

# Utah State Building Board



## MEETING

September 6, 2017

---

### MINUTES

#### Members in Attendance:

Ned Carnahan, Chair  
Lisa Barrager  
Joe Burgess  
Chip Nelson  
Gordon Snow

#### Guests in Attendance:

Jeff Reddoor	Building Board
Patty Yacks	Building Board
Mike Smith	Building Board
Tyson Gregory	Building Board
Tani Downing	DAS - EDO
Ken Hansen	DAS - EDO
Bruce Whittington	DFCM
Sarah Boll	DFCM
Lucas Davis	DFCM
Lee Fairbourn	DFCM
Jennifer Evans	DHS
Terry Howick	DNR - DWR
Shawn Anderson	UDC
Greg Peay	UDC
Sid Painar	AJC Architects
Jim Nielson	Axis Architects
Jonathan Hickerson	EDA Architects
Jodi Geroux	FFKR Architects
Jeff Palmer	Layton Construction
Heather Knighton	MHTN Architects
Eric Tholen	Michael Baker Intl.
Chris Coutts	NWL Architects
Malin Francis	Salt Lake Community College
Tiger Funk	Southern Utah University
Brennan Wood	Southwest Tech

Jade Teran	Spectrum Engineers
Dave Woolstenhulme	USTC
Joseph Demma	USTC
Tyler Brinkerhoff	USTC
Rich Amon	USHE

On Wednesday, September 6, 2017, the Utah State Building Board held a regularly scheduled meeting in the Zephyr Room of the Rio Grande Building, in Salt Lake City, Utah. The meeting was called into order at 9:00 am.

The Board diverted from the original agenda and heard the following item:

- 13. DNR/Division of Wildlife Resources: Fisheries Experiment Station Raceway Replacement

**☐ DNR/DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES: FISHERIES EXPERIMENT STATION RACEWAY REPLACEMENT**

Mr. Howick, Assistant Chief of Aquatics, presented a request to replace a raceway system and system cover at the Fisheries Experiment Station (FES) in Logan, Utah. The Logan Fisheries Experiment Station Master Plan 2017 by JUB Engineering calls for a 110ft. X 110 ft. building covering 16 individual raceways. The estimated cost of this project is approximately \$857K. Funding will come from an annual legislative appropriation of \$649K and the State Fish Hatchery Maintenance Account (SFHMA) that has historically provided over \$900K annually.

Mr. Reddoor confirmed that this project meets the criteria for non-State funded projects and that approval falls under the Board's purview.

**MOTION: Mr. Burgess moved to approve DWR's request for the Fisheries Experiment Station Raceway Replacement. The motion was second by Mr. Nelson and passed unanimously.**

**☐ FIVE-YEAR REVIEW AND NOTICE OF CONTINUATION OF RULES R23-4, R23-5, R23-6, R23-9, R23-10, R23-12, R23-14, R23-21, AND R23-24**

Mr. Kelley reviewed nine rules submitted for Five-Year Review and Notice of Continuation. There are no changes to any of the rules presented at this time. If approved by the Board, these rules will be renewed on November 14, 2017.

Lee Fairbourn, DFCM Real Estate Manager, advised the Board that DFCM is anticipating an amendment to R23-21 Lease Procedures in order to expand the timeline for renewals. This amendment will begin to be drafted shortly after the rule is renewed on November 14.

**MOTION: Mr. Nelson moved to approve the Five-Year Review and Notice of Continuation of Rules R23-4, R23-5, R23-6, R23-9, R23-10, R23-12, R23-14, R23-21, and R23-24. The motion was second by Mr. Snow and passed unanimously.**

The Board diverted from the original agenda and heard the following items next:

- 12. DHS/Utah State Developmental Center: Request for Design of a Theater Annex (Non-State Funded)
- 11. DFCM: Update on an Alternative Building Standard for University Housing Projects

**☐ DHS/UTAH STATE DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER: REQUEST FOR DESIGN OF A**

### **THEATER ANNEX (NON-STATE FUNDED)**

Director Reddoor presented an overview of this item to the Board. USDC had originally submitted this request for approval of both design and construction. Both phases will be fully funded from both the Alpine Community Theater and by individual donors; therefore this will be a donated project to the State of Utah. Preliminary estimates have shown that this project will cost approximately \$580K, or \$70/per sqft. This estimate raised concerns on the building standards that the project would adhere to. USDC's request today is to proceed with the design phase that must adhere to DFCM's standards.

Mr. Forbes, USDC Financial Manager, presented a request to proceed with the design phase of a theater annex that will be located on the USDC property, next to the existing auditorium. The theater annex will be a freestanding building. This facility will support USDC's mission and long-term mission, which is to "provide an array of services and support that promote independence and quality of life got Utah's most vulnerable people with disabilities". The theater annex will provide multiple opportunities for USDC clients in the form of jobs and participation in community events. It is anticipated that these new opportunities will positivity impact approximately 5% of USDC's cliental.

A concession agreement will be awarded to the Alpine Community Theater to promote and manage this facility, it is estimated that this partnership will provide \$30K in revenue that will be deposited into the USDC Trust Fund (Fund 2201). These funds will cover O&M costs. This facility will not create any adverse impacts to the State of Utah.

Mr. Snow inquired if this project is included in USDC's Master Plan. Mr. Forbes stated that it is not included. The Master Plan was approved two years ago, which was prior to USDC being approached for this project.

Mr. Davis, DFCM Project Manager, expressed his agreement to move forward with the design phase while adhering to State standards. This process will help USDC obtain a clear estimate of the project prior to proceeding into construction.

**MOTION: Mr. Burgess moved to approve the design phase of USDC's request for a theater annex with the stipulation that USDC must return to the Board to move forward with the project beyond this phase. The Board requests that USDC come prepared with a well-developed financial plan at that time. The motion was second by Mr. Nelson and passed unanimously.**

### **□ DFCM: UPDATE ON AN ALTERNATIVE BUILDING STANDARD FOR UNIVERSITY HOUSING PROJECTS**

Mr. Hunting, DFCM Improvement Program Manager, was assigned a task given from the Board to work with stakeholders in higher-ed, architects, engineers, developers, and DFCM to develop an alternative design standard for the construction of student housing this spring. Many universities agree that there is a need to implement an alternative standard; SUU's President Wyatt originally brought this need before the Board. Mr. Hunting reviewed a summary of the revisions for this alternative standard.

- Section 1 - Variances
  - It was widely acknowledged that while a process for requesting variances to the Design Requirements has always been in place, few knew that this was an option. This information is provided as a key component of the Design Standards

document, including instructions and forms for requesting a variance to any of the design standards.

- Section 2 - Codes/Laws/Rules/and Regulatory Requirements
  - This section outlines the statutory requirements and oversight bodies which DFCM and other state agencies are bound to. Design requirements which are in place as a result of these regulations have little opportunity for negotiation; however, discussions related to the interpretation of the statutes may be appropriate in some cases. These requirements include State and may include local code as well.
  
- Section 3 - DFCM Requirements
  - Section 3 identifies code requirements which must be followed, but DFCM has adopted a practice of exceeding the code-required minimum in some instances because it is "the right thing to do." Transcending these code elements is now at the discretion of the institution to decide if the code-required minimum is appropriate for the intended use and if the elements fit within the project budget. Examples follow:
    - Power door operators on entrances and restrooms: The ADA does not require power operators; however, DFCM has recommended them in certain areas of a given building because this better serves a sector of the population. The institution is now free to decide if they want these operators on the project or not.
    - Installation of energy efficient products: The energy code requires minimum basic elements be included in the project, but DFCM has had a long-standing practice of moving well beyond this minimum. The new standard now allows for installations to be evaluated based on the life-cycle cost and consideration for a return on investment.
    - Vibration limitations: The old standards were not based on defined metrics, but rather language such as "detectable by people." This was difficult to apply consistently. The new standard has several defined references which make it possible to apply consistent engineering practices. This also makes allowances for wood structures, including flooring, which will be a tremendous benefit in being competitive with the private sector.
    - Space Standards: It was decided that Utah Space Standards not apply to student housing and should be defined as such.
    - Infrastructure Flexibility: Many of the standards for infrastructure were moved from *Required* to *Recommended*. These are items such as spare electrical capacity and spare communication/data capacity. While steel conduits for electrical conductors are recommended, the new standard makes a clear distinction that lesser expensive solutions are acceptable such as metal-clad cabling (MC cable), non-metallic tubing (Smurf tube) or non-metallic sheathed cable (Romex). J-hooks are now defined as an acceptable method of managing communication/data cabling. Cross linked polyethylene (PEX) remains as an acceptable solution for culinary plumbing. Lightning protection has moved from *Required* to *Recommended*.
    - Architectural Elements: Many of these standards are now listed as Recommended. This gives each institution the authority to decide if these standards are right for their respective project/s. For example, this includes the following building elements:
      - Roofing

- Acoustical qualities
  - Wet area water resistance, such as showers, toilet rooms, and janitor closets.
  - Structural Elements: It is now clearly noted that all construction types are acceptable: Concrete, Steel, Wood, or a combination thereof.
  - Mechanical Systems: Several standards were adjusted to reflect the trend from *Required* to *Recommended*, and are now left to the discretion of each institution. Examples include:
    - Redundant components for heating and cooling systems
    - Fixed access via stairs to rooftop equipment
    - Equipment located in ceiling spaces and the respective access
    - Building automation systems for controlling HVAC systems
    - Central cooling and heating equipment such as chillers and boilers
    - Roof-mounted mechanical equipment
    - Types of mechanical systems used to provide HVAC (electric heat, variable refrigerant
    - flow, unitary furnaces, etc.)
- Section 4 - Landscape and Irrigation Standards
    - It was the consensus of the committee that changes to this section was not necessary.
  - Section 5 - High-Performance Building Systems
    - Every project has the option to use standardized Owner Project Requirements (OPR) and Basis of Design (BOD) documents provided by DFCM. This has an opportunity to save a project extensive money and time due to reduced fees for consultants and added design time. It is expected that the design check-points outlined in the standards be adjusted based on the experience of the project team with DFCM processes.
    - Many elements related to Programming, Design and Engineering documentation on a project have been moved from *Required* to *Recommended*.
    - Benchmarking data in the EPA Energy Profiler system is now Recommended instead of Required.
    - Transportation management plans are no longer required but are still recommended.
    - Several elements of energy performance are now recommended, such as providing Energy Star Appliances when available and identifying water efficiency goals as part of the project.
    - Implementation of a recycling program in the finished building is no longer required but is recommended.
    - Utility metering remains required on all major utilities but is no longer required on smaller subpoints of consumption

Mr. Hunting stated that the committee assigned to developing the alternative standard and President Wyatt are in agreement with the revisions brought forward. Other higher-ed intuitions have also responded to Mr. Hunting with their approval.

Mr. Amon from USHE agreed that the revision process went very well and that their institutions were well represented. He also thanked Mr. Hunting for the broad outreach efforts made to receive feedback on these revisions.

Mr. Hunting stated that the revised standard is ready to be approved by the Board. The only changes left to be made involve non-substantive ones in regards to formatting and website link updates.

**MOTION: Mr. Burgess moved to approve the Alternative Building Standard for University Housing Projects. The motion was second by Ms. Barrager and passed unanimously.**

**❑ ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH AND UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY**

Mr. Nye delivered the administrative report for the University of Utah. There were 20 professional service agreements and 18 construction contracts issued. There is one item to highlight for professional service agreements:

- Item 1: Project 21960 University Guest House Addition, Jacoby Architects has been selected for the design phase. This project was given approval last legislative session.

There are no increases and one draw to the Project Reserve Fund:

- Project 21911; North Chemistry 3rd Floor Lab System Upgrade:  
This transfer of \$220,482 covers the difference between the construction budget and the low bid after deducting scope items that were funded entirely by the University. The scope of the project had been reduced as much as possible during design. The total project cost is approximately \$2.5M.

Mr. Nye stated that funds for FY18 projects will be added to the Contingency Reserve Fund in the next report to the Board.

There are no increases and one draw to the Contingency Reserve Fund:

- Project 21224; HTW Plant – Replace Generator:  
The majority of this transfer of \$44,166.40 is to cover the cost of a shutdown of the HTW Plant extending longer than expected as a contractor on a separate project made repairs to the HTW distribution system that had to be done while the plant was shut down and the system drained. Both projects had been funded by state funds and were therefore eligible for state contingency funds.

Mr. Nelson requested a brief update on the MED Center and Crocker Science Center. Mr. Nye confirmed that the Crocker Science Center is on budget and schedule. The building is completely closed in and interior work is being completed. The estimated completion date is anticipated to be sometime next fall.

The Ambulatory Care Center is under construction and foundational walls are going up. This building will house occupants from the School of Medicine, which will then be demolished. The Dumke Building located next to the School of Medicine has already been demolished. Construction for the Rehabilitation Hospital will begin within the next few months.

Mr. Berrett delivered the administrative report for Utah State University. There were 16 professional service agreements; one item was highlighted:

- Project SLC Campus Relocation - \$95,860: A design contract issued to Method Studio for leased space in Taylorsville (located on 4600 South, old ITT Building) to convert interior space in classrooms. The construction contract for this building will be included in the next report.

There were 21 construction contracts issued; four items were highlighted:

- Project Stairs Replacement N Terrace - \$501,700: The stairs located north of Aggie Terrace are being replaced. USU has closed off this area in winter due to their existing condition.
- Project HPER Admin/Nursing Remodel - \$342,157: Consolidate the Nursing Program
- Project Medium Voltage Upgrade FY18 - \$147,948: Upgrade switch and substation isolation
- Project Ray B. West Reroof - \$354,151: Business school roof replacement

There were 13 draws to the Contingency Reserve Fund totaling \$243,765. Many of these draws were used to replace utility lines near the Student Center. The ending balance of the Contingency Reserve Fund is \$525,597. The Project Reserve Fund had 2 draws totaling \$211,268. The ending balance of the Project Reserve Fund is \$518,537. Mr. Berrett reported that both the Contingency and Project Reserve Funds are in good order.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT FOR DFCM**

Mr. Whittington, DFCM Assistant Director, presented the administrative report for DFCM.

- 11 leases issued
  - 4 for new space
  - 7 amendments to existing leases
- 55 professional service agreements awarded
  - 36 design agreements
  - 19 planning/study/other agreements
- 45 construction contracts issued. Approximately \$1M from Project Reserve Funds were used to award the following contracts:
  - Item #2, Matheson Courthouse Public Restrooms Valves and Fixtures Replacement
  - Item #7, Draper Prison Timpanogos Bldg #5 Air Handler Replacement, Lone Peak RTU
  - Item #11, Rio Grande Depot Repair and Restore Exterior Windows & Masonry Work
  - Item #36, DOT MTF Bldg Replace Air Cooled Chiller
- Capital Development Contingency Fund
  - Started the period with \$3,418,464 and ended with \$3,472,827, with 2 transfers to contingency totaling \$1,133,663 and 14 transfers to projects totaling \$1,079,300
- Capital Improvement Contingency Fund
  - Started the period with \$5,501,395 and ended with \$4,970,875, with 36 transfers to projects totaling \$588,108 and 3 transfers to the fund of \$57,588
- Project Reserve Fund
  - No increases and one decrease of \$71,502 ending with a balance of \$1,066,122, while the capital improvement project reserve fund had multiple transfers to the fund of \$1,608,482 and 7 transfers out totaling \$258,564, ending with a balance of \$6,051,187. The multiple transfers are due to closing many projects at the fiscal yearend deadline.
- Contingency Reserve Fund
  - The current projection is a deficit balance of (\$998,815). However, this is an improvement from the June projection of a deficit of (\$3,259,316)

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Director Reddoor thanked Heritage and Arts Director, Ms. Love, and her staff for providing the venue for today's meeting. Director Love welcomed the Board and meeting attendees on a tour

of the Rio Grande basement where several State artifacts are currently being stored.

- Meetings for Capital Development Hearings and Prioritizations will take place on October 4 and 5
- Chair Carnahan, Director Reddoor, and senior Board members will meet with the Board of Regents this afternoon (9/6/17) to review their prioritization and scoring processes
- Construction Budget Estimates (CBE's) are currently being finalized
- Prioritizations from the Board of Regents and Utah System of Technical Colleges will be distributed mid-September

**□ ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Mr. Snow moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was second by Ms. Barrager and passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 am.