



CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY BOARD  
Santiam Conference Room at Dept of Forestry  
2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310

MEETING MINUTES – October 21, 2005 1:40 p.m. – 2:35 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Bill Neland, Chair  
Ed Galligan, Port of Portland, retired  
Denny Nielsen, Salem Hospital, retired  
Vickie Hardin Woods, City of Salem  
Peter Fernandez, Public Works Department

**MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE:**

Ron Polvi, Northwest Natural  
Tom McMullen, Vice Chair

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Bill Foster, DAS Facilities Division  
John Wales, DAS Facilities Division  
Elaine Schacher, DAS Facilities Division

Andy Golay, Oregon Youth Authority  
Joan Dalton, Oregon Youth Authority  
Mark Tyler, Department of Education

**Handouts distributed to all members present:**

- Agenda
- Minutes from September 16, 2005 meeting
- Administrative Rule 125-125-0050 through 125-125-0450
- Salem-Keizer Area Review Project No. 415000-01 OYA Project Pooch Kennels
- Project Pooch brochure (MacLaren)
- MacLaren School narrative, vicinity map, floor plan and elevation plan

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman, *Bill Neland* called the meeting to order at 1:40 pm.

**Public Testimony.**

No public testimony was requested.

**ADMINISTRATION**

**A1. Board Meeting Minutes of September 16, 2005**

*Bill Neland* asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

*Vickie Hardin Woods* moved and *Peter Fernandez* seconded to approve the minutes of the September 16, 2005 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

**A.2 CPAB Rule Changes**

*Bill Foster* reported that what is before the Board is some revisions to the Administrative Rule, Division 125 to reflect the consequences of Senate Bill 90 that permanently eliminated the Capitol Planning Commission plus a few other changes related to leasing. It was a process of going through the rule surgically and as it turned out, it did not take a whole lot of change to accomplish what was really needed. For instance, it had the period of the last biennium that this was in effect. Now that this was permanently done, the dates come out. On page 2 there is reference to the leasing plan and the biennial leasing plan. These are new requirements and the threshold was brought down from 25,000 to 10,000 square feet. On page 4 the new composition of the Board is reflected including the two members from the City of Salem that was made part of that bill. The procedure for submitting reports on the next page is adding reference to that leasing plan. What we are attempting get the agencies to do here is to submit a specific plan for a large lease but we are also asking them to give us a biennial plan of what they are doing for leasing, for context. That ends up being helpful to us as well because then we have an idea what they may be changing and how to better interact with them. Then, another piece is that we are heading toward this applying to

# Approved 01-20-06

lands in the city of Salem rather than some of the broader context that the Capitol Planning Commission used to have. We have an anomaly of things slipping through the cracks with the project that the Board will review today. By SB90, we took that to be just the areas within the City of Salem. *Bill Neland* asked if the project that the Board toured last month was within the city of Salem (Department of Safety Standards and Training Academy). Response: Yes. *Bill Foster* continued that the reference to Keizer was removed. This is something that evolved when Keizer became a city. The City of Keizer really didn't ever really need to be there because there were no properties that DAS was dealing with in the city of Keizer.

*Bill Neland* acknowledged the arrival of Ed Galligan at 1:45 pm. *Ed* explained that the reason he is tardy is because traffic was held up due to a whole gaggle of geese crossing the road and they walked very, very slowly.

*Bill Foster* continued: In the process of doing this revision, the attempt was made to differentiate between the major projects that would come to the board and some of the minor projects may be handled administratively. What the rules says is that CPAB reviews will be for major projects or those requiring public input. *Bill Neland* asked if "major project" is defined. *Bill Foster* responded; yes, it is defined in terms of what it is. In terms of whether it is a one step or two step review. That was previously in there.

*Denny Nielsen* inquired about the leasing plan on page 2 "a site with 10,000 or more conditioned square feet for a term of ten years or more. Is ten years a threshold that must be met before they will be reviewed? *Bill Foster* responded; yes, the threshold was changed from 25,000 to 10,000 square feet. The ten years was already there. *Denny* concluded that the term must be ten years before there is any scrutiny. *Bill Foster* responded "correct". Although what DAS is also asking, though it is not necessarily for a particular review, but for context, is this plan for all of the leasing that they are planning to do for the next biennium.

*Bill Foster* continued – On page 6 under Area Plans, we didn't have exactly the right name of two plans. There was an earlier historic name used than what it currently is in the previous rules. For example: Hillcrest was Fairview-Hillcrest, since there is no Fairview, it's now "Hillcrest".

*Bill Neland* asked about page 10, number 1. He wanted to know if this would allow DAS to approach the agency rather than waiting for the agency to come to DAS with Capitol Mall Area reviews. *Bill Foster* explained that this is referencing the Capitol Mall Area Design Review group. With certain projects there would be reviews before both groups, on other things, they would just come to the Capitol Mall Area group. This is just clarifying that. DAS will also be updating another document that describes how these plans are prepared. This document will be updated to give better instruction to the agencies about these leasing plans. This is pretty minimal here but those requirements will be more clearly spelled out in the companion document referenced in Page 3, #5, the State Facilities Planning Process Manual. Realistically, it is going to be fairly minimal treatment to make the changes. The intent was to show it to the Board before beginning the formal rules process to start in November and they will be adopted by January, 2006.

*Peter Fernandez* asked about that sub-committees that the Capitol Planning Commission dealt with on Capitol Mall Projects and Parking. Were those committees dissolved? *Bill Foster* responded that there was a parking committee. It was really not a part of the Capitol Planning Commission. It was something that was advisory to DAS. It had been dissolved but it appears that it may be re-energized. The Assistant City Manager and some other staff came in to talk with us a few months ago and we concluded that it really would be beneficial to put that back into place. It is all of these different related things that nobody has full control over because there is coalition between transit and the Cities' parking and the State's parking and the Capitol. A forum needs to exist to talk about those things. It hasn't happened yet but *Bill* thinks it needs to.

*Peter* further noted that on Page 2, number 9, capitol improvement is misspelled. It should read "capital" with an 'a'. *Bill Foster* agreed that this correction was needed.

**Action:** *Denny Nielsen* moved to accept the report and affirmed that the document makes sense. *Vickie Hardin Woods* seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

John Wales pointed out the map on the last page of the Oregon Youth Authority handout to give the Board members some orientation of where MacLaren is located. *Bill Foster* added that under the Capitol Planning Commission, it included the Salem-Keizer Area plus the unincorporated areas of Marion and Polk counties. You ended up with something like Monmouth, where Western Oregon University is located, even though it is in Polk county, it was in an incorporated city so the Capitol Planning Commission didn't have anything to say about it. Really the only thing that fell outside of that description, was MacLaren. It is located outside the city limits of Woodburn, immediately adjacent to it. With the processing and everything that has gone on. Under the old process, it would need to be reviewed. When the new rule goes into effect, it will not be subject to review because the city of Salem is really where the focus is. It's a minor thing that in the future, DAS would deal with administratively, but here it is and it's between the cracks so you are getting it.

*Vickie* asked if this is the level of project the Board will be seeing and added that it is an exciting project. *Bill Foster* responded no, that is exactly his point. What DAS will try to do is deal with the more minor projects administratively. But again, that's what is in the rule which has not yet been adopted.

## SALEM AREA REVIEWS PURSUANT TO OAR 125-125-0350

### B1. MacLaren (Dog Kennel) Initial Submittal Minor Project

A brochure and narrative handout was presented to the Board by Oregon Youth Authority speakers Andy Golay, Facilities Manager and Joan Dalton, head of the Project Pooch Program at MacLaren. This purpose of this presentation is to explain what the building is that they are proposing for the Project Pooch program is. The project is consistent with the area plan for MacLaren. *Andy* pointed out the stated paragraph on the first page of the handout talking about the vocational emphasis for the youth at MacLaren. There is emphasis on developing good work habits, getting along with employers and fellow workers, and being prepared to begin and complete a project. MacLaren is not just about holding youth, there is an education aspect and part of the educational aspect is the vocational program. Project Pooch is an important part of that vocational program. *Joan* shared that her background is vocational education and she started the Pooch program at MacLaren in 1993. What they are trying to do is teach the young men who are incarcerated at MacLaren some vocational skills as well as showing them a work ethic; what it means to be responsible, patient and compassionate for all life which encompasses vegetation around the area to the dogs that they work with. All these dogs come from local shelters and the dogs have problems much like the youth. *Andy* added that the youth do some training of these animals and eventually these dogs are trained, enabling them to go back into the community. The program adopts them out and the youth gets the experience of having a dog to love and take care of. *Joan* added that the program also gives the youth some vocational skill opportunities as well so they learn about different dog breeds, different behaviors, different careers and job possibilities by working with these dogs at the kennel.

The building itself is shown on the second page of the handout. The plan view of the campus shows a bold square where the existing Project Pooch is located and where the addition will be. The filled in box is where the new building will be. The open box below is where the existing kennel is. The existing building has five kennels and a small classroom attached. This new building will have a very small impact on the look of the campus. It is on the back side of the campus with a small footprint. It is auxiliary to an existing program. The effect on the campus will not be very large. *Joan* added that MacLaren is trying to serve more needs and give the opportunity to more youth with this program. The 3<sup>rd</sup> page is a floor plan view of the building itself. He emphasized that the size of this building is 23 sq ft X 15 sq ft for a total of less than 400 sq ft. The crosshatch section of the drawing represents four enclosed kennels. It is a concrete block structure. The area to the right is a dog run. The last page is a side view of the elevation of the building. It is a shed roof type of design. The block part shown in the design is the enclosed part of the kennel. There will be a concrete block half wall, then fencing above that half wall, and a standing sheet metal roof. Utilities to the building will bring over electric for lighting and a little bit of slab heating for the dogs inside the enclosed areas. They will bring over water and a couple hose bibs and connect the drains into the existing drains for that area of the campus. Funding will be done by donations exclusively. They have a donation of \$20,000 for the project. *Bill Neland* commented that he imagined there wouldn't be much difficulty raising funds for this type of project. *Joan* responded that there are a lot of people out there who like the idea that this program is a win-win for both the dogs and the kids.

*Denny Nielsen* asked the cost of the project. *Andy* responded that the \$20,000 is the donation. They bid this out once and the bids were \$80,000. Those bids were rejected and they are now negotiating with general contractors to donate their time and to help coordinate some subs who will also donate their time. *Denny Nielsen* asked what \$80,000 would work out per

# Approved 01-20-06

square foot. *Bill Neland* asked if the contractors working conditions were like the Penitentiary where all the materials would need to be removed at the end of the shift. *Andy* responded, not at all, they will be using youth labor as much as possible. *Ed Galligan* commented that it is probably a product of the construction that is going on. These contractors are saying they don't need this small project and if you really want us to do it, you're going to pay a huge premium for it. If you call them three years from now, when the building boom crashes, they will probably cut their price by a third. *Andy* continued that another aspect of the project is that they are requiring the contractor to use youth labor as well as non-skilled in hauling logs, digging trenches, etc.

*Bill Neland* indicated that the last time he visited MacLaren, he toured some tents and he wanted to know if this kennel was anywhere near those tents. *Joan* responded that it is in the general area and beyond. The tents are still there. The original kennel was located where the tents are now. They had only two kennels and a small area for food storage but then when the tents went up, they moved the kennel. *Andy* added that the tents are getting to the end of their life. They went up in 1995 and they were meant to be temporary. Their life span was ten years. *Andy* continued that they have obtained a building permit from Marion County for Project Pooch and they are ready to begin construction once they get a contractor lined up. There are no conflicts with archeology or wetlands or those types of concerns.

*Ed Galligan* commented that this is a wonderful project and a noble cause.

*John Wales* commented that the form used in the Board packet for this project is the short form. Future projects the Board sees will be more comprehensive.

*Denny Nielsen* inquired whether the Humane Society participates in this program in any way other than supplying the dogs. *Joan* responded that they supply the dogs. They get quite a few dogs from Salem. In the past they used their cruelty investigators for animal neglect and abuse. *Denny* wanted to know if they are willing to give up any of their resources to help with this program. *Joan* responded no, but they do have two dogs from Hurricane Katrina. *Bill Neland* commented that the Humane Society is overloaded with dogs from Hurricane Katrina. They were just on the Animal Planet last week so they are getting international dogs owned by Animal Planet in the United Kingdom. They are getting good results with this program. Of the 100 kids that have entered the program they have 100% recidivism, based on a survey of 100 youth that have been through the program since 1993.

*John Wales* asked the ages of the youth. *Joan* responded that right now they have an older group. The youngest is age 18 and the oldest 23. However, when they first started the program in 1993, they had youth as young as 15. With measure 11, they have older youth who have graduated from high school. MacLaren wants everyone working or going to school.

**Action:** *Ed Galligan* moved to accept the Pooch Project report. *Vickie Hardin Woods* seconded the motion and it carried unanimously

*Joan* invited the Board to visit the MacLaren facility and see the dogs.

*Andy* further added that this is the first opportunity some of these youth have actually had to love something and form emotional attachment. *Ed* asked if any of the animals come back. *Joan* responded yes, and added that it is a good lesson for the youth because many of them have been in several foster homes and they know how it is that sometimes it doesn't work out. It's not a reflection on the training that they do with these dogs. A lot of times, the people adopting, don't realize that it's quite a commitment to keep up with the training. They compare it a lot to parenting. *Ed* asked if they go through a process to actually qualify somebody to adopt one of the dogs. *Joan* responded that the application form was modeled after the Humane Society application. Applicants will receive an hour home visit. If that is successful, they do a trial visit for the dog on an overnight or weekend prior to the final agreement.

*Bill Neland* announced that his concludes the formal business of the meeting. The Board is scheduled to meet the third Friday of November, however, there will be no meeting in December and the Board will reconvene in January, 2006 when they begin building toward the legislative presentations.

*John Wales* explained that it was recognized that this was a short agenda but the reason the Board was encouraged to attend this meeting was the fact that this will be the last opportunity to take people inside the facility before security clamps down.

## TOUR

### C1. Tour of Computer Data Center (CNIC)

Project Manager, Bryan Olyear conducted an informational tour of the Computer Data Center.

*Ed Galligan* asked for a 30 second update on the management of the Computer Data Center. *Bill Foster* responded that it is continuing to evolve somewhat. One of the decisions made was that the Data Center Manager would actually become an Administrator of a Division of the Department of Administrative Services. That person is now on board, fairly recently, and is beginning to work through some things so they are slowly beginning to get some definitive approaches to how it is going to evolve and be organized. They are also starting to advertise and hire for some of the managers and the support team. What they have now is a whole group of people that are described as 'in scope' for this consolidation with different agencies and they are planning how to manage the transition as to who will actually ultimately be an employee of the Data Center.

*Denny Nielsen* asked if they will ultimately achieve any economies in terms of the human resources related to the previous model as it sounds like they are adding on as apposed to combining resources. *Bill* responded that this isn't the plan. The intent would be to ultimately end up with approximately 60 fewer FTE supporting the data center, once it's up and running, than they currently have. There has been some argument about where the start number is and the end number, scope and those kinds of things but certainly some of the operational savings that they were projecting was for fewer FTE. *Denny* clarified that he remembers that clearly because that's how the whole program was rationalized originally was through those savings. However, what he is talking about is the administrative level where they had all the opportunities initially where there might be economies. *Bill* responded that there are probably still more that exist but they can only bite off so many things at the same time so they need to begin to actually get the Center implemented. The biggest benefit is to only three agencies. There are a total of twelve agencies in the program that will be consolidated into CNIC. Then there is a potential of reaching out further into state government. Whether it involves discussions with the Secretary of State and the Treasurer about consolidating some of those functions or some of the legislative functions so all of those are out there for potential future considerations but at least the scope of this initially is a little more limited.

*Ed Galligan* asked about the background of the new manager. *Bill* responded that he has worked for a variety of places including IBM and has been through this process before, which is a real benefit because a lot of the people previously involved with this project had not been through a consolidation before at the detail level. He brings a knowledge base into the equation that was not there before and has been very helpful. It is still a big venture and some of the savings will be in personnel but some of it is also the facility. There was an open house one week ago and several legislators attended. One of the people, who have been involved in some of this, has come around to the opinion that even if there is no savings, the level of reliability and security that the new Center will bring is probably worth it. What previously existed has been significantly upgraded in terms of redundancies and security and those kinds of things. Any savings on top of that will be very beneficial. The original projection was a savings of \$10 million per year once it is up and fully functional. *Ed* responded that this is very impressive. Given all the criticism that government always gets, this is a great model to ultimately demonstrate that in concrete numbers. *Bill* added that some of the folks that initially tried to implement it had underestimated the level of problems dealing with the personnel and that has been a big adventure. *Ed* asked if the state has previously done reductions in work force in the past and do they have a format and process to go through, having just done it about a year ago. It was about as tight as one could make it and out of 80 people that were put out of a job, only one sued and that suit will not stand the test of anything reasonable. *Bill* responded that the hope is that a lot of this will work itself out in time. Initially they are going to capture all the people and then slowly begin to build permanent positions. In the meantime they are working and helping with the transition and at the same time there is a certain amount of attrition with retirements and other kinds of things. It varies somewhat depending on which group you are dealing with in state government. Most of these folks previously had not been represented and part of the deal with the union is that now they will be represented. There are some things that will probably help, through that process and those agreements, most of which will go unchallenged. *Ed* added that this is a tough assignment because you've got security issues and when you have disgruntled employees in a high security environment, it is a real challenge.

*Bill Neland* asked if all the hardware will be new. *Bill Foster* responded that it is a mixture. Some existing equipment will be lifted and moved and others are new, with new technology.

# Approved 01-20-06

## **NEXT MEETING**

D.1 Next meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2005 1:30 pm to 4:00 pm at Department of Forestry, 2600 State Street, Salem, OR. No meeting is scheduled in December and the Board will reconvene January 20, 2006.

*Prepared by Elaine G. Schacher, DAS Facilities*