

AGENDA OF THE UTAH STATE BUILDING BOARD

Wednesday, July 6, 2005
House of Representatives Building
Room West 125
9:00am

- (Action) 1. **Approval of Minutes of May 25, 2005** Tab 1
- (Information) 2. **Capital Development Request Process and Tours** Tab 2
- (Information) 3. **Subcontractor Insurance Requirements in the General Conditions** Tab 3
- (Information) 4. **Administrative Reports** Tab 4
- University of Utah
- Utah State University
- (Action) 5. **Delegation of Agricultural Facilities Relocation Project to USU** Tab 5
- (Action) 6. **Master Plan for the Ogden/Weber ATC Campus of UCAT** Tab 6
- (Action) 7. **Master Plan for the College of Eastern Utah** Tab 7
- (Information) 8. **Administrative Reports for DFCM** Tab 8
- (Information) 9. **Other** Tab 9

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 Shannon Lofgreen 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>*



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: June 6, 2005
Subject: **Approval of Minutes of May 25, 2005**

Attached for your review and approval are the meeting minutes of the Utah State Building Board meeting held on May 25, 2005.

FKS:sl

Attachment

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

May 25, 2005

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Larry Jardine, Chair
Kerry Casaday, Vice-Chair
Steven Bankhead
Katherina Holzhauser
Manuel Torres
Cyndi Gilbert
Richard Ellis, Ex-Officio

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

F. Keith Stepan	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kenneth Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Blake Court	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Division of Facilities Construction & Management/AGO
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Representative D. Gregg Buxton	Legislature
Rick Stock	Architectural Nexus
Stanley Kane	Utah State University
Darrell Hart	Utah State University
Greg Peay	Department of Corrections
Lindsey Marek	VCBO Architecture
Scott Potter	Utah National Guard
Chris Coutts	MHTN Architects
Stacy Meyer	HFS Architects
Eric Tholen	3D/I & AIA Government Affairs
John Harrington	Siemens
Randall Funk	University of Utah
Kevin Walthers	Utah System of Higher Education
Greg Stauffer	Southern Utah University
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
Jackie McGill	Spectrum Engineers
Darin Bird	Department of Natural Resources

Miles Moretti
Barbara Bruno

Division of Wildlife Resources
Herman Miller

On Wednesday, May 25, 2005, the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting in the House of Representatives Building, Room W125, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair Larry Jardine called the meeting to order at 9:00am. He recognized Representative Gregg Buxton and thanked him for his support.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 13, 2005

Chair Jardine sought a motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 13, 2005. He indicated Brent Windley of Utah State University was inadvertently omitted from the roster and should be added.

MOTION: Kerry Casaday moved to approve the meeting minutes of April 13, 2005, pending the addition of Brent Windley to the roster. The motion was seconded by Steve Bankhead and passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO STANDARD CONTRACT DOCUMENTS (R23-1-60)

Kenneth Nye stated the Board previously reviewed a draft of the documents that was also distributed to various contractor groups and architect/engineer groups for their review and comment. The current drafts reflected the changes made after the comments were received from the professional groups which were shown in italics. A minor change occurred in the General Conditions which clarified DFCM's ability to submit claims through the dispute resolution process along with the other parties.

A document was distributed identifying changes made to the general liability insurance. The items highlighted in red with white print indicated changes since the previous distribution. The change affected the requirements by contractors for general liability insurance. DFCM initially required contractors to have \$2 million in aggregate, plus \$1 million for operations and personal injury for each occurrence. Upon further discussion with Risk Management and various insurance contracts, DFCM concluded modifications were in order. The initial proposal required an umbrella policy of \$2 million for contracts exceeding \$5 million and \$5 million for contracts exceeding \$20 million. The new proposal changed those limits to umbrella policies of \$10 million and \$25 million.

Steve Bankhead stated the values were very appropriate for general contractors, but would be a large burden for small subcontractors. He questioned the possibility of structuring ties for a more standard policy size based on the scope of work rather than require them to carry the same requirements as the prime contractor. Kenneth Nye suggested clarifying the language to identify the requirements were applicable to only the general contractor who would then negotiate terms with the subcontractors.

Alan Bachman stated the language should clarify that the general liability insurance should cover the general contractor and every tier underneath them, although the general contractor will be required to provide the certificate of insurance. DFCM is not requiring insurance certificates from subcontractors. Chair Jardine recommended the language clarify that the insurance requirement between the general contractor and the subcontractor is up to the general contractor.

Kenneth Nye stated it was the desire to adopt the documents and suggested the Board approve a provision to allow DFCM to make the minor clarification regarding subcontractors. The language would be presented at the next Board meeting for the Board's review. Alan Bachman hoped DFCM could use the document in the meantime when issuing contracts.

Kenneth Nye proceeded with the design agreement, which had also been distributed and reviewed and changes were shown in italics. Changes included a clarification of an allowance for DFCM to bring issues into the dispute resolution process.

Other changes were made to the professional liability insurance requirements based on discussions with Risk Management and an agent representing the state architects and engineers for insurance purposes. They also previously included a potential provision requiring the state to provide additional compensation to an architect if changes were made to the schematic design by DFCM after they had been approved. Upon further discussion, DFCM determined they did not wish to create a liability or a potential claim for liability for typical occurrences in the design process. The current version removes the provision in regards to the schematic phase, but retains it for the design development phase. If significant changes are made after the design development phase has been completed, compensation will be provided to the design team. If changes are required based on the responsibilities of the design team, no compensation will be granted.

Another item dealt with a procurement code requirement which is problematic in statute. It requires a standard contract clause addressing certain items to be adopted by rule. As it has been approached in the past, they have created a separate document to include the contract clauses to be incorporated into the rule. A revised document was distributed to the Board which included the provisions and agreements required by statute to be adopted by rule. This is basically selected provisions from the General Conditions and the design agreement.

DFCM also wished to change the provisions pertaining to small construction contracts and wished to make substantial changes to the document. DFCM requested deleting the Board's previous approval in order to address it in the future which will require an amendment to the administrative rule. The amendment will basically change the date of the document incorporated by reference. The statute also requires notification whenever there is a material variation from the specific contract clauses.

Kenneth Nye asked for the Board's concurrence on the contract documents and approval to the amendment of the administrative rule.

MOTION: Cyndi Gilbert moved for the Board to concur with DFCM's use of the contract documents (General Conditions and A/E agreement) with the provision that DFCM will add a sentence to clarify they are not imposing the insurance requirements on subcontractors and it will be left to the general contractors option. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Steve Bankhead moved to approve the rule change as presented. The motion was seconded by Cyndi Gilbert and passed unanimously.

ADOPTION OF DESIGN MANUAL.....

DFCM sought the approval of the Building Board for the adoption of the design manual. The lengthy process began approximately eight months ago and focused on needed changes within the design process, contracts, and the General Conditions. The design manual has been slightly reorganized through input from the AIA and the Consulting Engineers Council of Utah.

Through the process, DFCM developed a programming chapter since there was no approved standard for programming. DFCM had a process and outline they wished to standardize to aid the various approving agencies and Board in obtaining information to make informed decisions.

A design process was also included in the design manual which formalized the various steps involved in preparing the contract or design and obtaining approval. The process identifies when DFCM desires portions of the design and what should be incorporated in the drawings, specifications, calculations, and adherence to code requirements. The process discusses the approval process with respect to the Building Official and peer reviews. DFCM will accomplish peer reviews on items pertaining to ADA compliance, code compliance, and structural compliance. The document will cover the process from the beginning of schematic design through contract issuance.

The third document of the design manual covered the design requirements. DFCM has adopted the base minimum codes of the International Building Code, as well as their own requirements. The DFCM requirements are enhancements to the building codes that, as an owner, DFCM may make requirements to improve life expectancies of the building beyond the building code.

Another attachment of the design manual will also be implemented pertaining to certain agency requirements. DFCM will be working with all agencies, institutions, and Higher

Education to review their particular needs on the campuses, with their buildings or with their clientele.

The design manual interacts a great deal with the General Conditions and the design agreement and should be reviewed as one complete set of documents.

Mr. Court expressed appreciation to the community for their assistance in preparing the documents. He felt the revisions would help DFCM obtain better projects and reduce extra work being done by the design community. As new issues develop, they will need to be incorporated into the standards.

DFCM sought approval of the design manual and the ability to implement it immediately.

Chair Jardine sought additional comments from the audience.

Blake Court reiterated DFCM intended to modify the document as the need arises. A provision is included to allow DFCM to make corrections to the design manual if they find items are not in the best interest of the state.

Keith Stepan added the concept trusted the professional to provide service at a very high level. As the industry progresses, DFCM will update their processes.

MOTION: Steve Bankhead moved to approve adoption of the design manual. The motion was seconded by Kerry Casaday and passed unanimously.

Chair Jardine complimented DFCM staff for their effort in keeping the documents up to date and for making it more efficient for the betterment of the state.

☐ REVISIONS TO CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT REQUEST EVALUATION GUIDE...

Kenneth Nye expressed appreciation for the efforts of Steve Bankhead, Katherina Holzhauser and Kerry Casaday in participating as a subcommittee to develop the revised guide proposal. The subcommittee also met with representatives of agencies and institutions to obtain input on the processes.

Mr. Nye identified a point of discussion was based on tying together the Building Board's recommendations and the Board of Regent's recommendations. It was previously suggested for the Building Board to accept the prioritizations of the Regents and intersperse agency requests within the Regent's. However, the Building Board subcommittee felt they had a statutory responsibility to develop a recommendation for all capital development requests, including higher education priorities. The subcommittee recommended the Building Board continue with the developed process, and at the conclusion add a final step prior to adopting the priority list to ensure there were not any extenuating circumstances that would suggest a change in the rankings. This step would

include a comparison of rankings from the Board of Regent's to determine differences between the two boards.

Kerry Casaday stated the agencies and institutions seemed pleased with the process, but also understood the Board wished to change and improve the process. Steve Bankhead added each had input on the process before reaching the current version.

Cyndi Gilbert asked if the Board of Regent's would be inclined to adopt a process similar to the Building Board's. Keith Stepan stated adopting the similarities between the two lists was an ongoing concern. The Legislature understands the Building Board reviews the Regent's data to develop their lists and has expressed a broad acceptance of the process.

Representative Buxton stated the Board did a very good job last year, but still had concern with the weighting and the points given for existing square footage. He did not wish to force colleges to demolish buildings with significant meaning on campus in order to be granted more points for future needs.

Kevin Walthers, Utah System of Higher Education, felt the subcommittee's solution was fair. He felt some frustration could be alleviated if lists could be closer developed and the Legislature did not have to choose a list to follow.

Mr. Walthers is working on updating the Q&P process which combines qualitative priorities on the campus with quantitative calculations of space needs. He suggested the Building Board may wish to tour the various campuses with the Regent's Finance and Facility Committee and the Capital Facilities Committee in order for all to obtain a better understanding.

Katherina Holzhauser stated the process should help validate different prioritizations of higher education projects based on the different criteria. She thought presenting both process side by side would allow the Legislature to ultimately decide which values were most important.

Kevin Walthers stated the Regent's process also takes into account student growth numbers to allow new facilities. He thought it was a good bias to take care of current space. Kerry Casaday felt it justified strategic objective two, which added the scoring anchor for the requested space to be justified by demographic data.

Kenneth Nye stated one item pertaining to the weight of individual criteria included significant changes. Based on the Board's previous concerns, the subcommittee concluded to recommend objectives one, two, three, and five all receive a weight of two, and objectives four and six receive a weight of one. This essentially lessens the impact from the items previously weighted three, and balances the existing building needs and growth needs.

Cyndi Gilbert felt it was very effective to tour the various projects and it would be beneficial to tour with the Regents and Capital Facilities Committee to allow all three entities the same information to base recommendations. Kenneth Nye responded that tour schedules were being developed with the Capital Facilities Committee and the Regents would be welcome to participate if they desired.

Other significant changes included clarification of the approach for objective one for comparing the cost of repairing an existing building versus the project cost to be scored. Objective two was clarified regarding growth and the focus on shortage of space resulting from growth occurring. Objective four weighting anchors were clarified, as was how to score the objective.

Katherina Holzhauser noted agency comments during the subcommittee meeting indicated weighting the alternative funding as one was less important. The subcommittee's contention was it is still a criteria and reasoned the one weighting was because some agencies simply could not get alternative funding. Kenneth Nye stated the Legislature felt one of the best things an institution could do in vying for a project is to offer some cash of their own and ask the State to cover the difference. Cash in hand carried weight as opposed to requesting 100% from the state. Katherina Holzhauser urged agencies to attempt to obtain private funding as the Q&P process took it into account as well.

Representative Buxton suggested another weighting consideration ought to be time on the list. Some points ought to be granted for those on the list for a lengthy period of time. Kerry Casaday stated it is the Building Board's charge to develop a five year plan and many projects are repeatedly on the plan. Kenneth Nye stated some projects remained on the list due to the agency or institution struggling to obtain the political wherewithal for funding. The project may also not be critical and should not benefit if it is not needed. The Board may feel it is appropriate to give consideration to how long a project has been on the list after the scoring process.

Representative Buxton thought another key factor was the site visits. Kerry Casaday felt some projects needed to be better defined.

MOTION: Kerry Casaday moved to approve the revisions to the capital development request evaluation guide. The motion was seconded by Cyndi Gilbert and passed unanimously.

Kenneth Nye referred to the UCAT lease purchase option created in statute this last session and the difficulty with how to approach it. Although this would occur infrequently, Mr. Nye suggested individuals within UCAT considering pursuing this type of project should submit a request in the regular state funded format. Once it is presented, the Building Board can evaluate it and determine how it best fits in the priority list or on the other funds list.

RECENT LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

The Legislature met in a special session on April 19 and 20 and discussed the authorization of a general obligation bond to apply \$4.5 million towards a Veterans Nursing Home in Ogden. It requires the Guard to be able to certify they received the federal matching funds before the bond can be issued. They are currently waiting for the federal funds to come through.

Representative Buxton was one of the driving forces behind this project. He stated they have two attempts to obtain the money this year and next year and then they will have to begin the process again. It will be a state owned building and will be treated as any other state funded project.

DFCM has also been working with the Legislative Fiscal Analyst on preparing a report for the Executive Appropriations Committee. Mr. Nye will distribute copies of the report to the Board once it is approved and official. The report looks at the performance of DFCM on time and cost for construction projects, as well as looking ahead to those projects recently approved. Some analysis of leasing statewide is also included in the report.

Keith Stepan referred to the meeting of the Government Operations Interim Committee where the Department of Administrative Services was asked to report on all DAS divisions. DFCM had a separate agenda item to report on the progress of DFCM and the Building Board. The report covered the five year book, as well as the process of developing the priority list. They also specified how projects are funded, how DFCM is funded, and how other fund projects are funded.

Keith Stepan reminded the Board that the Bourne Building was also funded in an interim committee session. DFCM now has the title to the building and the building is in use.

There was also groundbreaking on the Davis ATC Entrepreneurial Building and the project is underway.

Kenneth Nye recalled the Legislature funded \$150,000 to DFCM to perform a feasibility study for relocating the Draper Prison. The State is currently in the process of selecting a consultant for that effort. The consultant will receive \$140,000 and \$10,000 is being held to cover administrative costs.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Randall Funk, University of Utah, excused Mike Perez and referred to the quarterly administrative report for the period from March 25 to May 6, 2005. Awarded for the period were seven new design agreements, three remodeling contracts, and five completed projects.

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

Darrell Hart, Utah State University, provided the quarterly administrative report for the period of March 23 to May 4, 2005. There were three new professional contracts and three new construction contracts. There were approximately 45 delegated projects, of which 40% were either complete or substantially complete.

MOTION: Cyndi Gilbert moved to approve the administrative report of Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Steve Bankhead and passed unanimously.

☐ PROGRAMMING OF UVSC DIGITAL LEARNING CENTER

UVSC requested for the Building Board to grant authorization to proceed with the programming of the Digital Learning Center, which has been their request for the last two years. They wish to proceed with the programming in anticipation of receiving funding in the future. They were previously ranked fifth by the Building Board, and also received tremendous support from the Legislature for next year. UVSC will use their own funds to advance the project in hopes to be reimbursed when the project is appropriated and funded. The programming will cost approximately \$50,000-\$100,000 and the programmer would be chosen through the VBS process. DFCM recommended the Board grant authorization to proceed with the programming phase of the project.

Val Peterson, Vice President of UVSC College Relations, stated their intention is to get the programming phase completed in anticipation to begin construction when funding is received. The programming will help them identify those necessary spaces in the building needed to support the campus.

Steve Bankhead expressed concern with the building not addressing the immediate growth needs at UVSC and hoped it would be taken into consideration. Mr. Peterson assured Mr. Bankhead they would guarantee the building was large enough for future anticipated growth of campus.

Representative Buxton asked if a precedence was being set by authorizing programming funds prior to being funded. Kenneth Nye responded this was a common occurrence and legislators frequently question if the planning is done when considering projects. This process does not create any design documents and creates only an architectural program.

Cyndi Gilbert questioned how programming funding would be reimbursed if UVSC was not approved next year. Keith Stepan responded that programming is established for a good length of time and the document will facilitate their proposal for a few years if needed.

MOTION: Kerry Casaday moved to approve programming for the Utah Valley State College Digital Learning Center. The motion was seconded by Steve Bankhead and passed unanimously.

☐ MIDWAY FISH HATCHERY DESIGN AUTHORIZATION.....

Darin Bird, Deputy Director of Department of Natural Resources, and Miles Moretti, Deputy Director of Division of Wildlife Resources, were present to discuss the Midway Fish Hatchery. Mr. Bird reported the Springville Fish Hatchery was closed in the last month due to whirling disease. This is the third hatchery closed down in the last five years because of whirling disease.

While they could appreciate the Legislature's concern to allow agencies to begin planning prior to receiving appropriated money, they hoped to begin planning in order to begin construction if money became available. This would be DNR's highest priority in the upcoming Legislative session.

Mr. Moretti added that DWR owns ten fish hatcheries throughout the state and fishing provides a huge economic asset. Two hatcheries have been rebuilt at Kamas and Fountain Green and they are in the process of rebuilding White Rock with Central Utah Mitigation Committee money.

Keith Stepan mentioned \$1.6 million had already been received for the \$8 million project. DWR will request \$4.8 million at the next legislative session, and another \$1.6 million would come from their annual appropriated monies. The design fees will cost approximately \$400,000 - \$500,000 and the previous appropriation could cover the design costs if they did not receive funding. DFCM recommended approval to the Board for their consideration.

Cyndi Gilbert inquired about yearly revenues in good water years. Mr. Bird responded the license fees generate over \$10 million, and federal tax money aids in program funding. The fishing economy generates \$300 - \$400 million a year.

Steve Bankhead asked how the Midway Hatchery would impact the shortfall caused by whirling disease. Mr. Bird responded that Midway would be able to produce 225,000 pounds of fish, which is a significant part of the hatchery production. Springville contributed 147,000 pounds of fish annually when it was open. There is currently 845,000 pounds of fish raised each year, and Midway would increase the count to one million pounds. This would represent 25% of the state's capacity.

MOTION: Cyndi Gilbert moved approval of the design phase of the Midway Fish Hatchery. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM

Keith Stepan referred to a summary of the lease report and highlighted the Health Care Financing renewal which was at market rate. There was a space decrease due to the moving of a staff member to a state owned facility. The Human Services Recovery Services also had a renewal of space at market rate plus carpet and paint at site. They have been at this site for 10 years.

DFCM is currently working with Davis County for the County to build a building for the Tax Commission Farmington Motor Vehicle program. This long-term lease will be presented to the Board as soon as Davis County and the State agree to the location and lease rate.

The DWS Murray Facility had an expensive build-out as a phone center. The market rate of the lease increased substantially due to development in the surrounding area. This was exasperated by the short term of the renewal.

The architectural/engineering agreements report indicated 19 new agreements issued during the period. There were 25 construction contracts awarded.

DFCM has also made a real effort over the last two years to close contracts. The report of open contracts was included. There were 155 open contracts and 45 projects were closed during the period.

Steve Bankhead asked when the suggestions on VBS selection committees would be implemented. Keith Stepan responded DFCM would begin training with program directors shortly to enable them to run their selection committees better. Kenneth Nye has been working on the training and intends to focus on the implementation beginning next fiscal year.

OTHER.....

Katherina Holzhauser stated one criteria of the Building Board is to provide the facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives. She asked for a summary of initiatives of the state when reviewing projects.

Cyndi Gilbert asked if the Board could receive pertinent news articles pertaining to the Board and the programs and initiatives of the State.

Keith Stepan stated DFCM recently initiated a process to track state owned buildings being demolished. Three buildings were recently demolished including the White Rocks State Fish Hatchery Maintenance Building, East Canyon State Park, and the Division of Child and Family Services Building in Ogden.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 6, 2005, at 9:00am in the House of Representatives Building, Room W125.

ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Katherina Holzhauser moved to adjourn at 10:59am. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Capital Development Request Process and Tours**

DFCM will review with the Board the steps and timelines for the review and prioritization of capital development projects this year. The instructions that were issued to agencies and institutions are attached.

At the August board meeting, DFCM will provide a list of state-funded requests that will be submitted. The requests from the agencies and institutions along with DFCM's analysis and suggested scoring will be distributed to the Board on September 20. This will provide the Board with two weeks to review the information prior to the presentations of state-funded requests on October 5. The Board will then meet on October 20 to determine its' recommended priorities and to consider Other Fund requests.

At the time this memo was issued, DFCM was working with the Legislative Fiscal Analyst to develop a proposal for joint tours with the Building Board and the Capital Facilities Subcommittee. This proposal will be discussed at the meeting and board members may be contacted prior to then regarding their availability.

FKS:KEN:sl

Attachments



State of Utah

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

Department of Administrative Services

D'ARCY DIXON PIGNANELLI
Executive Director

Division of Facilities Construction and Management

F. KEITH STEPAN
Director

To: Agencies and Institutions
From: Ken Nye, Deputy Director
Date: June 22, 2005
Subject: Capital Development Request Process and Schedule

It is time to begin another cycle of capital development budget requests. Last year, the Building Board initiated a substantial change in the process used in evaluating requests for state funds. Some modifications to the Board's Evaluation Guide were adopted by the Board on May 25, 2005. These changes primarily affected the weights of the various objectives and the scoring anchors for objectives 1, 2, and 4.

The Board's Evaluation Guide was well received last year as it provides a greater degree of structure to the evaluation of requests. It also resulted in a significant improvement in the quality and consistency of information submitted with requests. The Guide results in a mathematical score that indicates how well a requested project aligns with the objectives identified by the Board.

The attached standard formats for capital development requests have been revised primarily to address concerns raised by the Legislature regarding the completeness and consistency of information submitted. Please review the italicized instructions on the forms to ensure that you provide the necessary information.

The Board has asked that each agency or institution suggest a scoring for its project and provide justification for its suggested score. The Board also asked DFCM to evaluate the information provided and perform its own analysis to arrive at its suggested scores. Both of these documents will then be provided to the Board members for their consideration. The Board anticipates arriving at a final score following the presentations that are scheduled for October 5. These scores will provide a starting point for the Board in arriving at its recommended priority list.

Due to the limited amount of funding that is expected to be available, we request that departments, colleges, and universities submit only one state-funded capital development request for consideration for funding this budget cycle. This limitation does not apply to requests for land purchases. Additional projects to be considered in the future should be noted on the Five-Year Plan as noted below. Please contact me if you believe that you have unique circumstances that warrant consideration of more than one project this year.

The Building Board may tour some of the projects submitted for consideration in FY07. The Capital Facilities legislative committee may participate in these tours.

One of our project directors will work with you in developing your project requests. If you do not know who to work with, please contact Blake Court at 538-3281 or bcourt@utah.gov. If you have any other questions, you can contact me at 538-3284 or by email at knye@utah.gov. The timetable of activities is outlined below.

July 22, 2005 – By this date, submit an email to knye@utah.gov identifying any state-funded capital development requests being pursued this funding cycle. This will allow us to inform the Building Board of the projects being pursued and ensure that we have one of our staff working with you on your request. The project being requested may be changed after this date but a change may place your request at a disadvantage in the evaluation process.

August 10, 2005 – Deadline for submitting the following:

1. FY07 State-Funded Capital Development Requests. Please use the attached format for state-funded requests. A detailed request is not required for projects for which funding is not being requested in FY07. These future requests should be identified on the Five-Year Plan as noted below.
2. Agency/Institution Five-Year Plan. Identify state-funded projects that are anticipated to be requested in the upcoming five years. For each project, provide a description of the project and estimates of the square footage and total cost. Identify any anticipated alternative funding sources.
3. FY07 Other Funds Requests. These are projects for which authorization will be requested in the 2006 legislative session. Please use the attached format for Other Funds requests.

August 31, 2005 – Deadline for resolving the scope and budget estimate of both state funded and non-state funded requests. This resolution will be led by DFCM's project director.

September 20, 2005 – DFCM distributes materials to the Building Board for its review prior to the presentations. This will include the requests submitted by agencies and institutions (including their suggested scoring and justification) along with DFCM's suggested scoring and analysis.

October 5, 2005 – Presentations to the Building Board for state-funded capital development requests. Additional details will be provided at a later date.

October 20, 2005 – Building Board sets priorities for its capital development recommendations that will be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature. Presentations to the Building Board for Other Funds capital development requests.

In order to facilitate review, we emphasize that the requests should be prepared in a concise manner while addressing the requirements identified on the standard formats. It is generally expected that requests will not exceed eight pages for state-funded requests and five pages for other-funds requests, not counting any attached demographic information or graphics. Please submit this information by email to knye@utah.gov.

Thank you for your assistance in developing the State's Capital Budget.

Building Board
Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide
 Approved May 25, 2005

	Strategic Objectives	Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Scoring Anchors
1	Address life safety and other deficiencies in existing assets through renewal and replacement	Does the project address documented code and condition deficiencies? For life safety deficiencies, what is the potential impact and probability of occurrence?	2	5 = cost of deficiencies exceeds 85% of total project cost related to existing facility 3 = cost of deficiencies between 45% and 65% of project cost related to existing facility 1 = cost of deficiencies is less than 25% of project cost related to existing facility 0 = project does not address an existing facility -and- ↑ or ↑↑ if substantial threat to life and property based on relative degree of threat and the probability of occurrence
2	Address essential program growth requirements	To what degree is the request driven by documented growth and shortage of space and is the amount of space requested justified by demographic data?	2	5 = request is driven by a substantial space shortage and the requested space is well supported by demographics for existing demand plus a reasonable allowance for future growth for the essential program 3 = requested space is supported by demographics for existing demand and growth 1 = requested space significantly exceeds the level justified by demographics or no demographics are provided 0 = project does not result in an increase in space
3	Cost effective solutions	Does the project reflect a cost effective solution appropriate to the facility need? Is this a “bargain” with a limited window of opportunity?	2	5 = Alternative approach that is substantially less costly to the State in the long term than a standard approach 3 = Cost effective solution appropriate to the facility 0 = More costly than is appropriate for the facility need -then- ↑ if this is a bargain opportunity that requires immediate action or it will be lost
4	Improve program effectiveness and/or capacity	To what degree does the project improve program effectiveness or increase program capacity other than the simple addition of space?	1	5 = substantial improvement in program effectiveness and increase in capacity 3 = moderate improvement in program effectiveness and/or increase in capacity 1 = minimal improvement in program effectiveness or increase in capacity
5	Provide facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives	Is the project required to support a critical state program or initiative?	2	5 = project is required for an essential state program or initiative to operate 3 = project is needed to support an important state program 1 = project enhances a less critical state program
6	Take advantage of alternative funding opportunities for needed facilities	What portion of the total project cost is covered by alternative funds?	1	5 = more than 60% 3 = between 20% and 40% 1 = no alternative funding is available for this program -then- ↑ if alternative funding (excluding donations) requires state funding this budget cycle

1. Scoring is on a scale of 0 to 5 using whole numbers only with the scoring anchors identifying specific points on this scale.
2. ↑ indicates that one point may be added for the condition indicated. This adjustment will not be made if it would cause the score to be greater than 5.
3. The scores for each criterion are multiplied by the weighting factor and summed to arrive at a total score.
4. Please see the attached additional information and instructions.

Building Board
Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide
Additional Information/Instructions

The following additional information and instructions are provided to aid in the application of the evaluation guide. The strategic objectives are broad objectives of the State as a whole that were identified by the Building Board as having an impact on facility needs. The criteria interpret each objective and identify the discriminating factor that differentiates the degree to which each request satisfies the strategic objective. The scoring anchors define specific points on the range of possible scores to facilitate consistent application. A project's score is determined by multiplying the score for each objective by the applicable weighting factor. These amounts are then summed to arrive at the total score. The total score indicates how well the project meets the objectives as a whole.

Clarification of how each objective should be scored is provided below.

Objective 1 – Address life safety and other deficiencies in existing assets through renewal and replacement

This objective measures the degree to which a project takes care of deficiencies in existing state-owned facilities. The measurement utilizes the information obtained through DFCM's facility condition assessment program. In consultation with DFCM, this may be supplemented by information obtained through other sources such as additional engineering studies or professional staff analysis.

This measurement is calculated by dividing the cost of correcting deficiencies by the portion of the total project budget that relates to the existing facility. The only deficiencies considered in this calculation are those that will be resolved directly through the requested project. This objective addresses basic deficiencies in the building and its systems. The cost of correcting programmatic deficiencies is not considered in this objective but is addressed in objective 4. An example of a programmatic deficiency is a space reconfiguration that is desired to improve space utilization or program effectiveness.

Additional points may be awarded based on the potential impact of life safety deficiencies and their probability of occurrence as noted in the scoring anchors. If the project addresses both existing space as well as an increase in space, the score resulting from the above calculation will be adjusted as explained below.

Objective 2 – Address essential program growth requirements

This objective evaluates the degree to which the requested increase in state-owned space is driven by documented growth and shortage of space as well as the degree to which the amount of requested space is supported by demographic information. Due to the wide variety in types of requests submitted, it is anticipated that the requesting agency or institution will identify the most appropriate demographic data to support its request. The validity and completeness of the demographic support will be considered in evaluating the

requested scope. In developing its suggested score, DFCM may obtain and consider additional demographic data beyond that which is submitted with the request. If the project addresses both existing space as well as an increase in space, the score resulting from the above calculation will need to be adjusted as explained below.

Objectives 1 and 2 Scoring Adjustment

For projects that involve both an increase in space and the renovation or replacement of existing state-owned space, the scores for objectives 1 and 2 must be reduced by the same proportion as the project cost associated with the existing facility or the increase in space, as applicable, is to the total project cost.

The following example is provided to demonstrate this calculation. Assume that 80% of a requested project replaces an existing facility and 20% of the project creates an increase in space beyond that contained in an existing facility. Assume further that substantial problems are documented in the existing building that is being replaced that are sufficient to justify a score of 5. This score would then be reduced to a final score of 4.0 through the following calculation: $5 * 0.8 = 4$. Assume also that the criteria for Objective 2 justify a score of 4. This score would then be reduced to a final score of 0.8 through the following calculation: $4 * 0.2 = 0.8$. The results of these adjustments should be rounded to one decimal place.

Objective 3 – Cost effective solutions

This objective measures the cost effectiveness of the request. It is expected that most projects will receive a score of “3”. Windows of opportunity will be evaluated to assure their validity.

Objective 4 – Improve program effectiveness and/or capacity

This objective addresses the degree to which a project improves the effectiveness or capacity of a program. Capacity increases will be evaluated based on quantity of service that can be provided in a given amount of space. Capacity increases that are only the result of an increase in space will not be considered.

Objective 5 – Provide facilities necessary to support critical programs and initiatives

This objective seeks to measure the degree to which a request supports critical programs or initiatives. It is not addressing the level of support for a specific project. The scoring anchors address the criticality of the program or initiative and the degree to which the project is required in order for that program or initiative to operate.

Objective 6 – Take advantage of alternative funding opportunities for needed facilities

This objective addresses the degree to which alternative funding reduces the funding impact on the state. A bonus point may be awarded for alternative funding (other than donations) that has a timing constraint requiring that state funds be provided in the current budget cycle.

**Capital Development Project
State Funded Request
FY2007**

(Note: In order to facilitate brevity, instructions in italics should be deleted in the submitted document.)

Agency/Institution: _____

Project Name: _____

Agency/Institution Priority: _____

Preliminary Cost Estimate: \$ _____
(Your DFCM project director will work with you to develop the final budget request.)

Total Project Space (Gross Square Feet) _____

New Space (Gross Square Feet) _____
Remodeled Space (GSF) _____
Space to be Demolished (GSF) _____

Increase in State Funded O&M \$ _____

(Estimate the amount of state funds, if any, that will be requested in the current or future budget cycles that is beyond the current budget levels for state funded O&M. Explain how this amount was determined below. If O&M funding is to come from another source, please explain the funding source below. For institutions of higher education, this amount will be based on the O&M funding formula that was approved by the Building Board and the Board of Regents. Institutions should estimate the O&M amount which will then be updated by DFCM to reflect the final capital development budget request.)

New Program Costs \$ _____

(Estimate the cost of new or expanded programs and services that will result if the project is funded and provide a brief description of the additional program costs and anticipated funding sources below. This should include any operating budget increase that will be required, other than O&M, in order to operate the programs that will be housed in the requested facility. If this request will make existing state space available for alternative uses, the above estimate should also include the estimated cost of new or expanded programs and services that will be housed in this vacated space.)

New FTEs Required for O&M _____

New FTEs Required for Programs _____

(Provide a separate estimate of the number of new employees that will be required for O&M and for program purposes if the project is funded. Provide a brief description below; i.e., staff for new or expanded programs or to maintain the facility. This includes any FTE that will be paid for from Increased O&M Funding or New Program Costs noted above.)

Other Sources of Funding \$ _____

(Identify other sources of funding such as donations, federal grants, and debt and indicate whether that funding is in hand. If debt is proposed for the project, identify the funding source for its repayment.)

Previous State Funding \$ _____

(Identify state funding previously provided for this project; i.e., planning, land purchase, etc.)

Existing Facility:

(How is the existing program housed? Why is the existing facility not able to meet your needs? What is the proposed use or disposition of the existing facility if your request is funded?)

Project Description:

(Describe the project. Identify areas of new construction versus remodeling as well as any existing facilities to be demolished. Document the programs and services to be offered in the proposed facility. Estimate any increase in program capacity that will result if this request is funded, i.e. number of FTE students taught, prisoners housed, court cases handled, etc. Discuss unique design requirements and program requirements. If the project involves the acquisition of an existing facility, indicate whether an independent appraisal has been obtained and the results of that appraisal.)

Planning/Programming:

(Describe the level of planning and programming that has been completed for the project.)

Site and Infrastructure:

(Estimate the size of site required for the project. If a site has been identified, document its location, size, ownership, and unique characteristics. If the site is not owned by the state, address the availability and cost of purchasing the site and the results of any appraisals that have been performed. Agencies should work with DFCM's real estate staff in addressing potential purchases. Identify any requirements to provide access to the site or to provide for parking. If the site is on an existing campus, address the capacity of the existing campus infrastructure to service the utility needs of the facility. If the site is not on an existing campus, address the degree to which utilities are available to the site.)

Scoring Analysis for Building Board Request Evaluation Guide:

Please provide the following self-scoring and justification to aid the Building Board and DFCM in applying the attached Capital Development Request Evaluation Guide. Provide a base score on a scale of 0 to 5, identifying proposed bonus points but without applying the weights or adjustments provided for in the guide. The proposed score for each objective should be justified per the description provided for that objective.

1. Existing Building Deficiencies and Life Safety Concerns. Suggested Score ____
(If the request involves the renovation or replacement of an existing state owned facility, provide a summary (one page maximum) of critical life safety and other deficiencies in the existing facility. Address the potential impact and probability of occurrence of life safety

deficiencies. Coordinate with assigned DFCM staff to identify the extent to which the project addresses documented deficiencies in the existing facility.)

2. Essential Program Growth Requirements. Suggested Score ____
(Summarize demographic data which justifies the scope of the project including any increased space requested. Document the extent of any existing shortages of space. Attach the source data unless it is generally available, in which case a reference to the source data may be provided. Examples of demographic data that may be used include workload, enrollment, and population changes.)

3. Cost Effectiveness. Suggested Score ____
(Address the expected level of quality and extent of aesthetic/monumental features in light of the purpose and nature of the requested project. If an alternative approach is being suggested that is less costly than a standard approach, demonstrate the immediate and long term savings of the alternative approach. Demonstrate any time constraints associated with the alternative approach.)

4. Improved Program Effectiveness and/or Capacity. Suggested Score ____
(Demonstrate how the requested project will improve the effectiveness and/or capacity of the associated program(s) and thereby improve the delivery of services.)

5. Support to Critical State Programs and Initiatives. Suggested Score ____
(Justify your suggested score by demonstrating the criticality of the program or initiative that will be supported by the requested project. Demonstrate how the requested project is required to support the program or initiative.)

6. Alternative Funding Sources. Suggested Score ____
(Document, by category, the amount of alternative funding that is in hand, the amount for which enforceable commitments have been obtained, and any additional amount for which alternative funding is being sought. With the exception of donations, identify any timing constraints associated with the alternative funding.)

Photographs and Maps:

(Photographs and other graphics justifying the project and/or maps showing where the facility will be located are requested to be submitted in electronic format if possible. These should help explain the project and justify why it should be funded.)

**Capital Development Project
Other Funds Request
FY2007**

(Note: In order to facilitate brevity, instructions in italics should be deleted in the submitted document.)

Agency/Institution: _____

Project Name: _____

Preliminary Cost Estimate: \$ _____
(Your DFCM project director will work with you to develop the final budget request.)

Total Project Space (Gross Square Feet) _____

New Space (Gross Square Feet) _____
Remodeled Space (GSF) _____
Space to be Demolished (GSF) _____

Increase in State Funded O&M \$ _____

(Estimate the amount of state funds, if any, that will be requested in the current or future budget cycles that is beyond the current budget levels for state funded O&M. Explain how this amount was determined below. If O&M funding is to come from another source, please explain the funding source below. For institutions of higher education, this amount will be based on the O&M funding formula that was approved by the Building Board and the Board of Regents. Institutions should estimate the O&M amount which will then be updated by DFCM to reflect the final capital development budget request.)

New Program Costs \$ _____

(Estimate the cost of new or expanded programs and services that will result if the project is funded and provide a brief description of the additional program costs and anticipated funding sources below. This should include any operating budget increase that will be required, other than O&M, in order to operate the programs that will be housed in the requested facility. If this request will make existing state space available for alternative uses, the above estimate should also include the estimated cost of new or expanded programs and services that will be housed in this vacated space.)

New FTEs Required for O&M _____

New FTEs Required for Programs _____

(Provide a separate estimate of the number of new employees that will be required for O&M and for program purposes if the project is funded. Provide a brief description below; i.e., staff for new or expanded programs or to maintain the facility. This includes any FTE that will be paid for from Increased O&M Funding or New Program Costs noted above.)

Sources of Funding \$ _____

(Identify the sources of funding such as donations, federal grants, and debt and indicate whether that

funding is in hand. If debt is proposed for the project, identify the funding source for its repayment.)

Existing Facility:

(How is the existing program housed? Why is the existing facility not able to meet your needs? What is the proposed use or disposition of the existing facility if your request is funded?)

Project Description:

(Describe the project. Identify areas of new construction versus remodeling as well as any existing facilities to be demolished. Document the programs and services to be offered in the proposed facility. Estimate any increase in program capacity that will result if this request is funded, i.e. number of FTE students taught, prisoners housed, court cases handled, etc. Discuss unique design requirements and program requirements. If the project involves the acquisition of an existing facility, indicate whether an independent appraisal has been obtained and the results of that appraisal.)

Planning/Programming:

(Describe the level of planning and programming that has been completed for the project.)

Site and Infrastructure:

(Estimate the size of site required for the project. If a site has been identified, document its location, size, ownership, and unique characteristics. If the site is not owned by the state, address the availability and cost of purchasing the site and the results of any appraisals that have been performed. Agencies should work with DFCM's real estate staff in addressing potential purchases. Identify any requirements to provide access to the site or to provide for parking. If the site is on an existing campus, address the capacity of the existing campus infrastructure to service the utility needs of the facility. If the site is not on an existing campus, address the degree to which utilities are available to the site.)

Justification:

(Document the need for and economic viability of the project. The following should be addressed in your analysis where applicable:

- *How does the project help you fulfill your mission and the objectives of the programs and services to be included in the project.*
- *Document current demand for these programs and services.*
- *Estimate growth in these programs and services and the space needed for that growth.*
- *Document how the new facility relates to other facilities and fits into your facility master plan.*
- *Document the problems the project will solve.*
- *Describe in detail why the project is needed---why is the proposed project the correct solution)*

Photographs and Maps:

(Photographs and other graphics justifying the project and/or maps showing where the facility will be located are requested to be submitted in electronic format if possible. These should help explain the project and justify why it should be funded.)



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Subcontractor Insurance Requirements in the General Conditions**

At the last meeting, when the Board approved the revisions that had been proposed to DFCM's General Conditions, a concern was raised regarding how the insurance requirements applied to subcontractors. DFCM was asked to clarify the wording and report back to the Board at the next meeting. In response to this concern, the following provision was added to the insurance section of the General Conditions.

"(5) Unless otherwise provided by the procurement documents, the insurance requirements in 10.1.1(1) through (4) above do not apply to subcontractors or suppliers at any tier under the Contractor and any insurance requirements of subcontractors and suppliers at any tier is a matter between the General Contractors and such subcontractor or supplier."

While reviewing the General Conditions for the above issue, DFCM noted that the wording of another section required the general contractor to incorporate all terms of the contract documents into its contracts with subcontractors. Since a number of provisions do not apply to subcontractors, the following clarification was added. The language added after the Board meeting is underlined.

"5.2.1 Comply with Contract Documents. By appropriate enforceable agreement and to the extent it can be practically applied, the Contractor shall require each Subcontractor to be bound to the Contractor by the terms of the Contract Documents, and to assume toward the Contractor all the obligations and responsibilities which the Contractor, by these Documents, assumes towards the DFCM and A/E."

FKS:KEN:sll



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Administrative Reports for University of Utah and Utah State University**

Attached for your review and approval are the administrative reports for the University of Utah and Utah State University.

FKS:sl

Attachment



June 17, 2005

Mr. Keith Stepan
Division of Facilities Construction
and Management
4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Reference: Delegated Projects Report for the Meeting of July 6, 2005

Dear Keith:

The status report of delegated projects to the University of Utah is enclosed for the Utah State Building Board.

Please call me at 581-4493 if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Randall Funk
Interim Director, Campus Design & Construction

Enclosures

c: Mike Perez



MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: Randall Funk
Date: June 17, 2005
Subject: Administrative Reports for University of Utah

The following is a summary of the administrative reports for the University of Utah:

Architect/Engineering Agreements Awarded (Page 1)

Two (2) new Design Agreements, and one (1) Study Agreement.

Construction Contracts Awarded (Page 2)

Six (6) Remodeling contracts awarded this month, and two (2) Site Improvement contracts.

Report of Contingency Reserve Fund (Page 3)

No activity or changes since last report.

Report of Project Reserve Fund Activity (Page 4)

No activity or changes since last report.

Attachments

**University of Utah
 Architect/Engineer Agreements
 Awarded From May 6, 2005 to June 17, 2005**

Design					
Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
0035-12647	Marcia & John Price Museum Building - UMFA Storage Racks	ARW Engineers, P.C.	\$100,000	\$1,350	Award Date 13 June 2005
0017-12534	Performing Arts Building Electrical Power Upgrade	James D. Graham & Associates	\$110,000	\$10,200	Award Date 13 June 2005
Programming					
Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
Study					
Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
0877-12626	Building 420 Chipeta Way Health Sciences Renovation Cost Study	FFKR Architects	\$1,300,000	\$8,500	Award Date 10 May 2005

**University of Utah
Construction Contracts
Awarded From May 6, 2005 to June 17, 2004**

Construction - New Space

Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Design Firm	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
-------------	--------------	-----------	-------------	----------------	-----------------	----------

Construction - Remodeling

Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Design Firm	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
-------------	--------------	-----------	-------------	----------------	-----------------	----------

0053-12605	A. Ray Olpin Union Panorama West Carpet Light & Wall Covering Renovation	Mark Hamilton Construction Company	Gould Evans Associates, L.C.	\$176,902	\$107,780	Award Date 17 May 2005
------------	---	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	------------------------

0210-12550	Dee Glen Smith Athletic Center-Remodel Football Team Locker Room	Archer Construction, Inc.	Gould Evans Associates, L.C.	\$400,000	\$193,325	Award Date 23 May 2005
------------	--	---------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	------------------------

0007-12156	Life Science Building Third Floor Remodel	Brubaker Construction, Inc.	Smith Hyatt Architects P.C.	\$540,175	\$484,558	Award Date 01 June 2005
------------	--	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------

0054-12231	Orson Spencer Hall Hinckley Caucus Room 255 Remodel	Archer Construction, Inc.	Gould Evans Associates, L.C.	\$110,032	\$99,000	Award Date 06 June 2005
------------	---	---------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	----------	-------------------------

0602-12554	Building 602 Fort Douglas Renovation	Brubaker Construction, Inc.	Smith Hyatt Architects, P.C.	\$278,459	\$258,000	Award Date 09 June 2005
------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------

0652-12403	Building 652 Fort Douglas Renovation	Brubaker Construction, Inc.	Smith Hyatt Architects, P.C.	\$179,000	\$163,000	Award Date 09 June 2005
------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------

Construction - Site Improvement

Project No.	Project Name	Firm Name	Design Firm	Project Budget	Contract Amount	Comments
-------------	--------------	-----------	-------------	----------------	-----------------	----------

8842-12155	East Ballfield Women's Soccer Lighting	Okland Construction Company	AJC Architects, P.C.	\$397,500	\$319,196	Award Date 23 May 2005
------------	---	--------------------------------	----------------------	-----------	-----------	------------------------

0700-12356	East Village Parking Lot Repairs	Kilgore Paving and Maintenance	Bingham Engineering, Inc.	\$414,500	\$309,850	Award Date 01 June 2005
------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------------

University Of Utah
Report Of Contingency Reserve Fund Activity
For the Period of May 6, 2005 to June 17, 2005

PROJ. NO.	DESCRIPTION	CURRENT TRANSFERS	TOTALS TRANSFERS FROM CONTINGENCY	% TO CONSTR. BUDGET	PROJECT STATUS
	BEGINNING BALANCE INCREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND DECREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND NEW CONSTRUCTION REMODELING PLANNING / OTHER ENDING BALANCE 01-00341-7000-05107	998,414.90 998,414.90			

University Of Utah
Report Of Project Reserve Fund Activity
For the Period of May 6, 2005 to June 17, 2005

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	TRANSFER AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION FOR CONTINGENCY TRANSFER	% OF CONSTR. BUDGET
	BEGINNING BALANCE INCREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND: DECREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND:	141,120.88		

CURRENT BALANCE OF PROJECT RESERVE: 141,120.88



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
FOR FINANCE AND BUSINESS
1445 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-1445
(435) 797-1146
FAX: (435) 797-0710

15 June 2005

F. Keith Stepan, Director
Division of Facilities Construction
and Management
4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Dear Keith:

SUBJECT: USU Administrative Reports for 6 July 2005 Building Board Meeting

The following is a summary of the administrative reports for USU for the period 05/04/05 to 06/15/05:

Professional Contracts, 5 contracts issued (Page 1)

Four professional contracts were issued for design/engineering services. One miscellaneous contract was issued for testing/inspection services.

Construction Contracts, 3 contracts issued (Page 2)

Item 1, HPER Upgrades - This project includes HVAC, fire alarm system, lock, and flooring upgrades. The HVAC upgrade has been completed, and this contract is for the fire alarm system portion. Because the contract amount exceeds the budget for this portion, it will decrease the amount available for locks and flooring upgrades. We will do as much as possible with the remaining funds.

Item 3, Recital Hall - Ann Preston has been retained as a commissioned artist to fabricate and install an original work of art in the Recital Hall. The artwork consists of a wall of mathematically derived tetrahedra sculpture. The design will extend to the lobby floor and plaza. Ms. Preston will work closely with the contractor during the installation.

Report of Contingency Reserve Fund (Page 3)

Utah State University was allocated \$5,265,000 for FY06 capital improvement projects. Fifteen delegated projects, excluding paving, total \$4,180,000. An amount of \$256,001 has been added to the university contingency for the delegated projects. This amount represents an overall 7.28% of the combined construction budgets.

Report of Project Reserve Fund Activity (Page 4)

The Lund Hall Chiller Replacement project is completed. An amount of \$7,600 has been added to the Reserve Fund to close the project.

F. Keith Stepan, Director
15 June 2005
Page 2

Current Delegated Projects List (Pages 5-6)

The FY06 capital improvement projects not previously reported have been added bringing the total projects listed to 60.

Representatives from Utah State University will attend the Building Board meeting to address any questions the Board may have.

Sincerely,



Kevin C. Womack
Associate Vice President for
Business and Finance

KCW/jm

c: Darrell E. Hart
Stanley G. Kane



Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance
1445 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-1445

Professional Contracts Awarded From 05/04/05 to 06/15/05

Contract Name	Firm Name	Budget	Fee Amount	Comments
1 SER Chiller/Steam/Condensate Replacement	The RMH Group	\$30,830.00	\$30,830.00	
2 Education Building Chiller Replacement	Spectrum Engineers	\$12,675.00	\$12,675.00	
3 Carousel Square Remodel	Beazer Engineering	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	Exhaust hoods upgrade electrical engineering services
4 Brigham City Campus Remodel	Beazer Engineering	\$7,045.00	\$7,045.00	Electrical engineering services
MISCELLANEOUS CONTRACTS				
5 Technical Support Services Renovation	CMT Engineering Laboratories		\$1,898.00	Testing/Inspections
Total		\$60,550.00	\$62,448.00	

Construction Contracts Awarded From 05/04/05 to 06/15/05

Project	Firm Name	Design Firm	Const Budget	Contract Amt	Comments
1 HPER Upgrades	Taylor Electric	Spectrum Engineers	\$180,000.00	\$251,000.00	Amount available for flooring/locks will be decreased
2 Museum Chiller Connection/ Air Handler	Bailey Construction	Spectrum Engineers	\$171,600.00	\$172,465.00	
MISCELLANEOUS CONTRACTS					
3 Recital Hall	Ann Preston	Sasaki Associates		\$337,500.00	Commissioned artist for integrated artwork
4 Carousel Square Remodel	Restaurant & Store Equipment	Porter Consulting		\$119,874.00	Exhaust hoods with ventilation systems
5 Inside Wiring Phase I	Cache Valley Electric	USU Facilities Planning and Design		\$49,886.62	Install Cat 6 materials at Innovation Campus
6 Museum Chiller Connection/ Air Handler	Mechanical Products Intermountain	Spectrum Engineers		\$46,986.00	Equipment only
7 Museum Chiller Connection/ Air Handler	Electrical Wholesale Supply	Spectrum Engineers		\$13,000.00	Equipment only
8 Museum Chiller Connection/ Air Handler	Gritton & Associates	Spectrum Engineers		\$2,997.00	Equipment only
			Total	\$351,600.00	\$993,708.62

Report of Contingency Reserve Fund
From 05/04/05 to 06/15/05

Project Title	Current Transfers	Total Transfers To (From) Contingency	% to Construction Budget	Project Status	% Completed (Paid)
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$344,813.21				
INCREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND					
Lund Hall Chiller Replacement (Close project)	3,547.00	9,826.39	12.30%	Complete	100%
FY06 Capital Improvement Projects					
CEP 2nd/3rd Chiller Project	57,925.00	57,925.00	6.15%		
Museum Chiller Connection/Air Handler	27,778.00	27,778.00	8.00%		
Steam/Condensate Replacement	17,778.00	17,778.00	8.00%		
Campus Electrical Upgrade	23,778.00	23,778.00	8.00%		
Education Chiller Replacement	12,025.00	12,025.00	8.00%		
Classroom Upgrades	11,111.00	11,111.00	8.00%		
SER Chiller/Steam/Condensate Replacement	30,680.00	30,680.00	8.00%		
Facilities Building Renovation and Addition	13,370.00	13,370.00	5.00%		
New Fire Connection	2,000.00	2,000.00	8.00%		
Business Building Electrical Upgrade	4,667.00	4,667.00	8.00%		
Replace High Voltage Switches (Phase I)	10,370.00	10,370.00	8.00%		
Recommission Old Main	4,074.00	4,074.00	8.00%		
Replace NFS Freezer	9,778.00	9,778.00	8.00%		
CEP By-Pass Stack	26,963.00	26,963.00	8.00%		
Concrete Replacements	3,704.00	3,704.00	8.00%		
DECREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND					
Fume Hoods Biology/Natural Resources (Change order)	(7,082.93)	(49,499.47)	6.28%	Construction	76%
Science Engineering Research Utility Corridor (Shipping/snow removal)	(306.80)	(83,770.80)	9.43%	Materials Installation/DFCM	100%
ENDING BALANCE	\$596,971.48				



Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance
 1445 Old Main Hill
 Logan, UT 84322-1445

Report of Project Reserve Fund Activity From 05/04/05 to 06/15/05

Project Title	Transfer Amount	Description	% of Construction Budget
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$88,537.86		
INCREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND			
Lund Hall Chiller Replacement	7,600.00	Close project	9.50%
DECREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND			
None			
ENDING BALANCE	\$96,137.86		

**Current Delegated Projects List
06/15/05**

Project Number	Project Name	Phase	Project Budget
CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT/IMPROVEMENT			
A08051	Fume Hoods Biology/Natural Resources	Partial Completion/Construction	\$871,612
A08080	Transformer/High Voltage Distribution Line/Water System (2001 Utility Upgrade)	Partial Completion	990,000
A08052	Campus Air Conditioning Phase II	Substantial Completion	500,035
A07975	Housing Fire and Life Safety Improvements	Partial Completion/Design	2,500,287 *
A08066	Veterinary Science Electrical/Mechanical Upgrade	Substantial Completion	388,174
A12309	Campus Safety Lighting 2-3	Partial Construction	377,000
	Electrical Cabling from North Sub-Station	Pending	200,000
A07997	Campus Fiber Optic Enhancements	Complete	743,646
A08063	Lab Animal Research Center Addition	Complete	295,368
A08029	Technical Support Services Renovation	Construction	767,097
A08088	Tunnel Extension - Edith Bowen Area	Partial Completion/DFCM	1,000,000
A08071	Central Plant Chiller Addition (Natural Resources & Spectrum)	Substantial Completion	1,503,947
A08089	Buried Natural Gas Pipe Replacement	Substantial Completion	100,000
A11546	Steam/Condensate Pipe Replacement	Substantial Completion	320,000
A08085	Lundberg Fire Escape	Design	50,000
A08087	New Well	Study	350,000
A11539	Veterinary Science Fire Pumps/Generator	Design	350,000
A08000	Inside Wiring Phase I	Substantial Completion	1,951,551
A11548	CPD Fire Alarm Upgrade	Design	165,841
A08072	Recital Hall	Construction	12,477,606 *
A11534	University Inn Renovation	Substantial Completion	719,832
A12589	Brigham City Campus Remodel	Design	1,093,932 *
A11545	Romney Stadium Turf	Substantial Completion	750,042
A08073	HPER Upgrades (Floors, A/C, Locks, Fire Alarms)	Partial Completion/Design	1,040,719
A11535	Lund Hall Chiller Replacement	Complete	61,956
A11542	Central Energy Plant Electrical Upgrade	Substantial Completion	350,000
A11543	Central Energy Plant Chillers	Substantial Completion	600,000
A11544	Art Barn Electrical Upgrade	Design	20,000
A12743	Agricultural Science Electrical Upgrade	Design	100,000
A11554	Science Engineering Research Utility Corridor	Materials Installation/DFCM	1,032,657
	Education Overhead Fire Doors Replacement	Pending	80,000
A12820	Veterinary Science Fume Hood Upgrades	Scoping Study	500,000

A11540	Nelson Fieldhouse Mezzanine	Substantial Completion	638,454
A07953	Spectrum Floor/Carpet Replacement	Partial Completion/Carpet Installation	161,029
A08001	Inside Wiring Phase II	Construction	471,403
A12107	SCADA High Voltage Controls	Construction	345,264
A08070	Carousel Square Remodel	Design	825,000
A08071	CEP 2nd/3rd Chiller Project (NEW PROJECT)	Substantial Completion	1,000,000
A12819	Museum Chiller Connection/Air Handler	Design	400,000
	Steam/Condensate Replacement (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	250,000
	Campus Electrical Upgrade (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	350,000
A13138	Education Building Chiller Replacement (NEW PROJECT)	Design	200,000
	Classroom Upgrades (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	150,000
A13139	SER Chiller/Steam/Condensate Replacement (NEW PROJECT)	Design	475,000
A12895	Facilities Building Renovation and Addition	Feasibility Study	500,000
	New Fire Connections (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	30,000
	Business Building Electrical Upgrade (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	75,000
	Replace High Voltage Switches/Phase I (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	150,000
	Recommission Old Main (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	150,000
	Replace NFS Freezer (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	150,000
	CEP By-Pass Stack (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	400,000
	Concrete Replacements (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	50,000
LIFE SAFETY (STATEWIDE)			
A08041	Ag Science Elevator/Communications	Complete	124,784
PAVING (STATEWIDE)			
A08076	North Campus (Originally A-2 Parking Lot Overlay)	Construction	60,000
A08076	900 East Rebuild	Pending	64,600
A08076	Miscellaneous Paving	Pending	16,180
A08076	Northeast Staff Parking Lot Expansion (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	220,000
A08076	East Campus Drive Center Shuttle Lot (NEW PROJECT)	Pending	90,000
ROOFING (STATEWIDE)			
A08028	Miscellaneous Roofing	Pending	43,539
ENERGY & WATER CONSERVATION (STATEWIDE)			
A11547	Insulate Condensate Lines	Partial Completion	<u>208,230</u>
TOTAL (60)			<u><u>\$39,849,785</u></u>

* Project management delegated to USU.



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Delegation of Agricultural Facilities Relocation Project to USU**

Recommendation:

DFCM recommends that the Board authorize the delegation of the Agricultural Facilities Relocation Project to Utah State University as requested in the attached letter from Kevin Womack.

Background:

A number of years ago, the Board authorized an “across the board” delegation to USU for projects costing less than \$2 million. In doing so, it was recognized that larger projects could be considered for delegation on a case-by-case basis.

As noted in the attached letter from Kevin Womack, the Legislature appropriated \$5 million to USU for this project. This project is different from a typical classroom/lab building for higher education in that it includes the construction of replacement animal pens and classroom/labs for agricultural purposes. This unique scope and the close internal coordination required with the College of Agriculture are the primary reasons for delegating the administration of the project.

This type of delegation is allowed in the statute governing delegation. The Board’s administrative rule governing delegation calls for DFCM to administer the programming step for state-funded projects that are delegated. However, as allowed by the rule, DFCM recommends that the Board waive this requirement and allow USU to administer the programming phase due to the unique nature of the project.

FKS:KEN:sll

Attachment

Utah State UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
FOR FINANCE AND BUSINESS
1445 Old Main Hill
Logan, UT 84322-1445
(435) 797-1146
FAX: (435) 797-0710

6 June 2005

F. Keith Stepan, Director
Division of Facilities Construction
and Management
4110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Dear Keith:

SUBJECT: Delegation Request - Agricultural Buildings/Facilities Relocation

The 2005 Legislature appropriated \$5 million to relocate agricultural buildings and facilities currently located adjacent to the main campus to a different area. We are requesting consideration of the Building Board to delegate management authority of this project to Utah State University. This would include programming, design, and construction associated with the relocation of agricultural facilities from the area north of 1400 North to the South Farm area. The relocation is necessary to provide land for the expansion of the Innovation Campus. The intent is to move all of the classrooms, labs, offices, and animal pens to locations more appropriate to their intent. Very close coordination with the College of Agriculture will be necessary, and it is felt that this would be best accomplished if Utah State University managed the project.

Utah State University has demonstrated its ability to successfully manage projects in excess of the \$2 million delegation limit. This project would be managed the same as previous projects with Facilities Planning, Design and Construction personnel coordinating the efforts and the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance handling the financial accounting. State procurement codes will be followed as administered by USU's Purchasing Services. USU will report the project through the regular delegation/administration report process and submit any other reports needed to DFCM as requested. It is our intent to request state O&M funding at the appropriate time.

DFCM's support of the project is very much appreciated. A favorable response to this delegation request at the 6 July 2005 meeting of the Building Board will also be appreciated.

Sincerely,



Kevin C. Womack
Associate Vice President for
Administrative Services

KCW/jm

c: Kenneth E. Nye
Darrell E. Hart
Stanley G. Kane



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Master Plan for the Ogden/Weber ATC Campus of UCAT**

Recommendation:

DFCM recommends that the Board consider the master plan for the Ogden/Weber ATC campus and, if satisfied, approve the plan.

Background:

The Board's administrative rule governing planning calls for master plans to be presented to the Board when initially created or substantially modified.

Campus President Brent Wallis will present the master plan for the Ogden/Weber ATC campus of the Utah College of Applied Technology. DFCM is not aware of this master plan being presented to the Board in many years.

Ogden/Weber is one of the campuses that UCAT will be considering for its higher priority capital development requests. In the last two years, the Board has seen master plan presentations or conducted tours of other UCAT campuses that might be prioritized high by the UCAT board. As a result, DFCM thought this meeting would be an opportune time for the Board to become more familiar with the Ogden/Weber campus.

FKS:KEN:sl



Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
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: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Master Plan for the College of Eastern Utah**

Recommendation:

DFCM recommends that the Board consider the master plan for the College of Eastern Utah and, if satisfied, approve the plan.

Background:

The Board's administrative rule governing planning calls for master plans to be presented to the Board when initially created or substantially modified. As the CEU master plan has gone through a significant update, it will be presented to the Board for its approval.

FKS:KEN:sl



Utah State Building Board

Jon M. Huntsman, Jr.
Governor

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

MEMORANDUM

To: Utah State Building Board
From: F. Keith Stepan
Date: July 6, 2005
Subject: **Administrative Reports for DFCM**

The following is a summary of the administrative reports for DFCM.

Lease Report (Pages 1 - 2)
No significant Items

Architect/Engineering Agreements Awarded, 35 Agreements Issued (Pages 3 - 5)
No significant Items.

Construction Contracts Awarded, 36 Contracts Issued (Pages 6 - 8)

Item 1, SLCC Jordan Campus Health Science Building

This is a CM/GC agreement, with the initial agreement only including preconstruction services. The balance of the construction costs will be added by change orders.

Item 25, WSU Utility Tunnel Lid Replacement for Buildings #2 - #4

Additional funds of \$50,773 transferred from Project Reserve to award construction contract which bid over budget.

Report of Contingency Reserve Fund (Page 9)

Increases

The funding increases are decrease change orders on these particular projects.

Decreases, New Construction

New Archives Building/Rio Grande Bldg. Remodeling

This transfer covers the contingency reserve fund share of change order #9 for remodel work in the Rio Grande Depot. This change order covers numerous unknowns and omissions, such as; sump pump and fire sprinkler head revisions, asbestos related work on the 2nd floor, landscaping and flatwork revisions, and casework changes. The balance of the change order cost came from the remaining construction budget funds in the project.

USU Heat Plant Water Treatment Repairs

This transfer is DFCM's share on a settlement with all parties, for repairs to this system. The majority of the costs are being paid for by the contractors and insurance company that performed on the original project.

Administrative Reports for DFCM

July 6, 2005

Page 2

WSU Plaza Chilled Water Line Replacement

This covers change order #3 for unknown conditions on the project. These include; excavation being deeper than the plans indicated, the piping being covered with concrete instead of lightweight concrete slurry, new piping connection couplings, extra piping, and the time associated with the additional work.

Fairpark Rodeo Arena Drainage Improvements

The large percentage is due to the small size of this project. The construction budget is \$16,648, so any draws look large percentage wise. The current change order is an omission for an expansion joint between the sidewalk and drain. Previous draws have been for inspection costs over budget.

Report of Project Reserve Fund Activity (Page 10)

Increases

These items reflect savings on projects that were transferred to Project Reserve per statute.

Decreases

WSU Utility Tunnel Lid Replacement for Buildings #2 - #4

To award the construction contract that exceeded the construction budget by this amount, as noted above in construction contract award section.

Statewide Planning Fund (Page 11)

FY'06 Capital Development Project funding has been reflected this month, leaving only one transfer to be covered in future Legislative sessions.

Emergency Fund Report (Page 12)

FY'06 funding is reflected in this report. Decreases are for a paint failure analysis at the CUCF shower facility, and the replacement of a 50 ton compressor at the DHS Administration Building.

FKS:DDW:sll

Attachment



Division of Facilities Construction and Management
 4110 State Office Building, Salt Lake City, UT 84114
 Telephone (801) 538-3018 FAX (801) 538-3267

LEASE REPORT

From 5/09/2005 to 6/18/05

No	Agency/Location	Services	Space Type	Lease Term	Square Feet		Cost/Sq. Ft.		Comment
					Old	New	Old	New	

LEASE

1.	Education, Rehabilitation American Fork	Full	Office	5 Yrs.		2,000		\$15.80	New location for program growth.
2.	National Guard Recruitment Salt Lake City	Partial	Office	1 Yr.	1,150	975	\$15.76	\$17.00	New location for recruitment center.

AMENDMENTS

1.	Health, Health Care Finance, Heber	Full	Office	3 Yrs.	228	228	\$13.00	\$13.39	Renewal at market.
2.	Human Services Services for People with Disabilities, Park City	Full	Office	2 Yrs.	997	997	\$15.65	\$15.65	Renewal, no change.
3.	National Guard Recruitment, Orem	Net	Office	1 Yr.	1,334	1,334	\$21.76	\$22.09	Renewal at market.
4.	Natural Resources Forestry, Fire and State Lands, Salt Lake City	Full	Office	5 Yrs.	7,210	7,210	\$14.85	\$15.30	Renewal at market.



Division of Facilities Construction and Management
 4110 State Office Building, Salt Lake City, UT 84114
 Telephone (801) 538-3018 FAX (801) 538-3267

LEASE REPORT
From 5/09/2005 to 6/18/05

No	Agency/Location	Services	Space Type	Lease Term	Square Feet		Cost/Sq. Ft.		Comment
					Old	New	Old	New	

5.	Natural Resources Wildlife Resources St. George	Net	Office	1 Yr.	1,600	1,600	\$ 7.88	\$ 7.88	Renewal, no change.
6.	Public Safety Driver License Fillmore	Full	Office	2 Yrs.	1,000	1,000	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	Renewal, no change.
7.	Public Safety Highway Patrol, Kanab	Partial	Office	3 Yrs.	780	780	\$ 9.40	\$ 9.40	Renewal, no change.
8.	Public Safety Highway Patrol Wendover	Full	Office	3 Yrs.	754	754	\$11.50	\$11.50	Renewal, no change.
9.	Transportation Region I, South Weber	Net	Trailer Space	1 Yr.	20,000	20,000	\$ 0.36	\$ 0.39	Renewal at market.
10.	Treasurer's Office Unclaimed Property Salt Lake City	Full	Office	5 Yrs.	7,576	7,576	\$14.85	\$15.35	Renewal at market.
11.	Workforce Services Fillmore	Full	Office	1 Yr.	1,463	1,463	\$10.20	\$11.90	Renewal at market.



Division of Facilities Construction and Management

4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Professional Contracts Awarded From 5/5/2005 To 6/16/2005

Design

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
1 USU	USU FINE ARTS MUSEUM ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	ARCHITECTURAL NEXUS	DESIGN	\$8,200.00	\$8,200.00
2 USU	ROMNEY STADIUM PH 2-CONCEPT DESIGN W/CONSTRUCTABILITY & COST STUDY	VCBO ARCHITECTURE LLC	DESIGN	\$42,000.00	\$41,700.00
3 NG	HILL AFB MUSEUM LANDSCAPING	J M WILLIAMS AND ASSOCIATES INC	DESIGN	\$5,000.00	\$4,800.00
4 WILDLIFE	MAMMOTH CREEK FISH HATCHERY WATER TREATMENT BUILDING	SUNRISE ENGINEERING INC	DESIGN	\$49,900.00	\$49,990.00
5 STORES	VERNAL ABC #28 TILE/DOOR/LOADING DOCK DESIGN	PRIOR & ASSOCIATES	DESIGN	\$4,000.00	\$5,360.00
6 WILDLIFE	CACHE VALLEY HUNTER ED BLDG IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	ARCHITECTURAL NEXUS	DESIGN	\$14,665.00	\$4,900.00
7 SLCC	SLCC RDWD RD ENTRANCE SIGNAGE/BUS STOP CANOPY	SCOTT P EVANS ARCHITECT&ASSOC	DESIGN	\$14,500.00	\$14,450.00
8 CAP PRESV	STATE OFFICE BLDG ELEVATOR UPGRADES DESIGN	LERCH, BATES & ASSOCIATES INC.	DESIGN	\$31,000.00	\$31,000.00
9 NG	LEHI NATL GUARD ARMORY ROOFING DESIGN	MCNEIL ENGINEERING INC	DESIGN	\$11,910.00	\$8,000.00
10 CAP PRESV	STATE OFFICE BLDG ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	HAWKS ARCHITECTURE	DESIGN	\$15,000.00	\$14,700.00
11 WSU	WSU PETERSON PLAZA CONCRETE/LANDSCAPE IMPRV DESIGN	BINGHAM ENGINEERING	DESIGN	\$29,250.00	\$29,250.00
12 CAP PRESV	DUP MUSEUM ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	HAWKS ARCHITECTURE	DESIGN	\$5,180.00	\$5,180.00
13 SNOW	SNOW COLLEGE SOUTH SEVIER VALLEY CENTER REMODEL DESIGN	PRIOR & ASSOCIATES	DESIGN	\$8,500.00	\$8,400.00
14 CUCF BLDG	WATER SOURCE DEVELOPMENT - CUCF	WILLOWSTICK TECHNOLOGIES LLC	DESIGN	\$35,500.00	\$35,500.00
15 UVSC	UVSC PARKING LOT V - PHASE II	KING ENGINEERING INC	DESIGN	\$81,000.00	\$47,400.00



Division of Facilities Construction and Management

4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Professional Contracts Awarded From 5/5/2005 To 6/16/2005

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
16 SLCC	SLCC RRC RAMPTON TECH BLDG ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS	SCOTT P EVANS ARCHITECT&ASSOC	DESIGN	\$14,600.00	\$14,600.00
17 UBATC	UBATC PAINT BOOTH VENT SYSTEM DESIGN	PRIOR & ASSOCIATES	DESIGN	\$13,550.00	\$13,550.00
18 DWS	DWS 7292 S STATE ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	HART FISHER SMITH & ASSOCIATES	DESIGN	\$15,025.00	\$15,995.00
19 UU	UTAH MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY	GILLIES STRANSKY BREMS SMITH	DESIGN	\$3,600,000.00	\$3,600,000.00
20 REGENTS	REGENTS FIRST FLOOR LOBBY REMODEL	MHTN ARCHITECTS INC	DESIGN	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
21 USU	USU ROOSEVELT ADMIN BLDG ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGN	PRIOR & ASSOCIATES	DESIGN	\$4,000.00	\$5,412.00
22 STORES	OGDEN LIQUOR STORE #24 DEMOLITION & REPLACEMENT	EATON ARCHITECTURE LLC	DESIGN	\$71,000.00	\$49,900.00
23 CORR-OTHR	ORANGE ST/FREMONT CCC RESTROOM IMPROVEMENTS	AJC ARCHITECTS	DESIGN	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
24 O/WATC	OWATC BDO BLDG BUILD-OUT PHASE III	NJRA ARCHTIECTS	DESIGN	\$13,920.00	\$13,920.00
25 DISTRICT	PROVO DISTRICT COURT SECURITY UPGRADE	SPECTRUM ENGINEERS INC	DESIGN	\$12,000.00	\$11,995.00
26 REGION 4	UDOT MEADOW MTN STATION ADDITION/REMODEL DESIGN	ARCHIPLEX GROUP LLC	DESIGN	\$30,000.00	\$27,957.00
27 CUCF BLDG	CUCF ADA/FIRE SUPPRESSION UPGRADE DESIGN	ARCHIPLEX GROUP LLC	DESIGN	\$9,500.00	\$9,453.00

Miscellaneous Services

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
28 WSU	WSU STEWART LIBRARY RENOVATION TESTING/INSPECTION	IVIE CODE GROUP INC	INSP OBSERV SER	\$9,400.00	\$9,320.00
29 UU	UU WARNOCK ENGINEERING BLDG TESTING/INSPECTION SVCS	CHRISTENSEN BROTHERS AND ASSOCIATES	INSP OBSERV SER	\$280,000.00	\$178,587.50
30 CUCF BLDG	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY - 288 BED CUCF PRISON EXPANSION	CRS CONSULTING ENGINEERS INC	SITE SURVEY	\$5,200.00	\$5,200.00



Division of Facilities Construction and Management
4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Professional Contracts Awarded From 5/5/2005 To 6/16/2005

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
31 DWS	LOGAN EMPLOYMENT CENTER ALTA SURVEY	CACHE LANDMARK ENGINEERING INC	SITE SURVEY	\$11,000.00	\$10,600.00
32 STORES	TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY - NORTH OGDEN LIQUOR STORE	FEHR & PEERS ASSOCIATES INC	STUDY	\$8,600.00	\$8,600.00
33 SLCC	JORDAN CAMPUS HEALTH SCIENCE CTR COMMISSIONING SERVICES	E-CUBE, INC.	COMMISSIONING	\$170,000.00	\$17,853.00
34 DFCM	CONDITION ASSESSMENTS - VARIOUS STATE-OWNED BUILDINGS	WAYNE NEILSON	STUDY	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
35 CAP PRESV	CPB - LEGAL REGULATORY REVIEW SERVICES	KENT BISHOP	UNCLASS CONSULT	\$10,000.00	\$1.00

End of Report



Division of Facilities Construction and Management
4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Construction Contracts Awarded From 5/5/2005 To 6/16/2005

Construction

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
1 SLCC	JORDAN CAMPUS HEALTH SCIENCE BLDG CM/GC	OKLAND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.	Const New Space	\$17,000,000.00	\$67,975.00
2 WSU	BROWNING CTR RIGGING REPLACEMENT- AUSTAD AUDITORIUM & ALLRED THEATER	OASIS STAGE WERKS	Const Remodel	\$509,252.00	\$440,270.00
3 DFCM	FIRE ALARM UPGRADES FOR PROVO REG CTR, TAX COMM & OFFICE OF EDUC	WASATCH CONTROL SYSTEMS LLC	Const Remodel	\$342,279.00	\$149,466.00
4 SFTY-OTH	OREM PUBLIC SAFETY SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	WASATCH CONTROL SYSTEMS LLC	Const Remodel	\$11,500.00	\$11,200.00
5 NG	WYOMING AVE & MARINE COMPOUND STORM DRAINS - CAMP WMS	CHAD HUSBAND CONSTRUCTION INC	Const Site Imp	\$200,000.00	\$198,264.00
6 SLCC	STANDBY POWER SYSTEM - RAMPTON TECH BLDG REDWOOD RD CAMPUS	HIDDEN PEAK ELECTRIC CO INC	Const Remodel	\$155,000.00	\$154,775.00
7 DFCM	BRIGHAM CITY DRIVERS LICENSE REMODEL	BAILEY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY INC	Const Remodel	\$73,444.00	\$77,048.00
8 SNOW	CENTRAL HEATING PLANT UPGRADE	ALTERNATIVE MECHANICAL	Const Remodel	\$1,224,000.00	\$1,123,278.00
9 COURTS	CEDAR CITY COURTS REMODEL	SPECTRUM CONST OF UTAH LLC	Const Remodel	\$227,000.00	\$227,081.00
10 SUU	UTILITY TUNNEL EXTENSION	VALLEY DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	Const Site Imp	\$1,263,650.00	\$969,000.00
11 DWS	BACKUP GENERATOR FOR DWS METRO	REMEDICATION TECHNOLOGIES LLC	Const Remodel	\$66,418.00	\$68,300.00
12 NG	UTES WASH RAMP ENCLOSURE - CAMP WILLIAMS	CHAD HUSBAND CONSTRUCTION INC	Const Remodel	\$165,000.00	\$164,419.00
13 NG	UTES YARD LIGHTING - CAMP WILLIAMS	TASCO ENGINEERING INC	Const Remodel	\$95,000.00	\$94,788.00
14 WILDLIFE	EGAN HATCHERY RACEWAY REPAIRS	RESTRUCTION CORPORATION	Const Remodel	\$72,780.00	\$21,500.00



Division of Facilities Construction and Management

4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Construction Contracts Awarded From 5/5/2005 To 6/16/2005

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
15 DFCM	HEBER WELLS BLDG - LIGHTING UPGRADE	BROKEN ARROW CONST CORP	Const Remodel	\$69,000.00	\$20,000.00
16 COURTS	OGDEN COURTS CCTV SYSTEM/DVR ADDITIONS	UTAH CONTROLS INC	Const Remodel	\$40,492.61	\$18,124.00
17 DATC	WATER SUPPLY REPLACEMENT	SR MECHANICAL	Const Site Imp	\$66,100.00	\$43,000.00
18 UU	RICE ECCLES STADIUM TRAFFIC COATING REPLACEMENT	LAYTON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	Const Remodel	\$67,000.00	\$66,667.00
19 REGION 3	UDOT REG 3 ADMIN BLDG CONFERENCE RM A/C IMPROVEMENTS	EXCEL HEATING AND A/C SERVICE INC	Const Remodel	\$12,500.00	\$12,265.00
20 YTH CORR	MILLCREEK YOUTH CENTER CHAPEL	CRAIG M CALL	Const New Space	\$103,000.00	\$102,890.00
21 DHS-OTHER	VARIOUS DHS BLDGS ACCESS CNTRL SYSTEMS UPGRADES	FUTURE TECH INC	Const Remodel	\$27,000.00	\$26,137.11
22 DRAPR FAC	DRAPER PRISON VOCATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	BRODERICK & HENDERSON CONSTRUCTION LC	Const New Space	\$1,384,300.00	\$1,322,300.00
23 WSU	SCIENCE LAB STRUCTURAL REPAIRS PHASE I	KAY GENERAL CONTRACTING INC	Const Remodel	\$209,475.00	\$209,475.00
24 WSU	DEE EVENT CENTER NORTH STAIRWAY REPLACEMENT	ASCENT CONSTRUCTION INC	Const Remodel	\$289,331.00	\$244,400.00
25 WSU	UTILITY TUNNEL LID REPLACEMENT - BLDGS 2 TO 4	KAY GENERAL CONTRACTING INC	Const Remodel	\$198,180.00	\$198,180.00
26 STORES	VERNAL ABC STORE #28 TILE FLOORING IMPROVEMENTS	K&K TILE	Const Remodel	\$48,000.00	\$19,500.00
27 DNR-OTHER	DNR COMPUTER ROOM REMODEL	EHP CONSTRUCTION INC	Const Remodel	\$8,000.00	\$7,932.00
28 DFCM	UDOT RAMPTON CAFETERIA A/C COMPRESSOR REPLACEMENT	MECHANICAL SERVICE & SYSTEMS I	Const Remodel	\$10,000.00	\$7,539.00
29 UVSC	UVSC SCIENCE BLDG SKYLIGHTS REPLACEMENT	ALDER SALES CORP	Const Remodel	\$45,000.00	\$42,895.00



Division of Facilities Construction and Management

4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Construction Contracts Awarded From **5/5/2005** To **6/16/2005**

Design/Build

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
30 DFCM	NEW OGDEN REGIONAL CENTER	BIG D CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION	Design Build	\$6,480,000.00	\$6,480,000.00

Miscellaneous Construction

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Contract Name</u>	<u>Firm</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Contract Amt</u>
31 UU	UU MARRIOTT LIBRARY PHASES I-2 ASBESTOS ABATEMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL ABATEMENT INC	Haz Mat Const	\$24,000.00	\$23,694.00
32 UVSC	UVSC VINEYARD SCHOOL EMERGENCY MOLD REMEDIATION	ROCMONT INDUSTRIAL CORP	Haz Mat Const	\$9,000.00	\$8,500.00
33 DRAPR FAC	DRAPER PRISON WASATCH CULINARY ROOF REPLACEMENT	WARBURTONS INC	Roofing	\$25,000.00	\$22,900.00
34 UU	MEDICAL LIBRARY ROOFING IMPROVEMENTS	KENDRICK BROS ROOFING INC	Roofing	\$118,000.00	\$117,300.00
35 NG	DRAPER NG COMPLEX - WEST ENTRANCE PARKING	GENEVA ROCK PRODUCTS	Paving	\$45,000.00	\$47,358.00
36 STORES	VERNAL ABC STORE #28 FLOOR TILE ASBESTOS ABATEMENT	ROCMONT INDUSTRIAL CORP	Haz Mat Const	\$8,000.00	\$7,775.00

End of Report

DFCM

Division of Construction and Management
 4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84144
 Telephone (801) 538-3018 Fax (801) 538-3267

Jul-05

REPORT OF CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND

PROJECT TITLE			GENERAL STATE FUNDS CURRENT TRANSFERS	TRANSPORTATION FUNDS CURRENT TRANSFERS	TOTAL TRANSFERS FROM CONTINGENCY	% TO CONSTR. BUDGET	PROJECT STATUS	% Complete
BEGINNING BALANCE			7,454,777.37	(4,064.46)				
INCREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND								
02042	U OF U	Health Science Education Building	93,556.13	-	195,695.48	0.69%	Construction	89%
04146	Human Services	USDC Raintree Bldg Remodel	15,843.00	-	15,945.77	1.22%	Construction	34%
03127	Dixie College	100 S Roadway Crossing Improvement	12,313.21	-	52,087.35	7.30%	Closed	100%
04209	UDOT	MTF Bldg Air Compressor	90.00	-	-		Construction	78%
99050	Corrections	Lightning Protection System	23.15	-	21,271.15	2.71%	Construction	100%
DECREASES TO CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND								
NEW CONSTRUCTION								
98188	Archives	New Archive Building	(35,507.35)	-	355,043.46	3.15%	Construction	64%
02029	USU	New Merrill Library	(23,324.00)	-	230,057.00	0.70%	Construction	63%
00018	Dixie College	Delores Dore Eccles Fine Arts Center	(12,916.80)	-	309,186.19	2.09%	Construction	93%
REMODELING								
05194	USU	Heat Plant Water Treatment Repairs	(86,605.00)	-	86,605.00		Pending	
04195	WSU	Plaza Chilled Water Line Replacement	(43,217.00)	-	53,270.00	41.40%	Construction	31%
04035	Dixie College	Central Chiller Replacement	(15,107.30)	-	15,107.30	2.15%	Construction	67%
03213	SLCC	Redwood Campus Various Improvements	(5,497.00)	-	24,773.41	12.06%	Complete	100%
04205	Youth Corrections	Slate Canyon Boiler Replacement	(4,343.24)	-	4,343.24	5.23%	Pending	
04165	Fairpark	Rodeo Arena Drainage Improvements	(2,980.00)	-	5,902.06	26.83%	Complete	100%
04217	UVSC	Irrigation Ponds Liner Replacement	(2,551.70)	-	13,276.70	4.70%	Construction	100%
04038	Health	Med Exam Mechanical System Upgrade	(2,408.20)	-	44,245.40	7.59%	Construction	76%
03211	DFCM	Ogden Regional Fire Alarm System Upgrade	(1,661.53)	-	3,413.46	2.12%	Construction	55%
02256	UDOT	Eureka Maint Station Addition	(519.94)	-	53,329.69	13.37%	Construction	100%
03256	DWS	Metro Employment Ctr HVAC Upgrade	(223.55)	-	223.55	0.43%	Construction	100%
TOTAL			7,339,740.25					



Division of Construction and Management
 4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84144
 Telephone (801) 538-3018 Fax (801) 538-3267

REPORT OF PROJECT RESERVE FUNDS ACTIVITY

Jul-05

% of
 Constr.

PROJECT TITLE	STATE FUNDS	DOT FUNDS	DESCRIPTION	Budget
<u>BEGINNING BALANCE</u>	<u>4,946,280</u>	<u>36,747</u>		
<u>INCREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND:</u>				
DOT MTF Bldg Air Compressor	711.00		Project Residual	1.41%
Provo Regional Center Fire Alarm Upgrade	192,393.16		Balance of Construction Budget	56.21%
ABC Store #28 Lighting Upgrade	43.00		Balance of Inspection Budget	0.53%
SLCC RR Admin Bldg Chiller	3,539.00		Balance of Construction, Design & Insurance Bu	18.94%
Fairpark Water Line Repairs	4,597.25		Balance of Design & Inspection Budgets	3.90%
DWS Metro HVAC Upgrade	5,856.00		Balance of Various Project Budgets	11.25%
ABC Store #24 Ext lighting/Rooftop Unit	8,256.08		Balance of Construction Budget	40.60%
WSU Electrical Upgrades Various Buildings	50,898.24		Balance of Construction, & Insurance Budgets	5.72%
UDC Draper Academy Fire Pump	54,904.48		Project Residual	15.04%
ABC Store #24 Lighting/Tile	4,827.49		Balance of Construction, & Design Budgets	29.98%
DHS Layton/N Ogden Group Homes Remodel	7,533.09		Project Residual	8.76%
<u>DECREASES TO PROJECT RESERVE FUND:</u>				
WSU Utility Tunnel Lid Replacement	(50,773.00)		To Award Construction Contract	
<u>Ending Balance</u>	<u>5,229,065</u>	<u>36,747</u>		

DFCM

Division of Construction and Management
4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84144
Telephone (801) 538-3018 Fax (801) 538-3267

STATEWIDE PLANNING FUND

\$350,000

Jul-05

INSTITUTION/ AGENCY	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	AMOUNT
Snow College	02273700	Master Plan	25,000
PLANNING FUND UNENCUMBERED BALANCE			\$325,000

DFCM

Division of Construction and Management
4110 State Office Building Salt Lake City, UT 84144
Telephone (801) 538-3018 Fax (801) 538-3267

EMERGENCY FUND REPORT

Jul-05

BEGINNING BALANCE:

\$2,189

INCREASES TO EMERGENCY FUND:

Per 2005 House Bill #1, Item #53, transfer \$1.0 million in Capital Improvement Funds previously allocated to Oxbow jail remodeling into DFCM's emergency fund.

1,000,000.00

DECREASES TO EMERGENCY FUND:

CUCF Shower Facility Paint Failure Analysis
Human Services Administration Bldg. 50 ton Compressor Replacement

(3,154.15)

(17,462.00)

ENDING BALANCE OF EMERGENCY FUND

\$981,573