

Utah State Building Board & Utah State Board of Regents Joint Meeting



MEETING

September 10, 2004

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Larry Jardine, Chair
Kerry Casaday, Vice-Chair
Cyndi Gilbert
Steven Bankhead
Katherina Holzhauser
Manuel Torres
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
Camille Anthony	Department of Administrative Services
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Steve Allred	Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office
Representative Fred Hunsaker	Legislature
Representative Brent Goodfellow	Legislature
Senator Beverly Evans	Legislature
Representative Bud Bowman	Legislature
Representative Ralph Becker	Legislature
Representative David Clark	Legislature
Mark Spencer	Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education
Kevin Walthers	Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education
Joyce Cottrell	Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education

Board of Regents:

Nolan E. Karras, Chair
E. George Mantes, Vice Chair
James S. Jardine
Daryl C. Barrett
Bonnie Jean Beesley
Katharine B. Garff
Jed H. Pitcher
Maria Sweeten
Linnea S. Barney
David J. Grant
Michael R. Jensen
Trenton Kemp

Board of Regents Chair Nolan Karras called the meeting to order at 8:20am at Weber State University and stated the purpose of the meeting was to discuss building priorities and the priority process.

Mark Spencer, Board of Regents, discussed the Qualification and Prioritization (Q&P) process which is the Regents quantitative process. In 1988, Regents first asked staff to develop an objective formula to rank projects, which has been refined in subsequent years. Staff took five categories of space including library and study space, office space, classroom space, physical education space, and other space, and developed criteria for new buildings could qualify based on the type of space requested. Each year institutions report on the current inventory space based on category.

Dr. Spencer referenced a handout which outlined a historical picture of the buildings funded since 1987; the enrollment in 1987; current enrollment; the percentage of change; and the total percent of the new space. Historically, several projects have been able to be funded from cash, but in recent years, projects have been bonded.

Dr. Spencer referred to the graph highlighting the Utah System of Higher Education System total projection of enrollment growth. Enrollment growth also factors in to the Q&P formula by identifying current space, current FTE faculty and staff, current FTE students and projection of student growth over the next five years. Institutions requesting new space with recent growth or projected growth would qualify well on the Q&P based on enrollment projections. The Q&P formula calculation utilizes all of the data points of current space, FTEs, and the criteria involved.

Dr. Spencer referred to another handout titled 2005-2006 USHE institutions priorities which identified the University of Utah Marriott Library as the number one priority with a state cost request of \$48.5 million. This spreadsheet also identified previous state funding, estimated state O&M, other funds available, new gross square footage, and renovated square footage.

Q&P life safety evaluations were also identified. Four projects requested an analysis with the assistance of DFCM staff and a system committee looked at weighting of each of the four criteria (structural, electrical, mechanical and other) and decided that structural seismic should be weighted more heavily than a raw score, based on extent of need in each of the categories.

Another sheet identified Q&P "other funds" calculations for 2005-2006, which are funds not appropriated to higher education. One point is awarded for every 5% of the total cost and funds should be in hand or very firmly pledged before they are allocated points.

The Q&P results take each project and looks at the relative space need. The quantification process is a space derived, FTE derived formula. The Q points are the space points with the number one priority receiving fifty points, and the points decreasing by two with each priority. One column identified the final Q scores or the gap score where the larger the score meant the larger gap of need. O&M points are then added to the Q score, along with other funds points, and life safety points. When institutions were allowed more than one priority, priority points were given with 25 points for the greatest need, but this is no longer relevant and may need to be reconsidered. Ultimately the total points are added together and ranked in order. The number one priority for 2005-2006 was University of Utah Marriott Library Facility and all of the priorities had been adopted.

Dr. Spencer referred to the two projects that were not asked to be ranked on Q&P, but asked to be listed as projects, and included the USU agricultural functions relocation to expand the Innovation Campus and the WSU IHC property acquisition. The top two UCAT projects were UBATC Vernal classroom building and Bridgerland ATC purchase of the Bourns building and were listed for informational purposes.

