



Note from the Executive Director – Karren Bee-Donohoe

The winter meeting of the SUNY Physical Plant Administrators Association (SUNY/PPAA) just ended and once again offered a wealth of information through both formal sessions and networking conversations. The OCF staff and I really appreciate these discussions. This event provides a great mix of campus, SUNY, SUCF, and DASNY staff focusing on facilities management, construction, environmental health and safety, energy management and more. We look forward to the summer event which also includes interaction with many vendors in a single venue.

Energy management continues to be an active area in OCF. The annual report for EO88 is in production by the Build Smart team, and SUNY continues to shine overall in the program, but more is to be done. Our new energy manager (see *Welcome*) will work closely with the campuses on all things EO88.

New in the program will be a monthly award to highlight facilities staff efforts that assist in EO88 goals. These Build Smart NY Facility Star awards will not be geared to the large projects such as those that were awarded during the first annual Build Smarter Innovators Summit, but rather to recognize the extraordinary efforts of state employees contributing to BuildSmart NY goals. An

application will be developed soon and shared with the campuses.

Another exciting initiative of the Build Smart program is their work toward creating a grant program designed to provide funding to jumpstart energy efficiency measures. Key to the program will be a requirement to reinvest the savings back into additional Energy Efficient Operations and Maintenance (EEO&M) measures. Details on the application process, measurement and verification and how reinvestment of the savings will be measured are all in development.

In other energy developments, building meters on many campuses are getting connected to the New York Energy Manager. It takes approximately three months of being on-line for the team to begin providing recommendations for energy savings. We look forward to sharing specific results in the next several months.

Lastly, campuses are continuing to progress Start-UP NY plans. OCF participates in the plan review process as well as coordinating the tax-exempt bonding attestation process. Continued tracking of private use will include changes in the future.

- Karren Bee-Donohoe, Executive Director

Contents

Page 1

- Notes from the Executive Director
- Welcome new staff
- NFPA Document Access

Page 2

- Code Training Update
- New Gift Regulations

Page 3

- Residence Halls — New vs. Rehab

Welcome!

SUNY Office For Capital Facilities welcomes two new staff members to the office.

Eric Mazzone is the new Energy Manager and will be working with campuses on compliance with EO88.

Amanda Harbinger is our new keyboard specialist and will be working with Ashley Moak on general office management, website updates, listserv management and other communications with the campuses.

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Document Access – by Barbara Boyle

Through the efforts of SUNYConnect, we now have all-access to the codes, standards, and documents of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). These consensus standards are considered best practice and many are NYS Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Codes reference standards. I'd like to thank John Schumacher, Carey Hatch and SUNY-

Connect for their efforts. This is a great shared resource, that I hope everyone uses liberally!

FREE Access to National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) documents via SUNY Connect : <http://codesonline.nfpa.org> (You must connect via a valid SUNY IP address. No password will be required).

The link should recognize your SUNY

IP address and give you immediate access. There should be no need for a sign in or password. If you bump into a problem, remember that this is a new process that may need to be tweaked. Please contact John at john.schumacher@suny.edu. He will need the information from your computer that you can get at <http://www.whatismyip.com/>

Updated Codes Training – by Barbara Boyle

Effective January 1 of this year is a new 19 NYCRR Part 1208, *Minimum Standards for Code Enforcement Training in the State of New York*. The new training regulation provides a number of changes for code enforcement personnel.

There are still two classes of certification, now called Building Safety Inspector (BSI) and the Code Enforcement Official (CEO). Basic training for each has been slightly tweaked and is 60 hours for the BSI and 120 hours for the CEO. The in-service requirements are still 6 hours per year for the BSI and 24 hours for the CEO, but there are some changes. The new regulations also formalize transitions from one level to another and provide for revocation of status in response to fraudulent reporting of training.

Failure to complete the in-service training renders the BSI/CEO inactive. If they fail to meet the requirements for three consecutive years or *if they fail to complete advanced in-service training in the period prescribed by the Secretary, then the former BSI/CEO must repeat basic training to regain certification.* (Advanced in-service training, sometimes referred to as “transition training,” is prescribed by the Secretary from time to time. Hours for such required training count towards the in-service training requirement.) Otherwise, a BSI/CEO returns to active status immediately upon completion of the 6/24 hours in-service for the current year. That training will also carry over the following year’s status. The three month grace period has been discontinued. The Secretary may

allow exemptions for extenuating circumstances (e.g., health, military deployment).

The requirements and options for training have changed. There are five ways to amass acceptable training hours: (1) courses developed and presented by DBSC (Division of Building Standards and Codes); (2) course approved and certified by DBSC and presented by approved adjuncts; (3) online courses approved and certified by DBSC (no maximum hours); (4) Professional Development Electives (PDEs, both online and in-person); and, (5) ICC Certification exams (limited to 8 hours of credit per exam).

Within their 24 hours annual in-service training requirement, CEOs

Continued on page 3

New Gift Regulations – by Jessica R. Miller

The question often comes up, a supplier or vendor offers you a gift, can you accept it? Like so many other questions, the answer is—it depends.

On June 18, 2014, the Joint Commission on Public Ethics (JCOPE)’s new regulations governing the acceptance of gifts, honoraria and official activity expense (travel) payments by State officers and employees became effective. Below are links to these regulations.

[19 NYCRR Part 930 Honoraria](#)

[19 NYCRR Part 931 Official Activity Expense Payments](#)

[19 NYCRR Part 933 Gifts for Public Officials](#)

Also available is [JCOPE’s Guide to the new gift regulations for State Officers and Employees](#), which provides guid-

ance on determining whether a gift can be permissibly accepted by a State officer or employee under the new gift regulations in Part 933.

Provided below are a few examples of gifts similar to those addressed by JCOPE in an Advisory Opinion. An explanation of why it is or isn’t appropriate to accept such a gift.

EXAMPLE #1: A campus employee wins \$100 by placing second in a foot race open to the public sponsored by an entity who is a supplier to the campus. The employee may accept the prize money because the event is a competition open to the public.

EXAMPLE #2: A Director of Facilities is attending a job-related Statewide conference with multiple sponsors, some of which do business with, or

wish to do business with, the Campus. At the conference, all participants, including private and State employees, have the opportunity to enter a raffle by dropping their business cards into a fishbowl from which a winner or winners are selected. The campus employee’s name is drawn from the raffle bowl; she has won a weekend at a Vermont inn, donated by a sponsor. The director may keep the prize.

EXAMPLE #3: A consultant offers to drive the campus employee to a conference or meeting and pay for tolls and gas. The campus employee may not accept travel from the consultant. Travel is considered a gift, as defined in Legislative Law, and is prohibited since it would be more than a nominal value, and is not being offered to everyone.



Updated Codes Training, Continued – by Barbara Boyle

are required to take at least 12 hours of DBSC approved training. (*They may continue to take the whole 24 hours under this category, as was past practice.*) The required 12 hours must contain at least three hours in each of the following topics: Code Enforcement and Administration, Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code, and Energy Conservation Construction Code. The remaining hours are at the discretion of the CEO (after any advance in-service requirement is met). BSIs must complete at least 3 of their 6 hour requirement with DBSC approved training in Code Enforce-

ment and Administration.

The new category of acceptable training is *Professional Development Electives (PDEs)*. These are documented to the DBSC at the end of the year and appropriate documentation (eight items specified in the regulations) must be maintained for three years for potential auditing. PDEs are training courses with subject matter to advance the professional development of the CEO or BSI. Topics include but are not limited to zoning, planning, ethics, management, communications, hazards, writing skills, time management, records management, media relations,

and computer skills. Credit is not provided for courses where attendance is not recorded (or registered) and maintained by the sponsor. Credit is not provided for meetings, roundtable discussions, work experience, and pre-recorded videos. PDE courses are only credited towards the year they are taken. There is no pre-approval process.

Please feel free to contact Barbara Boyle for additional information. A summary of the training requirements can be found at <http://www.dos.ny.gov/dcea/TrainingRegs.html>.

Residence Halls, New vs. Rehab – by David Ferrari

Should we build a new residence hall, or fix the one we have? Many campuses grapple with this question as residence hall capital plans are developed. Enthusiastic debate often surrounds the topic, and many factors must be considered. Each campus must thoroughly evaluate the impact this decision will have on the campus and the overall residence hall program, including the quality of life and total experience the outcome will deliver to the students.

There is often a clear answer to questions that relate to health or safety concerns. But the more subjective questions, those questions relating to student satisfaction, present a greater challenge to the teams responsible for residence hall planning and changes. One component to consider is what changes will make your campus more desirable than the competition. From campus to campus the reasons for expanding or renovating residence halls vary. A campus may choose new con-

struction to diversify its bed stock by adding apartments or townhouse style housing. Another campus may choose to build a more traditional style residence hall, one with double loaded corridors and group style bathrooms, in order to meet its demand at the most affordable price. Generally speaking, campuses that choose rehabilitation do so because it is a less expensive option than new construction.

Another component to consider is the type of construction used to build a new residence hall facility. Wood framed and modular structures are options. Although they cost much less the useful life of wood framed buildings is considerably less that of traditional dormitory buildings. Modular have varying useful life depending on construction materials. The lower cost compared to traditional construction may play a role in the decision making process. Additionally, most steel and concrete residence halls will need a significant, if not a complete gut, re-

hab by the end of 30 years ... roughly the same projected useful life of the lighter construction models.

As campuses contemplate whether to build new facilities or rehab the old, here are several questions to consider:

- Is the demand driving the decision to add or renovate? Are students currently in forced triples?
- Are the beds being considered the right style? Is there sufficient demand for that style of bed, and will they be filled?
- Can the campus afford the project? Remember, the Residence Hall Program is completely self sustaining.

As it is with any major decision, planning is an integral part of the process. To ensure the total Residence Hall Program remains solvent all projects must be included in the campus' 10-year capital plan which estimates the campus' ability to afford the projects.

