Utah State Building Board

MEETING

January 8, 2003

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:
Keith Stepan, Chair
Kay Calvert, Vice-Chair
Larry Jardine
Haze Hunter
Steven Bankhead

DFCM and Guests in attendance:

Joseph A. Jenkins	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kenneth Nye	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Kent Beers	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Shannon Lofgreen	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Francis X. Lilly	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Dave Williams	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Blake Court	Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Alan Bachman	Attorney General Office/DFCM
Kevin Walthers	Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Dennis Geary	College of Eastern Utah
Brent Windley	Utah State University
Darrell Hart	Utah State University
Barry Smith	Hart Fisher Smith Architects
Mark Spencer	Board of Regents
Mike Perez	University of Utah
John W. Huish	University of Utah
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
Raymond Duda	Utah National Guard
E. Bart Hopkin	Department of Human Services
Lynn A. Samsel	Department of Human Services
Stan Plewe	Dixie State College
Don Mahoney	AIA – Utah
Doug Wright	Department of Corrections

Bryan Wilmot	Department of Corrections – UCI
Marlo Wilcox	Department of Workforce Services
Lee Robinson	Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind
Ken Frank	Department of Public Safety
Kim Wixon	Department of Health
Rep. Loraine T. Pace	Legislature

On Wednesday, January 8, 2003, the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting at the Utah State Capitol, Committee Room 129, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chair Keith Stepan called the meeting to order at 9:01 am. Chair Stepan welcomed Mr. Steven Bankhead as a new member of the Board.

❑ APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2002 .....

Chair Stepan sought a motion on the Building Board minutes of December 4, 2002.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the minutes of December 4, 2002. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

❑ LEGISLATIVE UPDATE .....

The Legislature held a special session in December to take further actions to balance the budget. At that time, some funding sources were changed for several projects, however no projects were canceled nor was any funding cut. A minor reduction did occur in the operating budget for the Facilities Management area.

The Governor's budget recommendations had recently been presented and, given the continuing revenue struggles, the Governor's recommendations did not include much for a capital budget, although he recommended .9% for capital improvement funding. The Governor's recommendations would take the balance of the base budget dedicated to capital budget, with the exclusion of the .9% funding level for capital improvements, and redirect the balance to other spending needs of the State. The Governor did not recommend a General Obligation bond, recommending only projects to be funded on a lease revenue bond or through other dedicated sources.

The upcoming Legislative session begins January 20. At meeting time, it was difficult to anticipate how the Legislature may proceed with capital project funding. Kenneth Nye felt anything funded would need to be done on a General Obligation bond.

In past years, the Capital Facilities Appropriation Subcommittee has held a joint meeting with the Building Board and anticipated doing so again this year pending their schedule. DFCM will follow up with the Board as more information becomes available.

Four House Bills have been proposed, which may have some impact on DFCM and the Board. The most significant impact to the Board is HB 21, which would change the membership of the Building Ownership Authority to the Governor, the State Treasurer, and the Chair of the Building Board. HB 11, Energy Data Collection and Reporting, would basically place into statute what has previously occurred. HB 15, State Armory Board Amendments, is anticipated to proceed with the fairly limited amendments as far as placing requirements that the Legislature approve purchases and sales of property by the National Guard. HB 47, Fire Prevention Amendments, will place some requirements on those who perform testing and inspection of fire sprinkling systems. Another proposed bill of significance would make it a third degree felony to knowingly violate the requirements of handling and disposing of asbestos. DFCM anticipated other legislation would occur that may have a more substantial impact on DFCM.

❑ REALLOCATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.....

DFCM recommended three projects to receive redistribution of capital improvement funds including Ogden/Weber ATC, which requested $340,426 to be moved from the Student Services HVAC project to HVAC projects at the Gymnasium, the Children's School South, and the Cosmetology Building. DFCM also recommended the reallocation of $165,000 for Southern Utah University from the Old Main and Braithwaite buildings seismic study to the design and demolition of the South Hall project replacement building. At Snow College, DFCM recommended to reallocate $225,000 from the Library Chiller Replacement Project to the design of the Business Building renovation project.