Chair Karras sought questions regarding the Q&P process. He felt the standard may need further clarification and suggested the need for priority points may also need reconsideration. He stated it was possible for institutions to have two or three projects that are higher priority than others and he wished for it to be shown in the formula. He also felt campuses could have projects that were their number one priority regardless of the points or rankings.

Keith Stepan stated the need for one priority to be submitted by agencies and institutions stemmed from the budget reality and economy status. The Building Board's five year plan does include second and third choices. Typically the second year of the five year plan is the first choices that were not funded, as well as second choices.

Regent David Grant stated the 25 points allocated based on institutional priority seemed to be a qualitative evaluation by institutions and perhaps the qualitative considerations could be expanded to allow the Regents to differentiate. He believed there are qualitative factors beyond the institutional priority that could be captured and the criteria expanded. He wished for consideration of other qualitative measures.

Steven Bankhead asked about the other funding points and felt there were some institutions in better position to raise money. He felt fund raising could be weighted to reflect the reality of the process. Mr. Bankhead also asked for clarification of the weighting of seismic considerations. He also questioned the gaps in inventory which is not acknowledged in the Q&P points.

Dr. Spencer said he could not address the issue of the differential ability of institutions to raise money. As for the Q&P point gaps, the formula assumes in a major renovation the project is taken off the grid and added back as new space. Over the years the decision was made to decrease the

Q score every two points rather than on a percentage basis. The percentage differences in Q scores and the Q points are not proportionate per the formula.

Chairman Karras inquired about the spectrum of points assigned to life safety. Keith Stepan responded that the electrical and mechanical are constantly inspected and reviewed and can be addressed through improvement dollars. The structural cannot be as carefully scrutinized and therefore becomes a project and justifies the heavier weighting. Chair Karras stated it is a quantitative process with qualitative judgments to get to the qualitative number. There is a 1.66 weighting and with a raw score for seismic, it ought to be higher.

Regent David Grant referred back to the life safety spreadsheet and expressed concern with the last percentage calculation weighting CEU as the most dangerous building. Based on the weighted percentage of the renovation, the score of 18 was decremented to a score of seven due to only 35% of the request relating to the building being renovated. The 35% is captured in the requested dollar amount and he felt the weighted score should not be decremented by percentage of renovation. Dr. Spencer stated it was both a percentage as well as an addition of new space, but it is captured in a different part of the analysis process. Chair Karras requested Regent Pitcher and his committee to evaluate this portion of the process.

Regent Jardine stated it is very difficult to assess the high priority projects for every institution and how to relatively judge them in terms of priority. He assumed this was an evolving process that was more beneficial than attempting to weigh the various perspectives of which each thought was subjectively most important. He also commented on the other funds points and the value added to the State by private contributions. Chair Karras stated private donations were an incentive from the Regents standpoint, but the ability to raise them varied between institutions.

Chair Karras sought the Regents opinion on changing their votes on the ranking based on the discussion, although the chances of more than a few receiving funding were very slim. He suggested they understand their system better and determine if changes should be made in the future. There were no desires to change the priorities.

Chair Larry Jardine expressed appreciation from the Building Board's standpoint to meet with the Regents and stated the Board has expressed desire to better quantify and qualify their process and have developed a better way to evaluate and prioritize.

Kenneth Nye began to explain the Building Board's process for ranking capital development projects. He referred to the Building Board capital development request evaluation guide summarizing the process. The Building Board has the added dimension of dealing not only with higher education type projects, but also with state agencies, making it even more challenging for the Building Board to develop a process mathematically similar to the Q&P. The Board desired to identify standard criteria used in evaluating requests while maintaining flexibility in the process through the application of judgment in scoring projects as well as making the scores input for information. They wished for the ability to deviate from the particulars of the points.

To establish their process, the Board identified six strategic objectives to identify the key issues affecting state facilities and then established evaluation criteria for each objective. The Board then gave a weight to each objective ranging from one through three and then identified scoring anchors ranging from zero to five. Bonus points may also be given if a project meets the criteria.

The first objective addresses existing facilities and will only be scored if the project actually addresses an existing facility issue, i.e. renovating or replacing a building. This objective is scored by addressing the cost of correcting the life safety and other deficiencies currently in an existing building and then comparing those deficiencies to the total cost of the request. This is somewhat similar to the Regent's process in allocating life safety points although the increase in space is addressed differently in the Building Board's process.

The bonus points pertain to life safety issues. When existing facilities pose a substantial threat to a life or property, and a relatively high probability of occurrence, they would be entitled to receive two bonus points. The project could receive one point with one life safety factor. The Building Board is very open in their analysis of the life safety issue where the judgment call is always open for second guessing.

The second objective deals with growth and the Board's evaluation of the need for increases in state owned space, but will only address actual increases. The Board will look at demographic data in the evaluation. This objective received a weight of two.

Kenneth Nye clarified objective one only dealt with existing space and objective two only dealt with new space as an attempt to maintain some balance between addressing existing space and dealing with growth needs. Some projects involve both new space and renovation to existing space including the University of Utah Marriott Library as a majority of the project is for a renovation, but does include a significant addition to house an automated storage and retrieval system. As the Board did not wish to have a project score high on objective one and two, they were doing an adjustment to scores for these objectives.

Regent David Grant noted the old physical education building at Southern Utah University had significant life safety issues. To be placed high in the rankings, SUU would need to raze the building to increase their inventory space need. However, DFCM had convinced SUU to not raze the building. He questioned how the demolition of buildings was weighted. Kenneth Nye stated the impact of a decision to demolish the old PE building would affect both the Q&P scores, as well as the Building Board's criteria. He felt the Building Board could address this issue in their process as it is not the only objective to deal with existing conditions. Mr. Nye recognized the SUU was being hurt in the evaluation process by keeping the building. The Building Board could also choose to modify their score and consider changing their ranking for the project.

Mr. Nye referred back to the second objective which stated if 80% of the cost of a project requested is to replace existing space, and 20% is to add additional space, they would adjust the score to multiply the score for objective one by 80% and the score for objective two by 20%. This would allow for the maximum points possible between objective one and two to remain at five for any type of project, rather than providing preferential treatment to projects dealing with both issues.

The third objective deals with cost effectiveness. The Board encouraged cost effective projects, as well as innovative thinking in completing projects in alternative ways that may be less costly than a standard approach. The expectation is that standard type projects will end up getting a score of three and those that have alternative methods will receive higher scores. This objective has been given a weight of three.

The fourth objective deals with program effectiveness and capacity and addressing the impact a project has on the effectiveness of a program, as well as increasing capacity for the program beyond what is associated with the increase in space. Projects building new space are going to increase in capacity just by the nature of having more space. If space does not effectively work for an institution, they may score higher than institutions with effective space currently. This objective received a weight of two by the Board.

The fifth objective deals with the criticality of the program and how essential the project is for that program. The Board is attempting to look at policy considerations as well as if it is a core essential program for the state and also for the institution. They will also be looking at how critical the project is for the program to be able to function. If the program can function in the current space and the reasoning behind the request is tied to other issues, institutions may not score well in this category.

The sixth objective relates to alternative funding. Points are given based on the proportion of the project funded through alternative sources. Alternative sources for higher education typically involve donations or revenue bonds funded through student fees. This objective received a weight of one largely because of the concern of the differing ability of institutions to be able to raise funds.

Chair Karras stated in the Regents process, any institution with the ability to raise \$2 million to be used to subsidize O&M would receive more points than if they used the \$2 million to reduce the price of the project and receive one point for outside money being contributed. The Regent's system encouraged more endowments to reduce O&M than to reduce building costs. He asked if it was more important to the Building Board that they endow O&M or reduce the initial cost and if there was a weighting associated.

Keith Stepan stated the Board certainly did not want to deny any donor, but most donors only wished to donate buildings and there should be an incentive for donations to reduce the cost of the project. Kenneth Nye believed the category in the Q&P process came about a number of years ago when there was a lot of joint discussion with the Building Board and the Regents regarding private funding for O&M. No one proved to be successful in raising private money for O&M, but remained in the Q&P formula. He did not think it was likely institutions would be successful in money dedicated to O&M as opposed buildings. This issue had not been identified in the Building Board process, but would be taken into account when looking at projects. Chair Karras considered removing the issue from their process.

Kenneth Nye continued with the process and stated they have asked each of the agencies and institutions to submit a request to DFCM and include a self scoring based on the evaluation guide, along with justification within the request for the basis of the scoring. The Building Board also requested DFCM to provide an analysis of each request and suggest scores to the Building Board. The information would then be provided to the Board along with the presentations from the institutions. The Board would then complete their scoring which will be tabulated and distributed with the weights applied in order to compile a final list. The rankings will be held on October 21 and the Board may choose to modify what the points indicate.

Bonnie Jean Beesley stated it may be of value to ask Regent Pitcher and his committee to evaluate their process and see where it makes sense to assimilate the process with the Building Board's process to allow for integration.

Chair Karras asked if it was helpful to have two different viewpoints on the prioritization process or was it more beneficial to have a cohesive ranking. Senator Beverly Evans stated one list would have more of an impact and would improve the credibility of the Board of Regents and the Building Board. The Building Board addresses all agencies throughout the state, but would appreciate the criteria to evaluate projects meshing. Chair Karras suggested the Building Board also assign a subcommittee to work with the Regent's subcommittee to achieve greater unity.

Dr. Richard Kendall felt the discussion was very valuable and advocated further analysis of the Q&P process to ensure the internal validity of the measures. He stressed the importance of partnerships in higher education and suggested all become more entrepreneurial for O&M.

Senator Evans commended the boards on their processes. She stressed the importance of getting the capital improvement funding to the 1.1% per the statute. Camille Anthony added the importance of restoring the general funds to DFCM's operating budget.

Chair Karras adjourned the meeting by thanking those involved in pursuing the implementation and improvements of the processes. All felt it was beneficial for those in attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10am.

Utah State Building Board



MEETING

September 10, 2004

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Larry Jardine, Chair
Kerry Casaday, Vice-Chair
Cyndi Gilbert
Steven Bankhead
Katherina Holzhauser
Manuel Torres
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
Camille Anthony	Department of Administrative Services
Randa Bezzant	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Representative Fred Hunsaker	Legislature
Representative Brent Goodfellow	Legislature
Senator Beverly Evans	Legislature
Representative Bud Bowman	Legislature
Representative Ralph Becker	Legislature
Representative David Clark	Legislature
Doug Wright	Department of Corrections
John W. Huish	University of Utah
Brent Windley	Utah State University
Bob Askerlund	Salt Lake Community College
Jim Michaelis	Utah Valley State College
Paul Hacking	Utah Basin ATC – UCAT
Rick Stock	Architectural Nexus
Stacy Meyer	HFS Architects
RoLynne Christensen	VCBO Architecture
Jackie McGill	Spectrum Engineers

Paul Platt	Courts
Chris Coutts	MHTN Architects
Mick Gaviglio	MHTN Architects
Michael Wollenzien	Utah Office of Rehabilitation
Kevin Walthers	Board of Regents
Greg Stauffer	Southern Utah University

On Friday, September 10, 2004, the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting at Weber State University, Ogden, Utah. Chairman Larry Jardine called the meeting to order at 10:23am. He recognized the Capital Facilities Subappropriation Committee for joining the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 4, 2004.....

Chair Jardine sought a motion on the Utah State Building Board meeting minutes of August 4, 2004.

MOTION: Steve Bankhead moved to approve the meeting minutes of August 4, 2004. The motion was seconded by Katherina Holzhauser and passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF R23-26, DISPUTE RESOLUTION; AND AMENDMENT TO R23-4, SUSPENSION/DEBARMENT

Kenneth Nye stated the legislation passed last year called for DFCM to take the draft rule to the Legislature's Government Operations Committee. DFCM presented the rule to the Committee who did not express any concerns. Mr. Nye noted that the rule had been presented to the Board in previous meetings and requested that the Building Board adopt the rule and amendment.

MOTION: Cyndi Gilbert moved to approve R23-26, Dispute Resolution and the amendment to R23-4, Suspension/Debarment. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

REALLOCATION OF DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.....

Kent Beers called for the Building Board to reallocate a portion of capital improvement funding for the Department of Corrections. Last May the Board authorized \$363,000 for the Draper Prison Oquirrh/Uinta Control Room upgrade. While this project is still needed, an emergency situation has arisen at the Central Utah Correctional Facility within the last month when a steam line broke. The estimated cost of the steam line repair is between

\$250,000 – 300,000, which exceeds the amount in DFCM's emergency account. Corrections desired to cancel the Oquirrh/Uinta Control Room upgrade project and redirect approximately \$100,000-125,000 to the steam line repair at CUCF and then use emergency funds to cover the balance of the emergency repair. The remaining \$238,000 would be redirected to the Wasatch Chapel HVAC and Electrical upgrade and a water conservation study/design. DFCM recommended the Board cancel the Oquirrh/Uinta control room project and authorize \$125,000 to the emergency repair at CUCF, \$160,000 to the Wasatch Chapel HVAC and Electrical upgrade and \$78,000 towards the water conservation study/design.

Katherina Holzhauser questioned the amount of the water conservation study/design. Kent Beers responded stated the immensity of the funding was intended for a study and remaining funds would be used towards design if possible.

Approximately 60% of the emergency repair at CUCF would come out of the emergency funds. Steve Bankhead questioned if it would be more practical to defer the non-emergency projects to allow more money to remain in the emergency fund. Mr. Beers recommended transferring \$78,000 to the emergency fund and proceeding with the Wasatch Chapel project so as not to leave the project sitting idly for another year.

Cyndi Gilbert inquired about the importance of the water conservation study/design. Doug Wright, Department of Corrections, stated the property is currently 50-60% under irrigation. They are currently in the process of doing an ESCO for water conservation. They are requesting to hire a design engineer to enhance the areas where the water is being diminished. He felt they could utilize the funding to assist in offsetting the cost of water.

MOTION: Steve Bankhead moved to reallocate \$125,000 to the steam line repair and \$78,000 recommended for the water study/design to the steam line repair totaling \$203,000, and \$160,000 to the Wasatch Chapel from the Oquirrh/Uinta control room project. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres. The motion passed with Katherina Holzhauser abstaining from the vote.

☐ CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND TOURS

DFCM, in conjunction with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office, has addressed the submitted capital development requests and determined their categories pertaining to state funded projects or other funds projects. Kenneth Nye distributed a map identifying project location and the projects separated into their respective categories. The list reflects DFCM's current understanding of estimated total project cost, state funding request, and project size. The state funded requests will be heard by the Board on October 6. On October 21, the Board will complete

their priority settings for state funded requests and address the other funds projects along with their recommendations. A draft five year plan will be presented on November 3 and each of the agencies and institutions were asked to identify projects they would see as part of their five year plan.

Mr. Nye anticipated distributing all of the request information and DFCM's analysis of the state funded projects approximately two weeks before October 6. DFCM will provide the Board a sheet identifying the DFCM suggested score as well as the self scoring from the state agency and institution. This form will also allow Board members to insert their score for each project. Once the Board's scores are received, the information will be tabulated and redistributed to the Board prior to the meeting on October 21.

Mr. Nye highlighted the tours scheduled and the areas the Board would tour in Northern Utah later that day. The Board will tour Central Utah on September 16.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

John Huish presented the administrative reports for the University of Utah for June 26 to August 13, 2004. There were two new A/E agreements and one new construction contract awarded for the period. The 2005 Fiscal Year projects were added to the statewide account and the improvement account.

MOTION: Kerry Casaday moved to approve the administrative report for the University of Utah. The motion was seconded by Cyndi Gilbert and passed unanimously.

Brent Windley, Utah State University, reported on the administrative report for the period of June 23 to August 11, 2004. There were six new A/E agreements, three of which are completed. There were two construction contracts.

MOTION: Steve Bankhead moved to approve the administrative report for Utah State University. The motion was seconded by Manuel Torres and passed unanimously.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FOR DFCM

Keith Stepan referenced the summary sheet and noted there were 35 A/E agreements and 36 construction contracts awarded.

DFCM is starting to see inflation caused by steel prices and some other raw material prices increasing which is causing some need for contingency reserve and an increasing concern in having DFCM's general fund reinstated.

❑ DISCUSSION WITH CAPITAL FACILITIES APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEE
.....

Chair Jardine expressed appreciation to the Capital Facilities Appropriation Subcommittee for attending the meeting and opened the meeting for discussion.

Senator Beverly Evans stated this was a real opportunity to meet and discuss the process with the Building Board. She stated there are several existing issues, including the need to restore the 1.1% funding for capital improvements. Restoring general funds for DFCM's operating budget is another primary concern as the contingency fund is no longer an option.

Representative David Clark inquired if DFCM charged a fee for management of a project of a state building. Keith Stepan stated there are two funds in the reserve category which are set aside for bids exceeding the budget. This fund has served as DFCM's operating budget over the last few years. With each cost estimate DFCM makes, they apply a percentage governed by a sliding scale to cover unforeseen conditions which is placed into the contingency fund. DFCM can draw from for purposes allowed under the statute. The percentage is applied to the construction budget and not the total project. The contractor also has a contingency to be used for change orders.

Representative Hunsaker felt a major concern of the Building Board was how to extend the life of the facilities when there is not adequate O&M money. Keith Stepan stated DFCM's standard was for buildings to last 40-50 years and improvement dollars were used to extend the life cycle. Under the direction of Kent Beers, assessments of most state buildings had been completed by an independent group to identify the parameters. Mr. Beers works with the institutions to establish priorities for the improvement dollars.

Receiving .9% instead of 1.1% for capital improvements meant that \$10 million was not received by DFCM. This causes the State to continue to fall behind in deferred maintenance. DFCM has approximately \$1.1 billion in deferred maintenance issues identified over the next ten years. There is approximately \$250 million in immediate needs and \$250 million needing to be addressed within the next two years.

Nationally, DFCM has been recognized for their programs and assessment data. The Facility Management staff does an incredible job of maintaining buildings at a low cost of \$3.97/sf when the national average is \$6.80/sf. The private sector is maintaining buildings at about \$5.00/sf. DFCM is also doing ESCO projects. Senator Evans stated the State

could also look at the way we are designing buildings and ensure they are efficiently designed for maintenance and longevity. She encouraged reinstating the 1.1%.

Keith Stepan stated DFCM had recently established an independent commissioning piece for the construction of new buildings. The independent commissioner will begin the project during design and go through the warranty period to ensure the mechanical, electrical, etc. is done in a way to maintain life cycle consideration. Representative Hunsaker stressed the importance of looking at long term building issues and how to get the most value out of the buildings. Camille Anthony expressed it is also helpful if the Legislature funds a buildings maintenance and operation costs in their base budgets.

Representative Ralph Becker asked how the Legislature could promote further efforts similar to the ESCO projects. Keith Stepan stated the reason more were not being completed was due to their private funding and the paybacks are 15-20 years. There may be some concern about future debt. Kent Beers stated if the Legislature would provide an additional \$20 million on to their GO bond each year, more ESCO projects could be completed. DFCM is also looking at a pilot project to address retro commissioning in some state buildings with a payback of three to five years. Representative Becker offered the Legislatures assistance in encouraging the authorization of dedicated funds.

Representative Goodfellow stated there is a crisis surrounding the Department of Corrections. Approximately \$1.5 million VOITIS funds would be appropriated at the special session in order to put a fence around a VOITIS prison. There is \$4.8 million earmarked in the bond for Corrections to buy the Oxbow facility and he questioned how it would be addressed in the future. He understood VOITIS funds would also be used to build 200 beds in Millard and 100 beds in Beaver. He questioned contracting with Salt Lake County to use fill those beds instead of continuing to spend money. He was concerned Corrections is displacing the training programs by relocating male prisoners. Senator Evans stated this was very problematic of the counties when inmates are displaced from their programs. It is a complex issue and some of the data has been inconsistent and she wanted to look at the Corrections issue with the Building Board in order to have accurate information.

Richard Ellis responded that the \$4.8 million earmarked for the Oxbow purchase would require legislative action to reallocate the money to a different project. With regard to the VOITIS money for the counties, there was money earmarked for Millard and Beaver counties several years ago and preliminary work had begun to build additional county jails, but the work was postponed when the revenues were turned down. The VOITIS money being addressed in the special session is the same money and will essentially eliminate Millard and Beaver County from jail contracting. The intent of leadership during the general session is to have a heavy discussion on the long term needs and facility requirements of Corrections. The contracting of more county jail beds will be addressed during the regular session.

Camille Anthony added that there are zoning restrictions at the Oxbow facility. With the facility remaining under County jurisdiction, it must maintain misdemeanor criminals. They could not take the population in a contracting situation because they would need to house felons. With the State owning the facility, they are not subject to the same restrictions.

Representative David Clark complimented the Board and DFCM on the formula for prioritizing buildings. He questioned how the Board prioritized the other funds projects. Kenneth Nye observed the Building Board compiles a much more detailed explanation and review of the projects and they make a decision as to whether or not to recommend the projects. Typically, they do end up being recommended.

Senator Evans asked if the Building Board would be courageous enough to look at some of those other state funded projects. She thought they need to look at how much they have maxed out with some of the institutions and if they could justify the type of fee increases required by students to accommodate the facilities. She felt they had an obligation to discuss the other state funded projects more than in the past, as well as analyze the revenue flow. Katherina Holzhauser thought they could use the prioritization process to show the scoring. She asked the Legislature to support the criteria and weighting established by the Building Board. Kenneth Nye stated the other funds projects were submitted in a different format and had not addressed the other criteria to help with evaluation. He suggested the Board consider the criteria when making their considerations.

Steve Bankhead re-emphasized that as the Board defined the objectives in their prioritization method, they were very mindful of the fact that they needed input from the Legislature as to the criteria addressing the right objectives. The Board would appreciate any feedback from the Legislature to improve or expand the objectives, evaluation, or weights. Senator Evans suggested scheduling a combined meeting with the Building Board to have time to provide feedback on the prioritization method. Cyndi Gilbert expressed the Board frustration with working on the process and then having it disregarded because of politics or budget balancing. The Board desired to work in tandem with the Capital Facilities Committee. Working together would create some unity.

Representative Becker stated a few years ago there were issues pertaining to the Percent for the Arts. He expressed appreciation to the Board for tracking which buildings were being funded and tracking the process for the Percent for the Arts.

Representative Clark emphasized the need to provide further analysis to the other funding aspect. The funds are still tax dollars, debt and bonding. They are all negligent in their duties if they don't provide framework to identify their values and justifications.

Senator Evans thanked the Building Board for their dialogue and thought it was important to increase their interaction and maximize their expertise.

Keith Stepan further added they would not be placing the Capital Preservation Board project into the prioritization list. It was assumed they would receive \$50 million in funding over the next few years.

OTHER.....

Kerry Casaday will participate on the selection committee for the Salt Lake Community College Jordan Campus Health Sciences Center design.

ADJOURNMENT.....

MOTION: Kerry Casaday moved to adjourn at 11:42am. The motion was seconded by Steve Bankhead and passed unanimously.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen