to manage and operate the building, pay for all of the costs of the building and that the building be designed in a manner to accommodate the needs of

Natural Resources in Carbon County.

Dennis Carver stated there were primarily two issues on this lease that Carbon County initiated with Natural Resources. This lease will benefit the state and would not require any additional funding from the Legislature to fund the lease.

This is going to be a zero interest loan through Carbon County and Natural Resources and will be paid through savings from existing leases. By putting all of their agencies into one facility, they will be able to save money on equipment and human resources which will also be used to pay the lease. This will remove the Price DNR building off the project list.

Natural Resources worked very closely with the facilities construction group in designing, planning and programming this building over the last year. This was a significant improvement of the situation for Natural Resources and worthy for the state.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to accept the lease with Carbon County. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

☐ REALLOCATION OF FY 2007 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS AT THE NATIONAL GUARD.....

DFCM recommended the Building Board reallocate \$281,300 in FY 2007 Capital Improvement funding from the Jake Garn Airport roofing project to the Tooele Armory Fascia/Soffit/Carpet/Windows/Paving/Entrance/Remodel project as proposed by the Utah National Guard.

Key components to the upgrades to the Tooele Armory include the remodel of an old garage/storage unit into a training facility and the installation of surrounding security barriers. The total budget for all of the upgrades is \$345,900. Unfortunately, costs for the remodel of the garage/storage unit and security upgrades are much higher than expected. As a result, the National Guard requests that funds previously approved for the roofing project at the Jake Garn Airport be reallocated to the Tooele Armory project. DFCM's roofing manager has inspected the Jake Garn Airport roof and agrees that the roof can get by one more year with patching. The National Guard will request funding for the Jake Garn Airport roof as a top priority next year.

Col. Scot Olson stated the roof may not require total replacement and it may just be a portion that is an essential replacement. He thought what the Board would see an emphasis from the National Guard in improving some of those armories in smaller communities that are very outdated, inefficient in energy use, and some safety issues. The intent in the small communities is to revitalize the activity and usage of those facilities.

MOTION: Katherina Holzhauser moved to approve the reallocation of FY 2007 capital improvement funds at the National Guard. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

Katherina Holzhausser excused herself from the meeting.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH DAVID ECCLES SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND NEW HUMANITIES BUILDING PHASE I CHANGE IN PROJECT SCOPE

Mike Perez stated the David Eccles School of Business major remodel project was approved by the 2006 legislative session and called for the remodel of the Madsen building and the Business Classroom building, along with a small addition. The University has updated the master plan as a result of the project moving forward and has found that the Business Classroom Building has floor to floor ceiling heights. The challenges of the infrastructure will not accommodate the desired tiered classroom seating and they have determined it is better to demolish the building and rebuild a newer building. This opportunity will allow them to relocate the Department of Economics currently residing in that building to another building off campus. The change in scope consists of a smaller, newer building being constructed in place of the business classroom building. There will not be any increase in O&M because of the smaller building.

The College of Humanities project was approved two sessions ago in the legislative session of 2005. The project is programmed and is currently in the last stages of design with hopes to begin construction in 2006.

After reviewing the master plan for the School of Business, the University determined it was more sensible to relocate the Department of Economics to the Orson Spencer Hall building. They would then move the Department of Philosophy over to the new College of Humanities project which would require them to expand the scope on that building. This would require an additional 10,000sf to the project and may have a small \$50-55,000 increase in O&M.

Mr. Perez requested the Board approve the change in scope on both buildings with the understanding the University may need to request permission for the Capital Facilities Committee for the additional O&M.

MOTION: Mel Sowerby moved to accept the changes as proposed. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT UNIVERSITY OF UTAH RED BUTTE GARDEN AMPITHEATRE AND ROSE GARDEN FACILITIES.....

This project was previously approved by the Building Board but since there were no state dollars involved, or a need for ongoing O&M, the Legislature did not need to approve the project. Therefore, the University requested approval again from the Building Board and have indicated an increase in cost. The \$6.4 million project was delegated to the University and they hoped to retain that delegation.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to approve the project delegation to the University and allow them to proceed with the project. The motion was seconded by Mel Sowerby and passed unanimously.

☐ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Randall Funk, University of Utah, presented the administrative report for the period of May 5 to June 9, 2006. There were six new design agreements, one programming agreement, and two study agreements awarded for the period, as well as one remodeling contract.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to accept the administrative report of the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Mel Sowerby and passed unanimously.

Darrell Hart, Utah State University, presented the administrative report for the period of May 3 to June 7, 2006. There were five construction contracts issued for the period, and one transfer in the Contingency Reserve Fund due to additional expenses on the concrete replacement project.

MOTION: Mel Sowerby moved to accept the administrative report of Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

☐ DHS REQUEST FOR PROGRAMMING AT STATE HOSPITAL FORENSICS LAB PHASE II

Dallas Earnshaw, Superintendent of the Utah State Hospital, stated their initial intent was to request approval from the Board for programming, but after looking at the funding rules, they have determined they are not prepared to use the money they anticipated out of FY06 funding. They will return to the Board in the future for programming, but wished to inform the Board of current issues at the State Hospital and the intentions of the Department of Human Services for future plans.

Phase I of the Forensic Facility was completed and opened in January 2000. Since that time, they have had a steady increase in court ordered admissions to the State Hospital Forensic Facility. In 2004 they had to work with the Courts to stop doing court ordered evaluations in the Hospital because of the increased senses at the Hospital. The court-ordered evaluations were then slated to be done in the jails. Persons who were found not competent to proceed were then ordered to the hospital for treatment. They are currently at 100% utilization and have been at that level for quite some time. They have tried to work with the Courts and the Community and mental health centers to move them out as quickly as possible and improve programming efforts, but the demand for beds continues to grow. Unfortunately, as people are in jails and are there for competency evaluations and are found not competent to proceed they are then ordered to the department for treatment. Those persons who have those orders are now on waiting lists to get into the State

Hospital. That waiting list continues to grow and the current facility is not meeting the demands for the state. It has become somewhat of a frustration with the court system not being able to get individuals in for treatment to carry on with their proceedings.

In 2004 the Board approved the master plan for the Utah State Hospital. At that time, there had been several studies going into the campus development and the Forensic facility was not in the next developmental phase of the master plan. Instead a pediatric facility was planned since the children and youth programs are in antiquated facilities. They have tried to upgrade and update to maintain those environments as safe and therapeutic as possible. The Department will need to determine their priority prior to the capital development hearings in order to determine if the State Hospital or pediatric facilities will be their top priority.

Manuel Torres asked how the increase in Corrections was affecting the State Hospital. Mr. Earnshaw responded that the initial design was for the State Hospital to handle the needs of both agencies. The needs continue to grow rapidly and they have found the facility is only able to handle the capacity from the Court system and the Department of Substance Abuse and Mental Health. Corrections decided to handle their own mental health issues through projects at the Draper site and build their own mental health facility. They still assist the Department of Corrections with their more difficult cases. Prison transfers are brought to the Forensic facility to treat, healths assesses and diagnose some of their difficult cases, but their focus is to meet the demands of the current population of those being committed through the court system.

The Utah State Hospital will return to the Board once they have further determined how they wish to proceed.

❑ DIXIE STATE COLLEGE ACADEMIC COMMONS AND SERVICE CENTER.....

Stan Plewe, Dixie State College, stated the College recently acquired the property for the Health Science building and expressed appreciation to those involved in the process. VCBO is in the final stages of construction drawings and they should be out to bid in August or early September.

Mr. Plewe stated Dixie State College is challenged with growth and its size and fit. The Education and Family Studies building was built in 1963 with 18,000sf and did not include air conditioning or corridors. A major renovation occurred in 1984 to increase the building to 18,352sf. The library was initially built in 1966 and was renovated in 1993 to expand the building to 47,000sf.

When President Huddleston started at Dixie 12 years ago, there were no health sciences programs. There was an outreach program sponsored by Weber State, but now they have grown to accommodate the needs of IHC and other health services in the area. They would like to be responsive to the community's needs.

Another challenge is their campus is only 110 acres. They are bound by a freeway and cemetery, as well as residential zoning. There is no area to grow which forces them to grow vertically.

They have grown in program growth, mission change, enrollment growth and O&M challenges. Their current five year plan for the Regents and the Building Board introduces a science building which is desperately needed with the new science degree. They also desire an information commons building which is a combination of a library addition, information center and tearing down the Whitehead Student Services Building scheduled to be demolished. A Teacher Education building would be their next desire. The total requests over the next five years would be seven new buildings with a 33,000sf replacement on the Whitehead building and 600,000gsf of new space totaling approximately \$150 million.

The Academic Commons and Services Center will be built to allow the greatest possible flexibility for future remodeling and renovation. This winter they visited five schools in the east and what they viewed primarily in the library and information commons renovation which is why they visited there. They all had difficulties in remodeling this old space which wasn't really designed to be remodeled and stairways and elevator shafts were especially difficult. The notion would be as they vacate spaces, they can accommodate the growth of the library and the information services over the years. As the buildings are built, they have a right sizing for all of those new programs that are starting for space for the faculty and in the long term of twenty five years, they have moved those out and have right sized the library and the IT. The vision would be that in time they would then go and have a place that is central to the campus and central to the student activities and the academics somewhat away from that location.

Mr. Plewe stated the Centennial Commons project was hoped to be operational by 2011 when Dixie State would be 100 year old.

Mr. Plewe reiterated their request was proceed with a program and identify the needs of the various academic components to define the needed sizes of spaces and types of structures to obtain the desired flexibility. The cost is estimated to be \$100,000 and will be split between Dixie State and DFCM.

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved for DFCM to share in 50% of the planning costs. The motion was seconded by Mel Sowerby and passed unanimously.

☐ COURTS FIVE YEAR MASTER PLAN.....

Dan Becker, State Court Administrator, introduced Judge Sheila McCleve as the chair of the Standing Committee on state facilities. Judge McCleve presides in the Third District Court. About nine years ago, the Judicial Council established a standing committee to advise the council in terms of facility projects in order to be more proactive. Judge McCleve provided an overview of the committee's responsibilities. The committee was

created to make recommendations to them and to review the proposals and manage facilities planning. This committee is to review the trends and projections combined with population and case load and other growth indicators to determine courthouse needs. They also work on a master plan in order to prioritize the needs. They make recommendations to the Judicial Council as to the order of the master plan priorities and develop a timetable for construction requests. They also make recommendations for the approval, modification or disapproval of construction requests and ensure compliance with the Judicial Council Design and Space Guidelines for Courthouses.

Judge Mc Cleve reviewed the purpose of the Court facilities planning in regard to the rules of Judicial Administration. Their purpose is to provide for effective planning of Court capital facilities, and promote efficient use of new and existing courthouses through application of co-location and multi-use Court facility concepts. They also establish framework for conceptual planning and developmental and implementation phases of Court facilities. The Court Facilities Planning Committee must provide for judicial council review and approval of all proposed Court capital facilities, and ensure adherence to design/space guidelines and other requirements of Utah Judicial System Capital Facilities Master Plan. Each of the eight jurisdictions presents their project and it is analyzed by the Courts staff and then recommendations are made to the Judicial Council. The Council reviews those recommendations and determines how it would affect the master plan.

Gordon Bissegger, Courts, provided an overview of their process as they look at the long term needs statewide. This document anticipates facility issues the Courts are facing over the next ten years. Their first project is the St. George Courthouse, which came before the Board last year and ultimately went to the Legislature. The Legislature approved land acquisition and payout of the existing bond on the old building that they are trading with the City for new property. This project will be presented to the Council at its' August meeting and will likely be recommended to continue as the number one project for the State Courts. Once it is approved in August, it will be resubmitted to the Building Board at the next meeting.

The Ogden Juvenile request was made to the Building Board last year and was recommended for approval to acquire the Old Ogden Post Office. In the interim, the building was sold to a developer resulting in the need to look again for land.

Mr. Bissegger pointed out that most of the projects on their list are not state funded. They are done through General Obligation Bonds or through lease revenue bonds. He noted the Sanpete Courthouse was approved by the Legislature last year as a lease increase at these locations, which is a contract site where the courts contract with these counties for provision of court services. They have the obligation of providing the facilities and constructing those facilities. The Sanpete Courthouse will drop of the list upon its completion in 2007. The Spanish Fork Courthouse is also in the same category and would constitute a lease increase which will be requested at the Legislature.

Most of the future needs have been identified along the Wasatch Front with the exception of growth in Washington County. There is need to expand in Davis County and they are looking for the opportunity to expand in Layton, Bountiful or Farmington. With Layton and Bountiful being landlocked, the most potential resides with the Farmington site although the confined space has impacted the needed expansion.

☐ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM.....

Kent Beers stated there was a new lease for the Logan Drivers License office. This is a new location to accommodate program growth at market rate.

DFCM entered into 26 new architect/engineering agreements during the period of May 12 to June 5, 2006. Notable agreements include the CUCF 192 Bed Expansion, USU Romney Stadium Phase 2 North End Zone Development, and the Snow College Heat Plant Boiler #3 Replacement. There were 26 construction contracts awarded for the period with the most significant being the New Park City ABC Store.

There were decreases in the amount of \$73,000 in the Contingency Fund for the USU New Merrill Library, the WSU Swenson Building Remodel, the Draper Prison Vocational Training Center, the Cedar City Courts Building HVAC Improvements and the Richfield Human Services Family Support Center Remodel.

There was an increase to the Project Reserve Fund in the amount of \$66,000.

☐ ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Manuel Torres moved to adjourn at 11:55am. The motion was seconded by Mel Sowerby and passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen