

Office of the  
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

## **FY 2002 Budget Recommendations**

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for  
Capital Facilities and Administrative Services

**Capitol Preservation Board**

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information



**1.0 Summary: Capitol Preservation Board**

The Capitol Preservation Board was created to manage the day to day operations of Capitol Hill facilities and to plan for future remodeling of the Capitol Building.

The Board is a joint effort of the all three branches of government and the private sector. Utah Code (63C-9-201) provides the following membership:

<b>Legislative Branch</b>	<b>Senate (3 Members)</b> President, Minority Member, Majority Member	<b>House of Representatives (3 Members)</b> Speaker, Minority Member, Majority Member
<b>Executive Branch</b>	<b>Elected Officials (2)</b> Governor and Lt. Governor	<b>Executive Branch Employees (2)</b> Archives Director and Exec. Branch Appointee
<b>Judicial Branch</b>	Chief Justice of the Supreme Court	
<b>Private Citizens*</b>	<b>Professional Appointees (2)</b> Private Sector Architect and Engineer	<b>At-Large Appointees (2)</b> Two Appointees

*\*Private citizens are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate*

Table 1: Capitol Preservation Board Membership

The Board has complete jurisdiction over all Capitol Hill facilities and grounds including maintenance, furnishings, occupancy, public usage and long range master planning.

The Fiscal Year 2000 budget for the Board was taken from the direct appropriation to DFCM for Capitol Hill. Last year, \$30,000 was transferred from DFCM to the Board for operation of the Greenhouse. In the recommendation for Supplemental Appropriations, the Analyst recommends a transfer of current year funds back to DFCM to align the budget with the Governor's veto. The FY 2002 budget also reflects that transfer as a change to the base.

	<b>Analyst FY 2002 Base</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2002 Changes</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2002 Total</b>
<b>Financing</b>			
General Fund	2,407,100	(30,000)	2,377,100
Dedicated Credits Revenue	218,800		218,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,625,900</b>	<b>(\$30,000)</b>	<b>\$2,595,900</b>
<b>Programs</b>			
Capitol Preservation Board	2,625,900	(30,000)	2,595,900
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,625,900</b>	<b>(\$30,000)</b>	<b>\$2,595,900</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>			
Total FTE		2	2

## **2.0 Issues:**

### **2.1 Transfer of Greenhouse Funds**

During the 2000 Session, the Legislature passed a bill that would transfer control of the Capitol Hill Greenhouse (and associated funds) to the Capitol Preservation Board. The Governor vetoed the bill, so the funds must be returned to DFCM for management of the Greenhouse.

### **2.2 Signage on Capitol Hill**

The Capitol is the preeminent public building in the state. In addition to providing official space for elected officials, the Capitol serves a museum, a public meeting place and a tourist destination. As such, appearance plays a vital role in how the public perceives the Capitol.

During the last year, there seems to have been a growing number of activities that are announced by taping flyers to Capitol Building doors, walls and elevators. These flyers are unofficial notices of meeting changes, announcements of retirement parties or other non-priority proclamations. Most flyers carry messages directed at staff housed in the building and could be announced through the email system – other public notices could be placed on designated message boards in locations throughout the building.

As the Executive Director brings rules to the Board regarding appropriate uses of Capitol Hill, the Analyst encourages him to ensure appropriate placement of flyers and unofficial announcements in the building.

### **2.3 Capitol Remodeling**

The Capitol Preservation Board completed three remodeling projects during the 2000 interim. The projects created useable space in the old Supreme Court library, altered the receptionist area in the Fiscal Analyst's office and remodeled Senate office space. Each project is discussed in detail in Section 3.1.

### **2.4 Use of State Capitol**

The Capitol Building is used for many functions from judicial installations to high school proms. Anytime a group uses the building a cost is incurred for setup, cleaning and security. Anytime the Capitol is used for a private function, costs associated with hosting that function should be recovered by the Capitol Preservation Board. The Analyst recommends intent language to address this in section 3.2.

### **2.5 State Capitol History and Master Plan**

During the 2000 Interim, the Capitol Preservation Board received a Historical Structures report from an engineering firm and developed a master plan to guide Capitol restoration. Details can be found in section 3.3.

### 3.0 Programs

#### Recommendation

	2000	2001	2002	Est/Analyst
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
General Fund	2,098,400	2,287,100	2,407,100	120,000
Dedicated Credits Revenue	263,100	218,800	218,800	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,361,500</b>	<b>\$2,505,900</b>	<b>\$2,625,900</b>	<b>\$120,000</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	134,100	136,500	136,500	
In-State Travel		3,000	3,000	
Out of State Travel	6,700			
Current Expense	2,212,900	2,366,200	2,366,200	
DP Current Expense	7,800	200	120,200	120,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,361,500</b>	<b>\$2,505,900</b>	<b>\$2,625,900</b>	<b>\$120,000</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
Total FTE		2	2	

#### 3.1 Capitol Remodeling Projects

The Capitol Preservation Board completed three remodeling projects during the 2000 interim. The projects created useable space in the old Supreme Court library, altered the receptionist area in the Fiscal Analyst’s office and remodeled Senate office space. Although the Capitol is scheduled to be completely remodeled in three to five years, the building remains the working house of legislation for the state and must be able to accommodate functions associated with the Legislative session.

*New Committee Rooms Provide Needed Space*

When the Supreme Court moved to its new home at the Matheson Courthouse, it also moved the State Law Library, vacating a large space in the northeast corner of the Capitol’s first floor. With funds from other project savings, capital improvement accounts and non-lapsing balances, the Board created two large committee rooms, three small meeting rooms and offices for CPB staff.

The focus of the project centered on committee room space. During the Legislative session, there are often times that there is a shortage of committee room space. For several years, the Executive Offices and Criminal Justice Appropriation Subcommittee met in the Fiscal Analyst conference room. With the creation of two new committee rooms, that committee will be able to move to another room that can accommodate the public without forcing them to stand in hallways and staff working space.

*Space for Analyst  
support staff  
improved*

Staff space for the Legislative Fiscal Analyst falls far short of statewide standards used in the Executive Branch. CPB staff attempted to maximize this space by installing systems furniture, but found that the offices were too small to accommodate the new furniture. The Analyst decided that it would be unwise to purchase expensive new furniture that could not be transferred upon completion of surge space behind the Capitol. Instead, the CPB restructured support staff work stations and the Analyst's reception area to provide better working space and to better control access to offices and documents.

*Senate  
Administrative  
Space Improved*

The open layout of administrative space for the Senate presented several problems in relation to noise, access and security. A new floor plan will give the Senate control over access, isolate noisy office equipment and will provide noise dampening during peak times. The remodeling project, paid for with Senate funds, moves a few walls and eliminates an entrance to the administrative space. The new configuration will provide public access without impeding on work space for committee secretaries.

### **3.2 Use of Capitol Building**

The Capitol Building is used for many functions from judicial installations to high school dances. Anytime a group uses the building a cost is incurred for setup, cleaning and security. When the Capitol is used for a private function, costs associated with hosting that function should be recovered by the Capitol Preservation Board.

The Capitol Preservation Board is in the process of writing rules to address the use of the Capitol Building. The rule will consider the time, place and manner of activities and assign a cost to different types of functions. The Analyst believes that the Board should consider standards based not only on space, but also on type of organization using the facility. If a high school wants to use the building for a dance, the cost may be less than for a lobbying group that wants to host a rally. At a minimum, however, the Analyst recommends that the Capitol Preservation Board recover costs from any group using the rotunda or other Capitol area in a way that incurs costs for security, set up or cleaning. To this end, the Analyst recommends the following intent language:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that any person, group or organization who holds an event in the Capitol Building or on Capitol Hill grounds pay for costs associated with staging the event.*

### 3.3 Historical Structures and Master Plan

The Capitol Preservation Board contracted with Cooper/Roberts Architects to complete a comprehensive assessment of the Capitol Building. The three volume, four inch document traces the history of the Capitol and reports on the viability of essential systems that make up the building's infrastructure. The report focuses on life safety, functional use and architectural integrity. Cooper/Roberts<sup>1</sup> found the following issues to be most important:

#### *Life Safety*

- ◆ The building must be seismically retrofitted to prevent loss of life;
- ◆ Fire poses a threat due to lack of exits, poor signage, lack of fire suppression systems and long distances to exits.

#### *Functional Usefulness*

- ◆ Column spacing at fourteen feet limits interior flexibility;
- ◆ Open space has been converted to office use;
- ◆ Staff and Legislative size increased greatly since 1916.

#### *Historical and Architectural Integrity*

- ◆ Grounds are significantly different compared to 1916;
- ◆ Exterior is largely the same as originally designed;
- ◆ Interior is mostly unchanged with the exception of added office space.

*Building can  
be functional  
and historic*

Almost half of all states have embarked on some sort of Capitol restoration over the last ten years. Some states attempted to duplicate original designs. The State of Wisconsin actually hired a furniture designer to replicate original desks and chairs. Other states have taken a long term approach that restores their capitol a little bit at a time. The Iowa capitol is now in its 16<sup>th</sup> year of restoration. Most states have attempted to blend tradition with functionality. Texas added new space behind its capitol for legislative committee and office space. All ceremonial space inside the original building was restored in a way that allowed for ceremonial function as well as day to day use.

The Analyst believes that the master plan proposed by the Capitol Preservation Board provides the state with a realistic means to restore the Capitol building in a way that is cost-effective, maximizes utility and preserves the historic nature of the building. As the restoration commences, the Analyst believes that the Capitol can serve both as the icon of state government and as the house of legislation that is its primary function. Public spaces should be maintained in historic fashion while meeting rooms and office spaces can be organized to provide maximum utility. Further information on specific design can be found in the Analyst's capital budget recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cooper/Roberts Architects. (July 2000) Utah State Capitol: Building and Grounds Restoration Master Plan and Historic Structures Report.

**4.0 Additional Information: Capitol Preservation Board**

	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
General Fund			2,098,400	2,287,100	2,407,100
Dedicated Credits Revenue			263,100	218,800	218,800
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$2,361,500</u>	<u>\$2,505,900</u>	<u>\$2,625,900</u>
<b>Programs</b>					
Capitol Preservation Board			2,361,500	2,505,900	2,625,900
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$2,361,500</u>	<u>\$2,505,900</u>	<u>\$2,625,900</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>					
Personal Services			134,100	136,500	136,500
In-State Travel				3,000	3,000
Out of State Travel			6,700		
Current Expense			2,212,900	2,366,200	2,366,200
DP Current Expense			7,800	200	120,200
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$2,361,500</u>	<u>\$2,505,900</u>	<u>\$2,625,900</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>					
Total FTE				2	2