In FY2002, the Building Board approved $400,000 for the Ogden/Weber ATC for their HVAC project at the Student Services Building. Further into the project, they discovered that, in addition to the HVAC work, the O/WATC needed to perform fire system upgrades and address several code violations regarding ADA issues. Due to timing issues, DFCM will not be able to perform the work at the Student Service building until September 2003. In the meantime, they hoped to use the money immediately on the Cosmetology building, the Gym, and the Children's School as they are currently being requested for 2004 dollars. A portion of money would be reserved for the design work for the Student Services building, and funding of FY2004 dollars would allow them the appropriate amount needed for the Student Services building for construction to begin in September 2003.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to approve the request to reallocate funds at Ogden/Weber ATC. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

For FY2004 capital improvement projects requests, Southern Utah University wished to

upgrade the HVAC work and perform some remodeling of South Hall. South Hall is a very small 10,000-11,000sf building constructed in 1934. Upon initially reviewing the project, DFCM had serious concerns regarding using any additional money into the building because of its age and dilapidated condition. DFCM asked Reaveley Engineering to review the building, who in turn agreed the building would not be worth additional funding and rehabilitation. Statute allows DFCM to use capital improvement money to replace any existing facility up to $1.5 million. Therefore, DFCM desired to transfer some money from an old seismic study being done on the Old Main and Braithwaite buildings and reallocate the money to begin design of the South Hall replacement. When FY2004 monies are approved in May, SUU can immediately begin construction for a completion date by next fall.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to reallocate $165,000 from the Old Main and Braithwaite buildings to South Hall for the design work. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

Snow College previously requested to remodel their Business Building due to the old Social Science building demolition and the need to relocate the Social Science program. Last year, the Board approved $225,000 for a chiller replacement in the library. The College currently has another project proceeding to construct a tunnel system throughout the campus and have found they have enough money to connect the library to the centralized chiller and tunnel system and therefore do not need to replace the current stand alone chiller. DFCM desired to reallocate the funding toward the Business Building renovation. A portion of the money will be used for the renovation of the building design with the hopes to begin construction when FY2004 dollars are approved. Snow College will still request additional funding in 2004.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the reallocation for Snow College for $225,000 from the Library Chiller Replacement Project to the design of the Business Building renovation project. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

- **AMENDMENT TO RULE R23-3, PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS.....**

Kenneth Nye stated the Board previously authorized a rewrite of the administrative rule dealing with the programming and planning of projects. The Board previously discussed the rule currently in place dealing with master planning. Due to the rule not addressing master planning in its current procedure, the Board approved the repeal of the rule, but asked DFCM to return with an amendment to the planning rule to incorporate the provisions dealing with master planning. The rule incorporates new language in R23-3-9 dealing with

the master planning issues. The language would basically require that for each major campus of state owned buildings, a master plan would be required to be developed and maintained. Master plans could also be developed for other state facilities, either at the request of the Building Board or by an agreement between DFCM and the agency or institution occupying the facility. Flexibility would be allowed to avoid getting into situations where they are preparing master plans where they are not needed, and are only doing it because it happens to fit a definition within the rule as well as provide flexibility where needed. The last provision of the rule would require that the initial master plan and substantial modifications to the master plan be presented to the Building Board for approval.

Chair Stepan suggested a definition of master plan be included. Kenneth Nye stated that, while this could be accomplished, the approach different campuses wished to take on the master plans varied greatly. Some of the larger schools have taken a very comprehensive plan for the entire institution to determine future needs and effects on facilities. In other locations, a master plan has been a much simpler effort of determining future needs. Chair Stepan stated the Board would determine that future growth and development potential would be demonstrated.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to accept the amendment to rule R23-3, planning and programming for capital projects. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

- **AMENDMENT TO RULE R23-9, COOPERATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING.....**

DFCM previously suggested that, in those instances where a local government entity could show that DFCM could make a direct impact on their utilities, DFCM should then pay the equivalent of the impact fee. On the other hand, some local government entities bill an upfront charge to fund new facilities indicating the charge may be a duplication of dollars. In addition, the Legislature has indicated they wish to deal with this issue rather than DFCM, and have specifically asked DFCM and the Board to proceed with the rule but delete items pertaining to the impact fee on utilities until such time as the Legislature determines how to proceed.

Kay Calvert asked if the State could currently make an independent community determination. Joseph Jenkins stated that by statute, the State is exempt from planning and zoning rules and does not have to pay impact fees. They were paying utilities as a support to local governments, and some impact is placed when new buildings are built. Mr. Jenkins felt DFCM and the Board should allow the Legislature to decide how to handle the issue. Kenneth Nye commented they would simply leave the rule silent regarding impact

fees, which is basically placing the State in the same position as the past.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the amendment to rule R23-3 as presented. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

❑ UCAT – DAVIS APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COLLEGE MASTER PLAN .....

Approximately four years ago, DFCM authorized the DATC campus to develop a master plan. Michael Bouwhuis, President of Davis ATC, indicated that plan was approximately ten years old and several changes had occurred since then. Under contract with DFCM, the DATC worked with Hart Fisher Smith Architects to create a master plan for the ATC to serve as a prototype for the State of Utah. The DATC felt they had prepared a master plan reflective of a market sensitive institution. It was presented to the Davis Applied Technology Board of Trustees and the Utah College of Applied Technology Board of Trustees, who unanimously supported the plan.

The 210,000sf Davis ATC is located in Kaysville, Utah, and was created by the Legislature in 1978. The contiguous buildings house most of their programs on the first floor and the general education and specialized technical programs on the second floor. The DATC has been built in three phases with funding provided in 1983, 1985, and 1987 for the main portion of their campus.

One of the DATC's goals of the master plan is to build out their campus and indicate future needs. They have a student body of about 11,000 students every year and have grown 100% over the 90's. They have been one of the fastest growing educational institutions in the state both with high school students and adults. Davis County is growing rapidly and is currently at a population of 250,000. At build out, which should occur in 2020-2030, Davis County will be approximately 380,000-400,000 people. Davis School District will go from 59,000 to about 80,000 in 2020.

In 1998, the Board provided DATC funding for the medical wing, which has since experienced rapid growth in the medical program and the building filled up within a year. By the summer of 2003, they need to add 2 to 3 portables next to their medical building.

Mr. Bouwhuis introduced Barry Smith who has been working with Davis ATC to prepare the master plan. Barry Smith stated the area studied encompassed most of the campus with except for their retention pond, but there is no anticipation of doing any structures in that area. They established a tartan grid for the campus identifying areas that would be probable locations for building pads, while still leaving areas open to allow for circulation between the buildings and required access for fire equipment. The intent is to expand the campus in any direction along the gridlines. Initially, the growth would be anticipated to

grow to the east and the south where the space is flat and ground is easily available for buildings. The massing concept is that lower buildings would be towards the south and the west and higher buildings would move back towards the north. There is a need for a utility building, which would be placed on the outside of the perimeter road so as not to interfere with the academic functions. The building layout would progress down the corridors assigned for development. Building sequentially would minimize infrastructure costs, but if there were a need for some facility to group with another one, it could be accommodated.

When the campus approaches its 50 year point, the original buildings may require major remodeling that may or may not make them worthy of redoing. If the original buildings were demolished, Mr. Smith identified what the campus may look like at final build out while trying to accomplish grouping functions. Buildings with similar sorts of functions would ideally be grouped around an area that would form a common area in between and allow people to move from one building to another. Mr. Smith showed a drawing identifying what the concept for development could allow in the future but it was not intended to be representative of the final product.

The internal road circling the perimeter of the property currently goes through the internal portion of the property and connects with the road at the bottom of the campus. The Kaysville City Council has recently approved the road to connect with Highway 89. After receiving approval from Fruit Heights, the campus will be able to connect to Highway 89 and allow for an entrance to their campus from Main Street, 400 North, and Highway 89. They have also tried to create some buffers to minimize the impact on the neighborhood.

The west of the campus includes the rest of the educational community in Kaysville including the Enrichment Center, the Mountain High program, Davis High and the Young Parents Program in which the Building Board approved the DATC to allow Davis School District to use the property to build a building for young parents who also access the programs at DATC.

President Bouwhuis felt that with the master plan, they would have flexible enough buildings to go high bay or low bay and accommodate whatever industry comes up in the next 20-40 years. They felt the prototype plan developed at Davis could also be utilized at Mountainland ATC or Ogden/Weber ATC.

Chair Stepan asked if a central plant location tunnel system was developing. President Bouwhuis responded DATC placed a water tower with air conditioning capacity when they received authorization for the medical building. Within the last two weeks, DATC had also placed a new boiler with more capacity. They have tried to connect all of the buildings to make it as efficient as possible. Eventually there may be a need for a possible heat plant in the very extreme northeast corner of their campus. Because of the size of their buildings,

they are accommodating with two boilers and a summer boiler and a very massive water tower for their air conditioning which is centrally located in the current plant.
Steven Bankhead questioned why there were several single story buildings as opposed to making use of the space by using two or three story buildings. He questioned if there was a problem with the site that lends itself only to single story buildings. Barry Smith stated it allowed some flexibility for the size of the buildings. In concept, the old buildings were located along the south side of the campus where it related more closely to residential areas and then increased to two story or high bay structures. The bulk of the campus right now is a single story structure and the recommendation was that the lower levels be to the south on the residential side and then moved to higher structures towards the back.

President Bouwhuis stated problems existed in linking programs that are technical in nature with other programs and creating innumerable problems with fumes and air conditioning. Despite modern technology, fumes still migrate into the air conditioning system. Some of these issues can be resolved by keeping high bay buildings separate.

Haze Hunter asked if DATC anticipated running out of property by using a lot of single story buildings. President Bouwhuis stated any campus runs the danger of running out of property. Long term, if they started running out of space, they would have to go to two story buildings to accommodate it. In the future, there are some possibilities across the street to the north where there could be some expansion.

Chair Stepan stated the Board felt the need that, as each project comes on board, it is looked at in an economical view of the economy of a two story versus one in order to ensure each institution was ensuring they used the economy of construction.

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to recommend that the Board approve the proposed master plan for Davis ATC with the future direction proposed. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY .....

John Huish, University of Utah, gave the delegated projects report for the period of November 15 to December 20, 2002 as well as the quarterly report. There were two new A/E agreements including statewide project improvement ADA upgrades at the Graduate School of Social Work and a laboratory remodel in the Radiobiology Building at the Health Sciences Center.

There were three construction contracts for the period including one for the renovation of the Merrill Engineering Building, as well as the realignment of the golf course to

accommodate the light rail project and a larger remodeling for the fifth floor of the Nursing Building. All of those projects were bid with very satisfactory results.

The construction contract status report indicated that, in some cases, the schedule indicated projects that they have run over on time primarily due to weather contingencies and other scope increases to the projects, which have extended the times. All projects are under budget and have satisfied schedule requirements.

The East Ball Field – Shed, Concession and Restroom project is 279 days over the contract and is currently having funds held while the University waits on a decision as to how to proceed. The design is complete as well as some construction. The schedule could possibly be updated to reflect the changes in status on that project. The project may be moved to cancel status or archived and started up again. They are holding this one open pending decision from the administration on how to proceed. Chair Stepan expressed concern with the potential additional costs involved in the delays.

MOTION: Haze Hunter moved to accept the administrative report of the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Larry Jardine and passed unanimously.

Brent Windley, Utah State University, reported for the period of November 13 to December 18, 2002. There were four professional contracts awarded for the period, including one for the Athletic Locker Room/Office Facility, which is mostly with private funds. There was also a water tank retrofit, including a technical investigation of the soil around the tank.

There was one small change to the contingency reserve fund to accommodate the Fire Lane Access Routes. The project reserve fund had one small change for some in-house installations on the fume hoods at the Agricultural Science building.

There were approximately 40 projects on the current delegated projects list with 18 being complete or substantially complete. Approximately eight were still in the design phases.

Mr. Windley provided an update on the cogeneration facility. They have signed the contract for the design currently underway. Darrell Hart stated the work began regarding the design/build contract with Jacobson to work on connecting the new engineering building with the quad loop underway. They anticipate have the project done in a 20 month construction period. They also anticipate having a new generation system operational in November and having the cooling system functioning by the following cooling season. They have reduced the size of the mechanical for both the Engineering Building and the new Edith Bowen lab school. They have taken the chiller and cooling towers out of those

two projects and anticipate providing both of those long-term through the new central cooling system.

MOTION: Larry Jardine moved to accept the administrative report of Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Kay Calvert and passed unanimously.

❑ UNIVERSITY OF UTAH LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN .....

Joseph Jenkins and Michael Perez previously discussed the possibility of the University of Utah to review their long range plan including the golf course. Mr. Perez was present to request authorization to expend $100,000 to begin the process. With the final product, they will return to the Building Board for final approval of the long range master plan.

The long range development plan was first performed in 1997 and had since had a lot of dynamic change on campus. Trax is impacting them and caused a need to determine the effects of long term pedestrian vehicular traffic. Also, at the Health Sciences building, there have been several buildings constructed in recent years and the densities are challenging. The golf course has basically been their land bank which now needs to be updated. As they consider all of this, there will be major impacts to their infrastructure. $100,000 will be directed to the land planning effort and concurrent to that, they will be having a utility study to consider their high temp hot water, chilled water, electrical distribution system, and all of the other ancillary systems that would work in concert with their long range goals. The funding would be the responsibility of the University of Utah.

Kay Calvert asked how much property was involved in terms of the land bank. Mr. Perez responded it used to be an 18-hole golf course and now it is a nine hole. Upon review, they would look at the opportunities at Research Park, Fort Douglas and the VA to consider their uses.

The student population at the University of Utah is currently just slightly less than 30,000. Mr. Perez stated there had been some considerations to capping enrollment due to the financial positioning assuming that is not a hindrance, he suspected that will grow at the same rate as the population and as the other institutions grow as well.

Kay Calvert asked if trying to make a determination on potential growth would be part of the long range development plan. Mr. Perez responded it would be, and this effort would be administered through their office, but they will be reporting to a steering committee comprised of the President's Cabinet to look at the strategic direction of the University and how the facilities should be developed for support.

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to approve the University of Utah's desire to proceed with update of their Long Range Development Plan with a cost of up to $100,000 and will be funded by the University. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

❑ FEASIBILITY STUDY OF CO-GENERATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH ..

Joseph Jenkins and Michael Perez also previously discussed doing a co-generation facility at the University of Utah. The University wished to inform the Board of their desire to proceed with reviewing a co-generation facility or unit. Mr. Perez stated they were a very large customer to Utah Power and Light with increasing consumption and felt they should look at all options available. Co-generation at their campus may be difficult because of the structure of their infrastructure and because they have high temp water and not conventional steam. The University felt it was very appropriate at a feasibility level to assess whether or not there might be any payback, or any sense to offset any consumption or cost by use of a different technology such as cogeneration. If in fact, the feasibility study were to suggest that there is some logic to it, then they would pursue the engineering analysis with no determination other than obtaining some further engineering studies to determine if in fact it does make sense. This is a broad feasibility effort which will be funded by the University. This issue could be incorporated into the Long Range Development Plan.

Joseph Jenkins stated when they are doing this feasibility, they should take into consideration a savings and the cost of the ESCO already completed as part of their analysis.

❑ COMMISSIONING OF STATE BUILDING PROJECTS .....

Joseph Jenkins stated DFCM believed commissioning is a very important part of the building process. When they build a new building is completed, many times the installers of the equipment never take the necessary maintenance precautions following installation and the agency or institution must resolve the issues. Some institutions have the necessary staff to resolve the issues, while others do not. Previously, general contractors have been instructed to the commissioning. This will continue to be the case, but DFCM feels the need for an independent person to act as a commissioning agent hired by the State of Utah to ensure commissioning is done in the more sophisticated buildings. There is currently one firm who has the ability to do commissioning in the State of Utah; otherwise DFCM must go elsewhere in order to get commissioning agents.

Blake Court stated that, over the past few years, DFCM has gone through several cycles of improvement through their general conditions, rewritten contract language, and revamped

inspection process. Each of these improvements has brought more efficiency and more responsibility to each of the individual firms in the practice. Value Based Selection has also helped increase the improvement and the quality of their construction firms and the completed product. Commissioning is being seen as the last step in the improvement cycle.

Mr. Court explained commissioning is the process of planning, documenting , scheduling, testing, adjusting, verifying, and training to provide a facility which operates as a fully functioning system as per the design intent. This will begin with knowing how the building is going to function, and taking it all the way through the design, construction and final training.

Commissioning is not design or inspection. It is verification that the design intent is translated to the desired outcome. Commissioning is more effective when implemented at the start of the design process and allowed to continue through construction and activation. A commissioning agent needs to be identified upfront, and participate in several design meetings. Once the intents are understood, specifications and testing procedures are written into the contract to identify the information needed to the contractor and certain locations where the information can be obtained.

Systems that should be commissioned include the HVAC, building controls, electrical, audio visual, security and fire protection. Many of the systems are not regulated by building codes and are regulated only by what is placed into the specification and the intended building function.

Commissioning during the design is to understand the design intent, develop the verification process and requirements for the contractors, and review the design of systems for compliance with desired outcome. Commissioning agents typically are people with a very wide background and several years of experience.

Commissioning during construction could be verifying what equipment is delivered to the site, verifying installation that will allow for better operation and maintenance, and verifying installation is per the contract documents. Mr. Court felt DFCM needed to begin understanding what the full range of a commissioning agent could provide and then determining which aspects of those services really are covered under the architect's agreements, which was covered by the general contractor, and which really needed to be done by an independent firm to avoid up front problems with the contractor.

Commissioning at completion is to verify performance of the systems per the design intent and the training of operation and maintenance personnel. DFCM feels they need to do a better job of involving the architect and the engineers with the operation and maintenance

personnel to define the intentions of the building. DFCM also needs to verify and review certain things that need a lot more maintenance, including ensuring the buildings are being built in a manner that the maintenance operations people can access filters and replace them quickly. During the final commissioning phase, equipment should be verified to operate per its intentions.

For building commissioning, the full scope and cost of commissioning ranges upwards of 1.5% of the cost of construction. DFCM does not believe that extent is currently required. By dividing up the activities for the general contractor and the architect, the cost of commissioning would be more from 3/4 to 1%. They currently need to identify how to divide the three areas of expertise, make the commissioning RFP available, and let people within the community know this will begin. Many of the activities of a commissioning agent duplicate what is required of the contractor or design team. Through this process, they want to hone in on what gives the State the best payback.

DFCM believes there are local individuals who could do an excellent job of commissioning and help to reduce the costs. DFCM is attempting to develop firms to provide the wide range of commissioning they are seeking.

Joseph Jenkins stated all current projects with a CM/GC will incorporate commissioning as part of the CM/GC's responsibility to select a commissioning agent as they select other subcontractors and consultants. Chair Stepan encouraged the initiative to being with the contract to avoid overlap of responsibility.

Kay Calvert asked if there would be plans to do ongoing training. Blake Court responded training manuals would be provided, but ongoing training will be the responsibility of the agency or institution. He added that the Commissioning agent would be available during construction, final testing and balancing, and for the first few months of questions.

Steven Bankhead felt the natural tendency would be for the operation of commissioning to decline over the years. He questioned if there was a system currently available to ensure the system was functioning per the original design. Joseph Jenkins stated Facility Focus would enable DFCM to monitor all of their buildings and all of their systems, including the maintenance of operation on a daily basis that is done on a software program.

An RFP for Commissioning will become available within the next couple of months.

❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM .....

Kenneth Nye stated a few significant items occurred in the contingency reserve report. The Weber State mechanical and air system repairs/abatement project had a draw on

contingency to deal with conditions found in the pool when it was drained and they needed to regrout the tile as well as other repairs. This was initially part of the scope of the project, but was not included in part of the project title submitted for the report.

One substantial increase occurred in the project reserve fund from the DYC Canyonlands Youth Facility. This project was funded initially substantially through federal funds. DFCM took quite some time trying to determine how much of the savings could be claimed as state dollars versus how much they would have to give back as the federal share. After extensive analysis, DFCM determined the savings was all state dollars, and DFCM could continue to meet the State match requirements for the federal money.

Joseph Jenkins indicated the University of Utah had a high temperature/high pressure water line break which would be funded $80,000 out of emergency funds.

❑ UPCOMING VALUE BASED PROCUREMENT SELECTIONS .....

There was no new Value Based Selection upcoming for the next month.

❑ ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Kay Calvert moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:58am. The motion was seconded by Haze Hunter and passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen