## CRIMINAL JUSTICE

# 2002-07 Minnesota Capital Budget

Presented by Governor Jesse Ventura to the 82nd Legislature

This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp



#### 2002-07 CAPITAL BUDGET

#### -INDEX-

### **CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

	<u>Page Number</u>
Governor's Recommendations (by funding sources)	H-1
Corrections Department	H-37



The *Executive Summary* of the 2002-2007 Minnesota Capital Budget and 9-volume set of detailed requests can be viewed at the Department of Finance's web site at: www.finance.state.mn.us

------

1	<u>جا</u> ، زعر	ي معام م م	è	ाम 'च	- 163 <u>1</u> 67	, styres <sub>an</sub> menter ,
			·	*****	-	
			وم م	72		

.

. .

nally left blank.

### This page intentionally left blank.

Agency Request F.Y. 2002–2007							(BY FUI	NDING SOU (\$ In Th	RCES)	
			Funding	Ag	ency Reques	st	Governor's Recommendation		Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	
Administration, Department of										
Statewide CAPRA	· 1	470	GO	27,700	25,000	25,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	
			GF	300	0	0	0	0	0	
Agency Relocation	2	270	GF	7,601	1,500	3,000	1,500	0	0	
DOT Exterior Repair	3	235	THF	5,046	4,720	5,044	5,046	4,720	5,044	
New State Buildings	4	445	GO	84,589	0	0	84,589	. 0	0	
			GF	0	9,200	0	0	9,200	0	
Renovation of 1246 University	6	265	GO	11,827	0	0	0	0	0	
			GF	0	300	0	0	0	0	
Capitol Complex Electrical Work	7	350	GO	3,231	0	0	3,231	0	0	
Governor's Residence Renovation & Repair	8	275	GO	4,246	0	0	4,246	0	0	
·			GF	45	0	0	45	0	0	
Stassen Buildout/Rice & University Predesign	9	245	GO	2,730	4,407	0	0	0	0	
			GF	427	0	0	0	0	0	
Property Acquisition	10	140	GO	1,500	7,500	15,000	0	. 0	0	
New State Buildings			GO	0	75,000	75,000	0	0	0	
Administration Ramp Replacement			GO	0	0	6,000	0	. 0	0	

#### Funding Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

### STATE OF MINNESOTA

## GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

······································				Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority		; Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Children, Families & Learning									
Early Childhood Facilities Grants	1	275	GO	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0	0
Red Lake School Additions and Renovations	2	300	GO	40,125	0	0	12,400	0	0
Public Library Accessibility Grants	3	260	GO	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	0
Library for the Blind Renovation	4	200	GO	500	9,824	0	0	0	0
			ſ						
			Project Total	\$46,625	\$15,824	\$6,000	\$12,400	\$0	\$0
	Ge	eneral Ob	ligation Bonding	\$46,625	\$15,824	\$6,000	\$12,400	\$0	\$0
Commerce, Department of									
Energy Investment Loan Program	1	400	GO/UF	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
			Project Total	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000
		User	Finance Bonding	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000

Funding	Source
---------	--------

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

d.

F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

				Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	-	F.Y. 2006
Corrections, Department of									
MCF-LL - 416-Bed Offender Housing Unit	1	356	GO	4,160	0	0	4,160	0	0
DOC - Asset Preservation	2	445	GO	23,100	15,000	15,000	23,100	15,000	15,000
MCF-SHK - ILC Renovation & Support Space	3	250	GO	3,070	0	0	3,070	0	0
MCF-STW - New Seg. Unit Design/Predesign	4	260	GO	906	0	0	90	0	0
MCF-RW - New Vocational Building	5	260	GO	4,938	0	0	0	0	0
MCF-FRB – Kitchen Renovation Predesign/Design	6	135	GO	346	0	0	· 0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Activities Building	7	195	GO	1,523	0	0	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - New Vocational Building	8	100	GO	8,070	0	0	0	0	0
MCF-SHK - 62-Bed Living Unit (Phase II)			GO	0	3,409	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Renovation of Old Ed & Admin Bldg.			GO	0	1,500	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Electronic Locks for CHA & CHD	<u>electron and the spec</u>		GO	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
MCF-OPH - Security System Upgrade			GO	0	4,029	0	0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Industry Warehouse - ML			GO	0	596	0	0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Vehicle Garage - ML		- and a subsection of the second s	GO	0	148	0	0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Kitchen Expansion - WR			GO	0	34	0	0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Industry Building Addition - ML			GO	0	51	708	0	. 0	0

#### **Funding Source**

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

PAGE H-5

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES) (\$ In Thousands)

F.Y. 2002-2007

			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Corrections, Department of								
MCF-WR/ML - Building Maint. Shop - ML		GO	0	116	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Electrical Upgrade - Industry		GO	0	800	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Sewer Vent - Replace Water Main		GO	0	2,000	0	· 0	0	0
MCF-STW - Receiving Complex & Warehouse		GO	0	17,608	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Tuckpointing		GO .	0	800	0	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Master Control Renovation		GO	0	1,611	0	0	0	0
MCF-OPH - Razor Ribbon Replacement		GO	0	350	0	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Facility Sewer System	n	GO	0	3,214	0	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Phone Equipment & Lines		GO	0	444	0	0	0	0
Dept. – Roof & Window Replacement		GO	0	7,776	7,776	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Expand Floor - Balcony Level		GO	0	0	318	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Toilet Carrier Replacement		GO	0	0	493	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Remodel Administration Building		GO	0	0	4,504	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Facility Climate Control		GO	0	0	1,291	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Construct New Warehouse		GO	0	0	1,171	0	. 0	0
MCF-SCL - Retube Boilers		GO	0	0	517	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

STATE OF	MINNESOTA
Agency Re	quest

F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

	an a		Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Goverr Planning E	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Corrections, Department of								
MCF-SCL - Upgrade Security System		GO	0	0	749	0	0	0
MCF-RW - New Living Unit		GO	0	0	1,470	0	0	0
MCF-LL - Replace HVAC Systems - Living Units		GO	0	0	700	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Loop Wiring, High Voltage		GO	0	0	350	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Install Sprinkler System		GO	0	0	500	0	0	0
MCF-RW - Admin. Building Porch Repair		GO	0	0	125	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Second Floor Kitchen Renovation		GO	0	0	75	0	0	0
		Project Total	\$46,113	\$63,486	\$35,747	\$30,420	\$15,000	\$15,000
	General Ob	ligation Bonding	\$46,113	\$63,486	\$35,747	\$30,420	\$15,000	\$15,000
Finance, Department of		·						
Bond Sale Expenses	- 1	GO	800	800	800	800	459	459
		Project Total	\$800	\$800	\$800	\$800	\$459	\$459
	General Ob	ligation Bonding	\$800	\$800	\$800	\$800	\$459	\$459

Fu	Indina	Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Grants to Political Subdivisions								
Regional Sludge Management Demonstration Project	ARL-1	GO	500	0	0	0	0	0
Blazing Star Trail	AUS-1	GO	2,500	0	0	0 -	0	0
Bayport Storm Sewer Reconstruction	BAY-1	GO	1,550	0	0	0	0	0
Bloomington Center for the Arts	BLO-1	GO	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
Dakota County Flood Mitigation	DAK-1	GO	750	0	0	0	0	0
Coleraine Street and Utility Improvements	COL-1	GO	50	250	0	0	0	0
North Shore Sanitary Districts	DUA-1	GO	11,638	0	0	0	0	0
Duluth Aerial Lift Bridge Repainting	DUL-1	GO	1,900	0	0	0	0	0
Eveleth Sanitary Sewer Collection Improvements	EVE-1	GO	251	0	0	0	0	0
Duluth Spirit Mountain Improvements	DUL-2	GO	3,175	0	0	0	0	0
Municipal Solid Waste Combustor Replacement	FF-1	GO	1,150	0	0	0	0	0
Fergus Falls Public Library Expansion	FF-2	GO	1,835	0	0	0	0	0
Visitor Center at Historic Murphy's Landing	HP-1	GO	3,191	0	0	0	0	0
Campaign for the Children's Theatre Company	HEN-1	GO	12,000	0	0	0	0	0
Colin Powell Youth Leadership Center	HEN-2	GO	6,000	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration of Historic Fort Belmont	JAC-1	GO	200	200	100	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

F.Y. 2002–2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

· · · ·		_	Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Grants to Political Subdivisions								
Regional Cold Weather Testing Facility	KOO-1	GO	3,628	0	. 0	0	0	0
Big Bear Education Center	KOO-2	GO	6,200	0	0	0	0	0
Trollwood Performing Arts School	MOR-1	GO	5,500	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Park Improvements	MPB-1	GO	33,102	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Empowerment Zone Projects	MPL-1	GO	12,000	7,900	8,400	0	0	0
Minnesota Space Discovery Center & Planetarium	MPL-2	GO	30,000	0	0	0	0	0
Guthrie Theater on the River	MPL-3	GO	35,000	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota Shubert Performing Arts Center	MPL-4	GO	10,000	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota Valley Academy	MPS-1	GO	3,500	0	0	0	0	0
Minnetonka Affordable Scattered Site Housing	MTK-1	GO	1,000	0	0	0	0	0
Glencoe Railroad Switching Yard	MTK-1	GO	796	0	0	0	0	0
Casey Jones Trail	MUR-1	GO	4,200	3,400	3,600	0	0	0
Minnesota Prairie Line Rehabilitation	MV-1	GO	7,500	0	0	0	0	0
Olmsted County Materials Recovery Facility	OLM-1	GO	3,000	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota Center for Agricultural Innovation	OLV-1	GO	2,000	0	0	0	0	0
Pipestone County Museum Improvements	PIP-1	GO	125	0	0	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

F.Y. 2002-2007

(\$	In	Thousands)	
-----	----	------------	--

			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Grants to Political Subdivisions								
Gibbs Museum Interpretive Center	RAM-1	GO	137	1,436	0	0	0	. 0
Regional Public Safety Training Center	ROC-1	GO	550	1,286	0	0		0
The New Rochester Arts Center	ROC-2	GO	2,300	0	0	0	0	0
DM&E Railroad Corridor Mitigation	ROC-3	GO	50,000	0	0	0	0	0
Improving Access to the Ports of Savage	SAV-1	GO	11,500	0	0	0	0	0
St. Louis Park Pedestrian/Trail Crossing	SLP-1	GO	492	0	0	0	0	0
St. Paul The New Roy Wilkins Auditorium	STP-1	GO	70,000	0	0	0	0	0
St. Paul Phalen Boulevard	STP-2	GO	8,000	0	0	0	0	0
St. Paul Como Park Conservatory Restoration	STP-3	GO	2,700	0	0	0	0	0
St. Paul 2004 Renaissance Project	STP-4	GO	8,375	0	0	0	0	0
Neighborhood House/El Rio Vista Facility Expansion	STP-5	GO	5,000	0	0	0	0	0
American Lung Association Healthy Design Project	STP-6	GO	3,000	0	0	0	0	0
St. Cloud Civic Center Expansion	ST-1	GO	45,000	0	0	0	0	0
Central Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails	STC-1	GO	8,560	0	0	0	0	0
New Ulm Recreational Trail	ULM-1	GO	1,150	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia/Eveleth Progress Park Expansion	VEE-1	GO	1,500	0	0	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	*
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002		F.Y. 2006
Grants to Political Subdivisions								
District Steam Heating System Infrastructure	VIR-1	GO	5,000	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast Park Community Center Waseca	WAS-1	GO	1,800	0	0	0	0	0
WMEP Southwest Integration Magnet School	WES-1	GO	27,714	0	0	0	0	0
Winona Harbor Intermodal Transp Improvements	WIN-1	GO	6,300	0	0	0	0	0
		Project Total	\$464,319	\$14,472	\$12,100	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Obl	igation Bonding	\$464,319	\$14,472	\$12,100	\$0	\$0	\$0
Health, Department of								
Dental Clinic at State Colleges and Universities	150	GO	775	0	0	0	0	· 0
		Project Total	\$775	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Obl	igation Bonding	\$775	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Funding S	Source
-----------	--------

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

## COVEDNOD'S DECOMMENDATIONS

## OTATE OF MININIFOOTA



#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

		, <u>1999 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997</u>	Agency Request			Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning E		
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score		; Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Housing Finance Agency									
Publicly Owned Transitional Housing Loans	1	285	GO	19,500	2,500	2,500	4,461	2,500	2,500
			Project Total	\$19,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$4,461	\$2,500	\$2,500
	Ge	neral Ob	bligation Bonding	\$19,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$4,461	\$2,500	\$2,500

Funding	Source
---------	--------

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

STATE OF MINNESOTA Agency Request F.Y. 2002–2007		GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDA (BY FUNDING SOU (\$ In Th							
				Ag	ency Reques	st	Governor's Recommendation	Goverr Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Human Services, Department of									
System-Wide Roof Replacement	1	470	GO	2,789	4,167	2,145	2,789	1,500	1,500
System-Wide Asset Preservation	2	470	GO	6,500	8,450	8,400	6,500	4,000	4,000
FFRTC - Upgrade Program Facilities	3	385	GO	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	0
System-Wide Building/Structure Demolition	4	395	GO	2,250	1,650	1,065	2,000	1,650	1,065
BRHSC – Building #20 Improvements	5	315	GO	6,305	0	0	0	0	0
SPRTC - Convert Power Plant to Low Pressure	6	280	GO	3,619	0	0	3,619	0	0
BRHSC – Convert Power Plant to Low Pressure	7	255	GO	2,965	4,414	0	0	0	0
AGC - B/C Residential Unit Remodeling			GO	0	2,750	0	0	0	0
AGC - A/D Residential Unit Remodeling		Î	GO	0	2,750	0	0	0	0
AMRTC - Remodel Miller Building	ann an State ann an	1	GO	· 0	6,000	0	0	0	0
AMRTC - Construct Vehicle Maintenance/Storage	Bldg	anna ann an ann an Anna ann an Anna	GO	0	250	0	0	0	0
BRHSC - Remodel Dietary Department			GO	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
MSPPTC – Reconfigure Industry Ship/Rec. Area	<u> </u>		GO	0	250	0	0	0	0
MSPPTC - Construct Storage Building			GO	0	100	0	0	0	0
SPRTC - Bartlett/Sunrise Building Improvements	<i>€ <del>П1,</del></i>		GO	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
SPRTC - Storm/Saniatary Sewer Separation/Upgra	ades		GO	0	1,500	0	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

F.Y. 2002-2007

		Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning E	
Agency Stra Project description Priority Sc		F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Human Services, Department of							
AGC – B/C Residential Unit Remodeling	GO	0	2,750	0	0	0	0
BRHSC – Building #19 Improvements	GO	0	6,200	0	0	0	0
SPRTC – Phase II Upgrade Shantz & Pexton	GO	0	9,500	0	0	0	0
AGC - Remodel E-Building & Install Elevator	GO	. 0	0	3,200	0	0	0
AGC - Install Fire Sprinklers	GO	0	0 ·	1,100	0	0	0
MSSPTC – Construct 50–Bed Addition	GO	0	0	9,900	0	0	0
WRTC – Upgrade HVAC/Mechanical Systems Bldg. #8	GO	0	0	1,500	0	0	0

Project Total	\$27,428	\$58,731	\$27,310	\$14,908	\$7,150	\$6,565
General Obligation Bonding	\$27,428	\$58,731	\$27,310	\$14,908	\$7,150	\$6,565

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

F.Y. 2002-2007

(\$ In Thousands)

				Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Iron Range Resources & Rehabilitation Bd									
Mesabi Station	1	229	GO	2,783	0	0	0	0	0
Giants Ridge Sports Dorm Renovation	2	250	GO	441	0	0	0	0	0
Giants Ridge Chalet/Winter Sports Operations	3	170	GO	939	0	0	0	0	0
Giants Ridge Magic Carpet	4	150	GO	71	0	0	0	0	0
Ironworld Library Expansion	5	125	GO	652	0	0	0	0	0
Ironworld Interpretive Center Energy Efficiency	6	145	GO	1,439	0	0	0	0	0
Ironworld Discovery Center Roof Replacement	7	155	GO	218	0	0	0	0	0
Ironworld Water and Sewer Upgrade/Extension	8	95	GO	284	0	0	0	0	0

Project Total	\$6,827	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
General Obligation Bonding	\$6,827	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

· · ·				Ag	Agency Request			Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Metropolitan Council									
Northwest Metro Busway	1	351	GO	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	0
Livable Communities Grant Program	2	275	GO	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Snelling Bus Garage	3	336	GO	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0
Transit Passenger Facilities	4	200	GO	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0	0
CSO Reliever Sewer	5	160	GO	2,500	20,000	0	0	0	0

Project Total	\$82,500	\$100,000	\$80,000	\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
General Obligation Bonding	\$82,500	\$100,000	\$80,000	\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

F.Y. 2002-2007

٠

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

	un de la construction de la constru			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Military Affairs, Department of									
Asset Preservation & Kitchen Repair	1	380	GO	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
Facility Life/Safety	2	245	GO	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	3	220	GO	857	796	822	857	796	822
Indoor Firing Range Rehab	4	195	GO	1,018	0	0	0	0	0
Military Affairs/Emergency Mgmt Facility	5	230	GO	3,235	39,284	0	0	0	0
Stillwater Training/Community Center (Armory)	na an an an Anna an Ann		GO	0	9,104	0	· 0	0	0
Blaine Training/Community Center (Armory)			GO	0	0	8,100	0	0	0
Anoka Training/Community Center (Armory)			GO	0	0	8,300	0	0	0

Project Total	\$8,610	\$52,684	\$20,722	\$4,357	\$4,296	\$4,322
General Obligation Bonding	\$8,610	\$52,684	\$20,722	\$4,357	\$4,296	\$4,322

**Funding Source** 

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

PAGE H-17

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

	_			Ag	ency Reques	st	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Minnesota Historical Society									
Asset Preservation – Historic Sites Network	1	450	GO	5,545	4,035	4,140	1,500	1,500	1,500
County and Local Historic Preservation Grants	2	385	GF	1,500	1,000	1,000	0	0	0
			GO	1,500	1,000	1,000	0	0	0
State Capitol 2005 Furnishings Project	3	290	GF	550	0	700	0	0	0
Sibley Historic Site Preservation	4	265	GO	542	1,000	0	0	0	0
Kelley Farm Historic Site Land Acquisition	5	125	GO	655	0	0	0	0	0
Historic Fort Snelling Site Improvements	6	220	GO	500	4,600	0	0	0	0
Heritage Trails	7	135	GO	384	250	250	0	0	0
Historic Sites Network Master Plan	8	125	GF	500	500	0	0	0	0
Improve Collections Storage Facilities			GO	0	2,000	500	0	0	0
Kelley Farm Maintenance Building			GO	0	600	0	0	0	0
St Anthony Falls Heritage Zone Implementation			GO	0	0	2,000	0	0	0
Split Rock Barn Reconstruction	<del></del>		GO	0	0	500	0	0	0
History Center Parking Ramp	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		GO	0	0	1,000	0	0	0

Project Total

\$11,676 \$14,985

\$11,090

\$1,500

Funding Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	ļ
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

\$1,500

\$1,500

STATE OF MINNESOTA Agency Request F.Y. 2002–2007	GOVERNOR'S RECOMME (BY FUNDING (\$							
			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Minnesota Historical Society								
	General Obli	gation Bonding	\$9,126	\$13,485	\$9,390	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
	General Fun	nd Projects (GF)	\$2,550	\$1,500	\$1,700	\$0	\$0	\$0

Funding Source		
GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

		nun eleren Stolen an en el		Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Minnesota State Academies									
Asset Preservation	1	415	GO	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,500	1,500	1,500
West Wing Noyes Hall Phase Two	2	315	GO	2,896	0	0	0	0	0
Safety Improvements/Roadway Related Construction	3	280	GO	1,400	0	0	0	0	0
MSAB Dorm Expansion			GO	0	3,225	0	0	0	0
Mott Hall Vocational Renovation			GO	0	2,416	0	0	0	0
MSAD Frechette Renovation			GO	0	4,247	0	0	0	0
MSAD Rodman Dining			GO	0	0	6,359	0	0	0
MSAB Vocational Building/Industrial Building			GO	0	0	1,257	0	0	0
MSAD Garage			GO	0	0	1,034	0	0	0
MSAD Lauritsen Recreation & Fitness Center			GO	0	0	5,217	0	0.	0

Project Total	\$6,296	\$11,888	\$15,867	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500
General Obligation Bonding	\$6,296	\$11,888	\$15,867	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

### **GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS** (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities									
Roof Replacement & Repair	1	470	GO	33,264	30,000	25,000	0	0	0
Mechanical/Electr Infrastructure Replacement	1	470	GO	30,851	30,000	30,000	0	0	0
HEAPR -	1	470	GO	35,885	40,000	45,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Normandale CC – Science Remodel Phase 2	2	353	GO/UF	9,900	0	0	9,900	0	0
Minneapolis C&TC – Consolidation Remodel Phs 2	3	393	GO/UF	9,000	3,625	0	12,625	0	0
Metro SU – Library & Info Technology Center	4	308	GO/UF	17,442	. 0	0	17,442	0	0
Alexandria TC - Classroom/Technology Bldg	5	333	GO/UF	9,150	0	0	9,150	0	0
Winona SU – New Science Building	6	378	GO/UF	30,000	9,772	0	30,000	9,772	0
MSU Moorhead – New Science Building	7	343	GO/UF	18,955	10,022	0	18,955	10,022	0
Systemwide Science Lab Renovations	8	313	GO/UF	1,900	2,000	2,000	1,900	2,000	2,000
Systemwide Land Acquisition	9	208	GO/UF	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	0	0
Bemidji SU/NWTC Co-Location Design	10	208	GO/UF	850	10,000	5,000	0	0	0
NWTC Moorhead - Health & Appl Tech Addition	11	288	GO/UF	400	5,000	0	0	0	0
St. Cloud SU – Centennial, Riverview Remodel Phs 1	12	273	GO/UF	10,000	8,500	0	0	0	0
MSU Mankato – Athletic Facility Phase 3	13	168	GO/UF	8,400	0	0	0	0	0
Southwest SU – Library Remodel	14	298	GO/UF	9,200	0	0	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources .	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

	-			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities									
Hennepin TC - "D" Wing Remodel & Driveway	15	238	GO/UF	3,500	0	0	0	0	0
NEHED Virginia – Lab, Classroom, LRC Remodel	16	248	GO/UF	5,496	0	0	0	. 0	0
Lake Superior C&TC - Design Academic Addition	17	158	GO/UF	700	8,000	0	0	0	0
MSC-SETC - Student Services Remodel	18	238	GO/UF	580	1,169	0	0	0	0
Dakota TC – Design Info Tech/Telecomm Remodel	19	213	GO/UF	500	6,000	0	0	0	0
St. Cloud TC – Design Workforce Center Add/Remode	l 20	133	GO/UF	700	12,500	0	0	0	0
Ridgewater C&TC – Science Labs Remodel	21	188	GO/UF	2,880	0	0	0	0	0
Century C&TC – Design Intermediate Space Remodel	22	188	GO/UF	1,500	3,400	0	0	0	0
South Central TC – Design Applied Labs Remodel	23	188	GO/UF	300	4,199	0	0	0	0
Fergus Falls CC - Design IT & Student Services Add	24	213	GO/UF	760	6,500	0	0	0	. 0
MnWest Worthington CTC – Science, Nursing Remode	el 25	208	GO/UF	6,300	0	0	0	0	0
Inver Hills CC – Design Student Services Addition	26	148	GO/UF	500	6,000	0	0	0	0
2004 /2006 Capital Improvement Program	ennedr on de Rolle I.		GO/UF	0	51,313	141,000	0	0	0
			Proiect Total	\$250,913	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$134,972	\$56,794	\$37,000

Project Total	\$250,913	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$134,972	\$56,794	\$37,000
General Obligation Bonding	\$201,116	\$201,163	\$201,160	\$101,983	\$49,603	\$36,340
User Finance Bonding	\$49,797	\$48,837	\$48,840	\$32,989	\$7,191	\$660

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

STATE OF	MINNESOTA				
Agency Request					

F.Y. 2002-2007

-

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

			Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Natural Resources, Department of								
State Park Initiative	DNR-1 520	GO	31,000	13,000	13,000	31,000	7,300	7,300
Field Office Renovation & Improvements	B-1 335	GO	7,000	1,500	1,500	7,000	1,500	1,500
Statewide Asset Preservation	B-2 395	GO	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Office Facilities Development	B-3 335	GO	4,600	7,507	10,168	4,600	4,600	4,600
ADA Compliance	B-4 390	GO	1,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Fish Hatchery Improvements	B-5 310	GO	300	300	300	300	300	300
Dam Repair/Reconstruction/Removal	NB-1 350	GO	700	2,000	2,000	700	1,000	1,000
Reforestation	NB-2 335	GO	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,500	1,500
Forest Roads and Bridges	NB-3 320	GO	1,200	1,000	1,000	1,200	1,000	1,000
Metro Greenways and Natural Areas	NB-4 260	GO	1,000	1,500	1,500	1,000	1,000	1,000
SNA's Acquisition & Development	NB-5 375	GO	500	1,000	1,000	500	500	500
RIM – Consolidated Wildlife/Critical Habitat	NB-6 360	GO	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Stream Protection & Restoration	NB-7 260	GO	500	1,000	1,000	500	500	500
Water Access Acq. Better, & Fishing Piers	NB-8 365	GO	1,500	3,000	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,500
State Trail Acquisition & Development	NB-9 325	GO	2,550	2,000	2,000	2,550	2,000	2,000

GF  = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO  = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF  = User Finance Bonding

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

F.Y. 2002-2007

				Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency S Priority		Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Natural Resources, Department of									
Well Sealing	NB-10	255	GO	425	0	0	600	0	0
			GF	175	0	0	0	0	0
Fisheries Acquisition and Improvement	NB-11	250	GO	500	500	500	500	500	500
State Park Acquisition	NB-12	345	GO	1,000	1,500	1,500	1,000	1,000	1,000
Prairie Bank Easements	NB-13	290	GO	500	500	500	500	500	500
Flood Hazard Mitigation Grants	NB-14	380	GO	15,500	15,000	15,000	15,500	15,000	15,000
State Forest Land Acquisition	NB-15	295	GO	500	1,000	2,000	500	500	500
Lake Superior Safe Harbors	NB-16	300	GO	1,750	6,500	8,000	0	0	0
Trust Fund Lands	NB-17	90	GO	0	1,000	1,000	0	0	0
Natural and Scenic Area Grants	G-1	270	GO	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
State Trail Connections	G-2	235	GO	500	1,000	1,000	500	500	500
Metro Regional Parks Capital Improvements	G-3	285	GO	8,000	15,400	15,900	8,000	5,000	5,000
		ſ	ОТН	0	7,260	0	0	0	0

Project Total	\$90,100	\$96,867	\$95,268	\$88,350	\$53,600	\$53,600
General Obligation Bonding	\$89,925	\$89,607	\$95,268	\$88,350	\$53,600	\$53,600
Env & Natural Resoures (OTH)	\$0	\$7,260	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Funding	Source
---------	--------

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

STATE OF MINNESOTA Agency Request F.Y. 2002–2007					GOV	ERNOR'S REC (BY FUN	OMMENDA IDING SOUI (\$ In Tho	RCES)
			Agency Request			Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Planning Estimat	
Project description	Agency Strategic Fundin Priority Score Sourc	~ 1	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Natural Resources, Department of								
	General Fund Project	ts (GF)	\$175	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

#### Office of Environmental Assistance

Capital Assistance Program	1	429	GO	12,500	8,000	12,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
	Project Total		\$12,500	\$8,000	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	
	General Obligation Bonding		\$12,500	\$8,000	\$12,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	

Funding Source			
GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

4

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

F.Y. 2002-2007

(\$	In	Thousands)

			<b>F</b> or the	Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Goverr Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority		; Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Perpich Center for Arts Education									
Performance Hall Cat Walk	1	275	GO	125	0	0	125	0	0
Asset Preservation	2	305	GO	643	300	300	643	300	300
Foodservice Kitchen Renovation	3	280	GO	570	0	0	570	0	0
Repair & Maintenance Building	4	230	GO	1,817	0	0	326	1,660	0
			During track	A0 455	¢200		¢4.004	¢4.000	
	Ge	eneral Ot	Project Total	\$3,155 \$3,155	\$300 \$300	\$300 \$300	\$1,664 \$1,664	\$1,960 \$1,960	\$300 \$300
Pollution Control Agency			(				•		
Closed Landfill Bonding	1	410	GO	10,795	25,260	0	10,000	26,055	0
Brownfield to Green Space Grant Program	2	245	GO	5,000	0	5,000	0	0	0
			Project Total	\$15,795	\$25,260	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$26,055	\$0
þ.	Ge	eneral Ob	bligation Bonding	\$15,795	\$25,260	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$26,055	<del>\$0</del> \$0

GF = General Fund OTH = Other Funding Sources THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
CO = Conversi Oblinettian Danda TUD = Truck Hinkury Fund Danding UE = User Finance Danding	i
GO = General Obligation Bonds THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding UF = User Finance Bonding	g

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

F.Y. 2002-2007

(\$ In Thousands)

		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		Agency Request			Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Trade & Economic Development									
Redevelopment Grant Program	1	390	GO	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
State Matching Funds	2	436	GO	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Wastewater Infrastructure Fund	3	378	GO	30,000	30,000	30,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
		Ī	GF	600	600	600	80	80	80
Clean Water Partnership	4	255	GF	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0

Project Total	\$59,600	\$59,600	\$59,600	\$30,080	\$30,080	\$30,080
General Obligation Bonding	\$56,000	\$56,000	\$56,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
General Fund Projects (GF)	\$3,600	\$3,600	\$3,600	\$80	\$80	\$80

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

.

		<u></u>	Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Transportation, Department of							-	
Northstar Corridor Rail Project	GO-1 319	GO	120,000	0	0	120,000	0	0
Local Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation	GO-2 385	GO	48,000	65,000	70,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Red Rock Corridor Rail Project	GO-3 270	GO	5,000	12,000	163,000	0	0	0
Midwest Regional Rail Initiative (Inter-City)	GO-4 256	GO	10,000	30,000	30,000	0	0	0
Rail Service Improvement	GO-5 270	GO	12,000	6,000	6,000	0	0	0
Port Development Assistance	GO-6 230	GO	8,000	8,000	6,000	0	0	0
Statewide Public Safety Radio System	GO-7 95	GO	36,690	35,000	35,000	0	0	0
Consolidated Operations Support Facility	THF-1 160	THF	9,500	0	0	9,500	0	0
Mankato Headquarters Building	THF-2 175	THF	14,000	0	0	14,000	0	0
Communications Backbone Digital Conversion	THF-3 145	THF	11,000	0	0	2,000	0	0
Rochester Headquarters Addition		THF	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
Golden Valley Building Addition		THF	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
Materials Lab Building Addition		THF	0	3,490	0	0	0	0
Training Center Building Addition		THF	0	4,600	0	0	0	0
State Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation		THB	0	70,000	70,000	0	0	0
Duluth Headquarters Addition/Remodel		THF	0	0	1,250	. 0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

STATE	OF	MINNESOTA
A	. D	

#### Agency Request

F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

		Agency Request			Governor's Recommendation		
Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
	THF	0	0	1,000	0	0	0
	THF	0	0	1,700	0	0	0
	THF	0	0	4,675	0	0	0
	THF	0	0	2,000	0	0	0
	THF	0	0	2,500	0	0	0
······································	THF	0	0	2,000	· 0	0	0
	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Priority Score Source THF THF THF THF THF THF THF	Agency Strategic Priority Score Funding Source F.Y. 2002   THF 0   THF 0	Agency Strategic Priority ScoreFunding SourceF.Y. 2002F.Y. 2004THF00THF00THF00THF00THF00THF00THF00THF00	Agency Strategic Priority Score     Funding Source     F.Y. 2002     F.Y. 2004     F.Y. 2006       THF     0     0     1,000       THF     0     0     1,700       THF     0     0     4,675       THF     0     0     2,000       THF     0     0     2,500	Agency Strategic Priority Score     Funding Source     F.Y. 2002     F.Y. 2004     F.Y. 2006     Recommendation       THF     0     0     1,000     0       THF     0     0     1,700     0       THF     0     0     4,675     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0	Agency Strategic Priority Score     Funding Source     F.Y. 2002     F.Y. 2004     F.Y. 2006     Recommendation     Planning Est F.Y. 2004       THF     0     0     1,000     0     0     0       THF     0     0     1,700     0     0     0       THF     0     0     4,675     0     0     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0     0     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0     0     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0     0     0     0       THF     0     0     2,000     0     0     0     0

Project Total	\$274,190	\$242,090	\$395,125	\$175,500	\$30,000	\$30,000
General Obligation Bonding	\$239,690	\$156,000	\$310,000	\$150,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
Trunk Highway Fund (THF)	\$34,500	\$16,090	\$15,125	\$25,500	\$0	\$0
Trunk Hwy Fund Bonding (THB)	\$0	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

				Ag	ency Reques	it	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
University of Minnesota									
Systemwide – HEAPR	1	470	GO	80,000	80,000	80,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
St. Paul – Plant Growth Facilities, Phase II	2	428	GO/UF	18,700	0	0	3,400	14,300	0
Duluth - Laboratory Science Building	3	288	GO/UF	25,500	0	0	25,500	0	0
Minneapolis – Nicholson Hall	4	298	GO/UF	24,000	0	0	10,000	0	0
Minneapolis – Mineral Resources Research Center	5	298	GO/UF	18,400	0	0	0	. 0	0
Systemwide – Classroom Improvements	6	213	GO/UF	4,000	4,000	1,500	4,000	. 0	0
Minneapolis – Translational Research Facility	7	233	GO/UF	37,000	0	0	0	0	0
Crookston – Bede Hall Replacement	8	313	GO/UF	7,701	0	0	7,701	0	0
Morris – Social Science Building & Sprinklers	9	213	GO/UF	9,000	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Teaching & Technology Center	10	213	GO/UF	3,000	0	0	0	0	0
Statewide - Research & Outreach Centers	11	248	GO/UF	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Northrop Auditorium	12	248	GO/UF	2,000	10,000	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis – AHC Precinct Plan Phase I			GO/UF	0	20,000	0	0	0	0
Crookston – Academic Program Improvement I			GO/UF	0	4,500	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis - Folwell Hall			GO/UF	0	27,000	0	0	0	0
Morris – Academic Program Improvements I			GO/UF	0	3,000	0	0	0	0

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

Agency Request F.Y. 2002–2007						(BY FUI	NDING SOUR (\$ In Thou	,
			Agency Request			Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Strategic Priority Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	<sup>=</sup> .Y. 2006
University of Minnesota								
Minneapolis – Pillsbury Hall Design		GO/UF	0	1,000	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Teaching and Technology Center		GO/UF	0	42,000	.0	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Lind Hall Renovation		GO/UF	0	18,000	. 0	0	0	0
St. Paul – North Project		GO/UF	0	24,000	0	0	0	0
Duluth – Kirby Plaza Project		GO/UF	0	12,000	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis – AHC Precinct Plan Phase II		GO/UF	0	0	52,500	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Pillsbury Hall		GO/UF	0	0	15,000	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Scott Hall		GO/UF	0	0	12,000	0	0	0
Minneapolis – Peik Hall		GO/UF	0	0	12,000	0	0	0
Morris – Academic Program Improvements II		GO/UF	0	0	4,500	0	0	. 0
Minneapolis – Tate Laboratory of Physics I		GO/UF	0	0	21,000	0	0	0
St. Paul – Food Science & Nutrition	anna a chuir ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann an	GO/UF	0	0	15,000	0	0	0
St. Paul - Plant Science Teaching & Outreach		GO/UF	0	0	4,000	0	0	0
Duluth - Chemistry / Life Science Vacated Space		GO/UF	0	0	9,000	0	0	0
Duluth - Bulldog Sports Center		GO/UF	0	0	16,751	0	0	0
Crookston – Academic Program Improvements II		GO/UF	0	0	6,000	0	0	0

#### Funding Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

#### STATE OF MINNESOTA Agency Request



F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

	Agency Strategic	Funding		ency Reques		Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	stimates
Project description	Priority Score	Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
University of Minnesota								
		Project Total	\$232,301	\$248,500	\$252,251	\$85,601	\$49,300	\$35,000

Floject Iotal	9232,301	ψ240,000	ΨΖJΖ,ΖJΙ	\$05,001	\$ <del>4</del> 3,300	\$33,000	
General Obligation Bonding	\$186,596	\$197,899	\$196,223	\$73,762	\$49,300	\$35,000	]
User Finance Bonding	\$45,705	\$50,601	\$56,028	\$11,839	\$0	\$0	]

Funding Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund	
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding	

.

F.Y. 2002-2007

	<u>in a shini na mangan sa mangan sa mangan sa kasa ka di 1000 k</u>				Agency Request			Goverr Planning E	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	; Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Veterans Homes Board									
Hastings Building Preservation	1	470	GO	8,553	0	0	8,553	0	0
Silver Bay Roof Replacement	· 2	395	GO	2,345	0	0	2,345	0	0
Silver Bay Master Plan Renovation	3	340	GO	3,659	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Dining/Kitchen Renovation	4	315	GO	4,375	0	0	0	0	0
Asset Preservation	5	420	GO	4,690	4,406	4,963	2,000	2,000	2,000
Luverne Dementia Unit/Wander Area	6	345	GO	766	0	0	766	0	0
Minneapolis Adult Day Care	7	210	GO	2,825	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Assisted Living	8	210	GO	2,710	0	0	0	0	0
Fergus Falls Wing-Dementia/Wander Additions			GO	0	5,034	0	0	0	0

Project Total	\$29,923	\$9,440	\$4,963	\$13,664	\$2,000	\$2,000
<b>General Obligation Bonding</b>	\$29,923	\$9,440	\$4,963	\$13,664	\$2,000	\$2,000

Funding Source	Fu	nding	a So	urce
----------------	----	-------	------	------

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

(\$ In Thousands)

#### F.Y. 2002-2007

#### GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

				Ag	ency Reques	t	Governor's Recommendation	Govern Planning Es	
Project description	Agency Priority	Strategic Score	Funding Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2002 F.Y. 2004		F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
Water & Soil Resources Board									
Reinvest In Minnesota	1	340	GO	20,000	20,000	20,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
			GF	1,634	1,634	1,634	0	0	0
Local Government Road Wetland Replacement	2	275	GO ·	5,200	4,600	4,600	0	0	0
			GF	900	800	800	0	0	0
Streambank, Lakeshore and Roadside Erosion Contro	ol 3	215 <sup>-</sup>	GO	4,740	4,740	4,740	0	0	0
		-	GF	260	260	260	0	0	0

			Project Total	\$32,734	\$32,034	\$32,034	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000
	General Obligation Bonding		\$29,940	\$29,340	\$29,340	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	
	G	eneral F	und Projects (GF)	\$2,794	\$2,694	\$2,694	\$0	\$0	\$0
Zoological Gardens									
Zoo Master Plan Design/Construction	1	370	GO	18,563	67,442	0	7,184	0	0
Asset Preservation	2	410	GO	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000

Project Total	\$21,563	\$70,442	\$3,000	\$10,184	\$3,000	\$3,000
General Obligation Bonding	\$21,563	\$70,442	\$3,000	\$10,184	\$3,000	\$3,000

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding
# STATE OF MINNESOTA Agency Request

F.Y. 2002-2007

# GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS (BY FUNDING SOURCES)

(\$ In Thousands)

		A	Agency Request		Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Planning Estimates	
Project description	Agency Strategic Funding Priority Score Source	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006	F.Y. 2002	F.Y. 2004	F.Y. 2006
	Grand Total	\$1,942,026	\$1,557,087	\$1,573,906	\$844,559	\$357,114	\$289,331
	General Obligation Bonding	\$1,762,840	\$1,314,785	\$1,341,875	\$745,914	\$314,923	\$262,547
	User Finance Bonding	\$121,502	\$125,438	\$130,868	\$65,828	\$28,191	\$21,660
	Env & Natural Resoures (OTH)	\$0	\$7,260	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund Projects (GF)	\$18,138	\$18,794	\$10,994	\$2,271	\$9,280	\$80
	Trunk Highway Fund (THF)	\$39,546	\$20,810	\$20,169	\$30,546	\$4,720	\$5,044
	Trunk Hwy Fund Bonding (THB)	\$0	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

Funding Source

GF = General Fund	OTH = Other Funding Sources	THF = Trunk Highway Fund
GO = General Obligation Bonds	THB = Trunk Highway Fund Bonding	UF = User Finance Bonding

This page intentionally left blank.

.

# PAGE H-36

# Corrections, Department of

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

**Projects Summary** 

Project Title	2002 Agency Priority					Statewide Strategic Score	Governor's Recommendations	mmendations Plann	
	Ranking	2002	2004	2006	Total	Score	2002	2004	2006
MCF-LL - 416-Bed Offender Housing Unit	1	\$4,160	\$0	\$0	\$4,160	356	\$4,160	\$0	\$0
DOC - Asset Preservation	2	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100	445	23,100	15,000	15,000
MCF-SHK - ILC Renovation & Support Space	3	3,070	0	0	3,070	250	3,070	0	0
MCF-STW - New Seg. Unit Design/Predesign	4	906	0	0	906	260	90	0	0
MCF-RW - New Vocational Building	5	4,938	0	0	4,938	260	0	0	0
MCF-FRB - Kitchen Renovation	6	346	0	0	346	135	0	0	0
Predesign/Design									
MCF-WR/ML - Activities Building	7	1,523	0	0	1,523	195	0	0	0
MCF-SCL - New Vocational Building	8	8,070	0	0	8,070	100	0	0	0
MCF-STW - Receiving Complex & Warehouse		0	17,608	0	17,608		0	0	0
Dept Roof & Window Replacement		0	7,776	7,776	15,552		0	0	0
MCF-OPH - Security System Upgrade		0	4,029	0	4,029		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Electronic Locks for CHA & CHD		0	4,000	0	4,000		0	0	0
MCF-SHK - 62-Bed Living Unit (Phase II)		0	3,409	0	3,409		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Facility Sewer System		0	3,214	0	3,214		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Sewer Vent - Replace Water Main		0	2,000	0	2,000		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Master Control Renovation		0	1,611	0	1,611		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Renovation of Old Ed & Admin		0	1,500	0	1,500		0	0	0
Bldg.									
MCF-STW - Tuckpointing		0	800	0	800		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Electrical Upgrade - Industry		0	800	0	800		0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Industry Warehouse - ML		0	596	0	596		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Phone Equipment &		0	444	0	444		0	0	0
Lines									
MCF-OPH - Razor Ribbon Replacement		0	350	0	350		0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Vehicle Garage - ML		0	148	0	148		0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Building Maint. Shop - ML		0	116	0	116		0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Industry Building Addition - ML		0	51	708	759		0	0	0
MCF-WR/ML - Kitchen Expansion - WR		0	34	0	34		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Remodel Administration Building		0	0	4,504	4,504		0	0	0
MCF-RW - New Living Unit		0	0	1,470	1,470		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Facility Climate Control		0	0	1,291	1,291		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Construct New Warehouse		. 0	0	1,171	1,171		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Upgrade Security System		0	0	749	749		0	0	0
MCF-LL - Replace HVAC Systems - Living Units		0	0	700	700		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Retube Boilers		0	0	517	517		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Install Sprinkler System		0	0	500	500		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Toilet Carrier Replacement		0	0	493	493		0	0	0

.

Corrections, Department of

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Projects Summary

· Project Title	2002 Agency Priority	(\$ by Session) S		Strategic Recommend	Governor's Recommendations 2002	- Planni			
	Ranking	2002	2004	2006	Total	Score	2002	2004	2006
MCF-SCL - Loop Wiring, High Voltage		0	0	350	350		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Expand Floor - Balcony Level		0	0	318	318		0	0	0
MCF-RW - Admin. Building Porch Repair		0	0	125	125		0	0	0
MCF-STW - Second Floor Kitchen Renovation		0	0	75	75		0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$46,113	\$63,486	\$35,747	\$145,346		\$30,420	\$15,000	\$15,000

## **Corrections, Department of**

## AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) is to ensure that sanctions and services of the criminal justice system are designed and delivered to create a safer Minnesota. The department is authorized under M.S. 241.

To aid in the achievement of this mission, the DOC operates ten correctional facilities including eight for adults and two for juveniles. As of 7-1-01, the adult prison population totals 6,428 inmates; juvenile offenders total 204. The DOC is also responsible for over 15,000 offenders on probation, supervised release, and parole that are supervised by department agents. Through the state Community Corrections Act the DOC also administers grant funds to local units of government for correctional services covering over 108,000 offenders.

The DOC is organized into three divisions: adult facilities, community and juvenile services, and management services. Additionally, units exist in the areas of investigations, diversity, interagency management, correctional industries, and medical services.

The department has established the following goals:

- To restore the victim, community, and offender.
- To develop and support a range of correctional services and programs.
- To provide a safe, secure, humane environment for incarcerated offenders.
- To manage the department effectively and efficiently.
- To educate and work cooperatively with other public and private organizations on common issues.

# TRENDS, POLICIES AND OTHER ISSUES AFFECTING THE DEMAND FOR SERVICES, FACILITIES, OR CAPITAL PROGRAMS:

The DOC continues the initiative of adding beds at the Level 3 (medium-custody) facilities. The agency's capital budget request includes the construction of a new 416-bed secure living unit at the MCF-Lino Lakes (LL); addressing the need for asset preservation funds; and additional program space. It is the department's position that, in the event any future bed expansion may be required due to law changes, it will be accomplished at existing facility sites to achieve cost effectiveness. In FY 2001-03, the DOC reduced per diem by approximately \$10, saving Minnesotans over \$18 million. To continue the per diem reduction effort, capital projects will need to be funded, such as enhancing perimeter security systems, utilization of state of the art electronics systems, and replacement of inefficient, outdated and unsafe prison living units, which will reduce the agency's per diem and create additional operating savings in the future.

**Adults:** The capital budget for the adult facilities division was first prioritized to address the security and safety of staff and offenders at the MCF-LL by replacing five non-secure cottages with a new 416-bed secure living unit and the ever-increasing needs for asset preservation funds.

Other priorities include: Predesign/design funds for a new segregation unit at the MCF-Stillwater (STW); kitchen renovation at the MCF-Faribault (FRB); repair wall and towers and updating perimeter electronics at the MCF-STW; bed and support expansion at the MCF-Shakopee (SHK); a new vocational building at the MCF-Saint Cloud (SCL); and a new activities building at the MCF-Willow River/Moose Lake (WR/ML).

**Juveniles:** The MCF-Red Wing (RW) has been established as the "backstop" to the juvenile correctional system to provide effective correctional treatment to the most serious and chronic juvenile offenders in the state. Included in this bonding request is a project to construct a new vocational education building at the MCF-RW, adjacent to the main school building. This new facility will combine classroom space and a shop complex to provide vocational assessment, skill building, and work experience so that the juvenile resident population may be aptly prepared to successfully enter the workforce upon their release. In addition, with the increased needs for specialized programming come requirements for enhanced treatment programming space in the cottages.

Adult Inmate Prison Population Growth: The number of individuals that the DOC incarcerates is not within the control of the DOCs management. Since 1989, the legislature and the Sentencing Guidelines Commission have substantially increased penalties for serious violent offenders. Penalties for drug offenses have also been increased. Life sentences without the possibility of supervised release were added for certain murderers and life sentences for certain categories of repeat sex offenders became law. In 1989, life sentences were increased from 17 to 30 years before the review panel will meet. This change will affect the prison population beginning in 2007. The Sentencing Guidelines Commission estimates the impact of this change will be approximately 300 additional beds by 2020.

Adult Male Population Projections: Based on current law, the 2001 prison population projections show an increase of 2,364 male inmates by 2010. The department has a plan in place to address this growth through a combination of new beds at the MCF-Rush City; expansions at existing sites; and contracting for beds, if necessary. Projections are completed each year. As of 7-1-01, there were 6,060 male inmates. By 2010, projections indicate an adult male population of 8,424.

Adult Males	Projected Population
FY End	(November 2001)
2002	6,300
2003	6,599
2004	6,970
2005	7,299
2006	7,526
2007	7,723
2008	7,926
2009	8,181
2010	8,424

Adult Women Population: Based on current law, the 2001 population projections show an increase of 126 adult women inmates by the year 2009. Minnesota has one primary facility available to house adult women offenders, the MCF-Shakopee (MCF-SHK). Until 1999, MCF-SHK's capacity was 243. A number of single rooms were converted to double occupancy and the July 2001 capacity was 407. As of 7-1-01, there were 368 female inmates. By the year 2010, projections indicate an adult women population of 494.

Adult Women	Projected Population
FY End	(November 2001)
2002	380
2003	393
2004	418
2005	434
2006	447
2007	463
2008	474
2009	486
2010	494

## Adult Facility Bed Space Plan Summary

#### **Recent Expansion**

*Male offenders* – In January 2000, the DOC opened 338 beds of the Rush City facility's eventual capacity of 951 beds. In accordance with the DOC bed space plan, the legislature provided operational funds limited to these 338 beds. The facility's remaining capacity will be used to accommodate future offender population growth. The DOC has contracted with the federal government to house Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) detainees at Rush City until all beds are needed for Minnesota offenders.

Also, in 2000, the DOC implemented its prison per diem reduction plan that expanded prison bed space using minimal expenditures. Through FY 2000-02

implementation of this plan and the Rush City beds accommodated 671 additional offenders.

*Female offenders* – Through the Shakopee facility's per diem reduction plan, double bunking and expansions, the institution's bed capacity has been increased to 407.

#### Future Needs

*Male offenders* – By December 2001, the 338 beds at the Rush City facility and the beds gained through the per diem plan will be fully utilized. Additional beds at Rush City will be needed to address the projected inmate population growth in FY 2002-03. By May 2004, the DOC expects all 951 beds at Rush City to be filled.

Beyond 2004, the DOCs plan is to utilize private correctional facility beds and/or more efficient and cost-effective proposed expansions at existing facilities.

*Female offenders* – Population projections indicate that the Shakopee facility's capacity will be reached by January 2004. Similarly with the male population the DOC will contract for available jail beds unless more efficient and cost-effective bonding initiatives are funded.

#### **Requested Capital Projects**

*Male Offenders* – While the proposed Lino Lakes facility living unit is primarily a replacement of non-secure units, it adds 50 new beds to the system. The proposed Stillwater facility segregation unit will add 150 beds. Due mostly to the cost efficiencies of adding beds at existing prisons, the annual operational expenses of these new beds would be approximately \$4 million less than the Department of Finance's (DOF) current calculation for DOCs future budgets (estimated FY 2006-07). As a result, future DOC requests for operational costs will be less than the amounts in DOF forecasts.

*Female offenders* – The proposed conversion of the Shakopee facility's independent living unit would add 48 beds to Shakopee's capacity. This initiative would cost approximately \$1 million less than the DOF's calculation for DOCs future budget. These additional beds will address projected population growth to FY 2005, when a new 62-bed living unit will be needed.

(Note: Cost comparisons are based on a marginal average facility per diem of approximately \$66.73 for space needs to accommodate the projected bed increases. This per diem is in FY 2003 dollars and includes central office inmate support and health care costs).

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007

**Strategic Planning Summary** 



**Minnesota Correctional Facility-Faribault (MCF-FRB)** opened in FY 1990 on the campus at the Department of Human Services, Faribault Regional Treatment Center (RTC). Over the past 11 years, the level 3 (medium-custody) facility has expanded and a level 2 (minimum-custody) unit was opened in December 1998. Total capacity is 1,125 adult male offenders. The original construction dates of buildings range from 1946 to 1995 (new segregation unit and industry building). Buildings are structurally sound, but preventative maintenance is required.

A variety of work, vocational/academic education, and treatment programs are designed to prepare offenders for release to lower custody and community settings. The MCF-FRB also provides a specialized setting for housing the department's aging/geriatric population.

**Minnesota Correctional Facility-Lino Lakes (MCF-LL)** houses adult male offenders in level 3 (medium-custody) and level 1 (minimum-custody) security. The facility receives transfers from maximum, close, and other medium-custody correctional facilities, and also serves at the DOCs intake facility for release violators. The MCF-LL is the primary therapeutic center for offenders requiring chemical dependency and sex offender treatment.

The facility was constructed in 1963 and operated as a juvenile institution until 1978 when it was converted to an adult male institution. The facility has undergone significant changes and growth. Major construction and renovation over the past 20 years has increased the capacity from 200 to the current level of 1,144 offenders. In 2001, renovation of the food services building was started to accommodate the increased population.

**Minnesota Correctional Facility-Oak Park Heights (MCF-OPH)** is the state's only level 6 (maximum-custody) adult male correctional facility, with a capacity of 392. The facility is designed to receive offenders from adult male correctional facilities who are classified as maximum-custody or who present risks to the public, including those convicted of serious person offenses, high escape risks, and dangerous or serious management cases.

Program services are provided for offenders in education, mental health, and work experiences under close supervision within a highly structured environment. The overall facility program is designed to encourage offender participation and maximize the number of difficult to manage offenders involved in constructive program assignments, thereby reducing the frequency, scope, and seriousness of potential incidents in a level 6 facility.

The MCF-OPH houses over 95% person offenders, of whom nearly 30% are serving life sentences. Although the facility does include a 52-bed segregation unit, and two 52-bed special housing units, it is unique for maximum-custody in that over half of the offenders are programmed out of their cells 15 hours/day, five days/week.

The legislature has approved funding and construction is underway of a 60-bed administrative/control unit.

The facility's education program is provided through a combination of employees and contracted services. The program offers: Full-time and part-time educational programs with instruction in literacy, basic education, GED, and some college level courses. The education offender programming emphasizes change in behavior and attitudes by incorporating anger management, commitment to change, critical thinking skills and parenting into the curriculum.

The primary focus of the two 52-bed special housing units is to house offenders who are awaiting positive programming placement, offenders who refuse to accept work or education assignments, as well as transition and segregation status offenders.

The mental health unit provides in-patient psychiatric care for offenders from throughout the department. This 46-bed unit services offenders who volunteer for treatment, are on emergency hold status, and those who have been committed by the court. Psychiatrists, psychologists, and therapists provide services.

Physicians, registered nurses, dentists, and other medical professionals provide inpatient and outpatient health care services. The transitional care unit has an inpatient capacity of 39 and provides 24-hour/day nursing care.

The goal of the two industry units is to become self-supporting, to provide a costeffective work experience, and reduce idleness by maintaining constructive offender assignments.

**Minnesota Correctional Facility-Rush City (MCF-RC)** began receiving offenders in February of 2000, with a population consisting of Minnesota adult male offenders and INS detainees.

The combined offender/detainee population as of 7-1-01 was 288. Projections are for the MCF-RC to house up to 380 offenders and detainees until February of 2002, when the population is expected to increase to 450. By July 2002, this will increase to 518. Projections are that this facility will be at its full capacity of 951 sometime in the year 2005.

Programming for offenders and detainees include an education program that provides Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language along with life skills training. Apprenticeship programs in building maintenance and grounds keeping provide offenders with the opportunity to obtain job skills by working with staff on maintaining the interior and exterior of the facility. As of 8-1-2000, the private partnership/industry program employed 52 offenders, five days/week on two shifts in a light manufacturing and assembly program. When the facility is at full capacity this program is anticipated to employ 150 offenders, seven days/week on three shifts.

**Minnesota Correctional Facility-St. Cloud (MCF-SCL)** is a level 5 (close-custody) facility for adult male offenders with a capacity of 816. As the DOC intake facility for all adult male offenders, the MCF-SCL's focus is on testing, assessments, and orientation of new admissions. In addition to the intake process, programming at the MCF-SCL includes academic, vocational, chemical dependency, individual and group job counseling, and work programs. After the intake process is complete, all younger offenders remain at the MCF-SCL resulting in a significant focus on educational programming for those offenders.

Many buildings date to the late 1800s and early 1900s with other buildings added over the years. Given the age of the buildings and physical plant, several requests have been made for capital asset preservation and replacement account (CAPRA) funds to upgrade and maintain the facility. The MCF-SCL will remain operational into the foreseeable future.

Minnesota Correctional Facility-Shakopee (MCF-SHK) houses adult women felons committed to the commissioner of corrections. Institution activities provide

academics and vocational education, specialized programming, and work programs. Academic education includes a variety of programs such as adult basic education and literacy instruction. Vocational programs include automated office skills, and painting/decorating. Extensive specialized programming is offered in chemical dependency, sex offender treatment, parenting/family issues, personal development skills, critical thinking skills, anger management, victim empathy, and prerelease programming. Work programs include data entry, assembly, textiles, market research, food service, and building maintenance.

**Minnesota Correctional Facility-Stillwater (MCF-STW)** provides academic, vocational, therapeutic, and work opportunities for level 5 (close-custody) adult male offenders. The MCF-STW, with a capacity of 1,293, is the largest state correctional facility. Most of the main buildings at the MCF-STW were constructed between 1910 and 1914. With buildings this old, renovation is ongoing and this request includes projects in the capital budget and in CAPRA. This facility will need to remain operational into the foreseeable future.

This capital budget request includes perimeter security upgrading, repair of the wall and towers of the facility perimeter, and predesign/design for a new 150-bed segregation unit.

#### Minnesota Correctional Facility-Willow River/Moose Lake (MCF-WR/ML)

The Moose Lake Correctional Facility opened at the Department of Human Services (DHS) Regional Treatment Center campus in 1988 as a level 2 (minimum-custody) facility sharing the campus with the DHS. Much of the facility was constructed in 1937 with some additions in the 1950s. Security modifications were completed in various steps as separate bid packages. Finally assuming full custody of the facility from DHS in December 1995, Moose Lake is now a level 3 (medium-custody) institution for adult male offenders with a current capacity of 874. Offenders are transferred from other department facilities to the Moose Lake location. This facility provides a variety of programs including vocational and academic education, literacy, sex offender programming, industry, and institutional support employment. Since becoming a DOC facility, additional buildings have been constructed. The newest building, the gymnasium was completed in 1996. All buildings are structurally sound but preventive maintenance and some repairs are required.

Willow River houses the institution phase of the Challenge Incarceration Program (CIP), which is a very intensive, highly structured, and disciplined program for nonviolent, chemically abusive men and women offenders. Prior to 1951, the facility was a forestry work camp. From 1951 to 1992 the facility functioned as a minimum-security men's vocational program. In 1992, M.S. 244.17 mandated the establishment of a CIP for men and women. The existing 13 buildings were constructed and/or relocated on the site from 1958 to the 1980s. The capacity of this program is 90, averaging 75 men and 15 women. Offenders participate in the incarceration phase of CIP at Willow River for a minimum of six months. The capital budget request is for the demolition of the existing activities building and

construction of a new activities building that meets codes and regulations. The CIP site includes 23.45 acres.

Minnesota Correctional Facility-Red Wing (MCF-RW) provides treatment and educational services to serious, chronic, and extended juvenile jurisdiction (EJJ) male iuvenile offenders after having been determined by the iuvenile court to be inappropriate candidates for community based or local corrections. The target population, i.e. serious and chronic offenders, represents those juveniles in need of intensive intervention and rehabilitation services in a secure perimeter. Typically, these residents lack the problem solving, moral reasoning, anger management, and social skills necessary to function successfully in the community. They have well entrenched anti-social values and attitudes. The majority of these residents have failed educational experiences in the community and are typically two or three years behind in year levels. Many of them have special education needs. Few of them have experienced anything other than short-term employment and often lack in skills to secure and successfully maintain employment. The residents at the facility have. for the most part, adopted delinquent lifestyles, which often involve engaging in antisocial behavior. The residents lack leisure time, recreational activities, and other prosocial interests and skills.

Vocational programs offered at the MCF-RW include printing, metal fabrication, food service, and building trades. Vocational education also includes career exploration and the development of employment skills. Residents may have the opportunity to participate in work programs, which provide central laundry services and building care services for the facility. The primary goal of the program is to provide effective and efficient counseling and education services in order to increase the likelihood that residents will successfully adjust to community-based living. Education objectives are accomplished by academic and vocational activities and training. The provision of properly structured transition and aftercare services is a key component of the facility's programming, greatly improving the chances of success for youthful offenders released into the community.

**Thistledew Camp (TC)** provides, on a per diem basis, two educational confidence building outdoor survival programs for young men, 13 to 18 years of age, who experience difficulties in their home communities. TC is located in Togo, Minnesota, and many of the buildings date back to the 1960s. Buildings need renovation and insulation. The camp averages between 50 and 60 juveniles.

## Juvenile Offender Population:

The average population at the state's juvenile correctional facility in Red Wing is approximately 169 with an addition 53 on supervised release status. The average population was 130 in FY 2000, with a low point of 121. The increase in the population from FY 2000-01, followed legislation, which provided a 35% state subsidy of per diem, costs to the counties and directed the courts to place appropriate offenders at the MCF-RW. The MCF-RW continues to respond to the dramatic

changes in its population as a result of the closure of the Sauk Centre facility in 1999. The MCF-RW has had to accommodate programming for juvenile sexual offenders, substance abusers, and youth with serious mental health issues in addition to specialized treatment for serious, chronic juvenile offenders. The conversion of the Brown Cottage into a 12-bed mental health supportive living unit will be completed in August 2001. The cottage provides mental health assessment, treatment, behavioral stabilization, and transitional services to youth who have serious emotional disturbances. Knox Cottage was reopened in April 2001, to house the substance abuse program. Transition and aftercare programming has been extended to juveniles reentering the community from the MCF-RW, Thistledew Camp (TC) and the contracted facility for the long-term treatment program for girls committed to the commissioner of corrections. TC operates as a fee-for-service facility. It has an average daily population of 58. TC expanded in 1997, with the addition of the Wilderness Endeavors 21-day program. In the summer of 2001 a separate 21-day pilot program for girls was developed.

# DESCRIBE THE AGENCY'S LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC GOALS IN RELATION TO CAPITAL REQUESTS:

In carrying out the mission of the DOC, the department has the following objectives that are reflected in this capital budget request:

- To maintain a safe, secure, and humane environment for adult and juvenile offenders while incarcerated;
- To provide programming and work opportunities for adult and juvenile offenders while incarcerated to help them successfully return to the community;
- To provide basic services, including health care, for offenders;
- To operate cost-efficient facilities to house offenders; and
- To value and respect staff and offenders of all cultures, races, and ethnic backgrounds.

The capital budget requests were first prioritized to deal with the safety and security issues at the MCF-LL and to continue the wall repair at the MCF-STW.

Projects were then prioritized to deal with security, safety, health, and program issues that also relate to the growing population demands.

# PROVIDE A SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE CONDITION, SUITABILITY, AND FUNCTIONALITY OF PRESENT FACILITIES, CAPITAL PROJECTS, OR ASSETS:

Because of limited funding in the capital budget and the CAPRA, the department has deferred or delayed many maintenance projects. In addition, ongoing projects, such as window replacement, roofing, and tuck-pointing have been deferred.

The department has received \$1 million of asset preservation and repair funds for the adult facilities and \$200,000 for juvenile facilities in FY 2002-03. These funds will be used to supplement the facilities repair and replacement accounts.

In the future, as new and renovated buildings age, additional funding will be needed to maintain these state facilities. Also, the need to meet state fire marshal, Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), and code compliance for safety and building standards continues to compete with and consume limited funding available through the capital budget process.

## AGENCY PROCESS USED TO ARRIVE AT THESE CAPITAL REQUESTS:

The DOC management seeks input from the wardens and superintendents of all the correctional facilities. Management provides general guidelines, including types of projects and department objectives. Each warden or superintendent develops his or her facility requests, which are forwarded to the central office where the commissioner and deputy commissioners consolidate, prioritize, and select those projects needed to meet the mission, goals, and objectives of the department. Various staff in plant operations and the financial area of the correctional facilities and central office provide data collection. Consultants and engineers have been consulted in developing the cost estimates for the requests.

The DOC continues the process of developing short and long-range plans for the agency, as well as a system to collect necessary data.

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1996-2001):

1996	Department	Asset Preservation	\$1,750
1996	MCF-RC	New Level 4 Facility	89,000
1996	MCF-Brainerd	Bed Expansion	1,500
1996	MCF-LL	Segregation Unit Predesign	500
1998	Department	Asset Preservation	3,500
1998	MCF-SHK	62-Bed Living Unit	4,645
1998	MCF-LL	80-Cell Admin. Seg. Unit	340
1998	MCF-OPH	Health Care Remodel	3,000
1998	MCF-SCL	Intake Center Remodel	1,500
1998	MCF-RW	Security Fence	1,200
1999	MCF-FRB	Sanitary Storm Sewer Repair	1,785
2000	MCF-FRB	Sewer Repair	7,500

2000	MCF-OPH	Bed Expansion	855
2000	MCF-LL	H-Building Remodel	3,400
2000	MCF-RW	Mental Health Unit	800
2000	MCF-STW	Wall Repair	1,000
2000	MCF-STW	Health Services Conversion	<u>1,800</u>
		TOTAL	\$124,075

### **Project Narrative**

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,160,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Lino Lakes

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:**

The Department of Corrections (DOC) is requesting funding to design and construct a new 416-bed offender housing unit. This project is the DOCs number one priority because of the need to enhance security and staff safety, and to reduce per diem costs and increase efficiencies. The new housing unit will be double-bunked, with locking wet cells. Individual cell toilets will enhance staff safety by allowing offenders to be routinely locked down on evening shifts and as needed to curb potential unrest.

This unit will replace five existing cottages with a current capacity of 366 inmates that cannot be locked down. Based on this initiative, it is estimated that the MCF-Lino Lakes per diem will be reduced by approximately \$3.

Three of the existing cottages will be renovated for critically needed program space. The remaining two cottages will be demolished.

#### IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Using the current bed space plan with existing facilities, the November forecast by the Department of Finance estimates that the annual cost of adding 50 beds is approximately \$1.2 million. Through operating efficiencies from a more efficient physical plant design, the annual operating costs for the additional beds in this request would be absorbed within the department. This would result in an annual net savings of about \$1.2 million under the current forecast when these beds are filled.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

The majority of this project will be financed through federal funds (\$10.179 million) from the Violent-Offender-Incarceration/Truth-in-Sentencing (VOITIS) program. These funds can only be used for construction of new prison beds. The program requires a 10% state funds cash match (\$4.160 million), which is reflected in the request and predesign study.

## PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 742-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

Project	Cost
---------	------

1. Property Acquisition         Land, Land Easements, Options         Land and Buildings         2. Predesign Fees         3. Design Fees         Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	All Prior Years \$0 0 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	FY 2002-03 \$0 0 0 119 158 316 204 0 0 0	FY 2004-05 \$0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	FY 2006-07 \$0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	All Years \$0 0 15 119 158 316 204	(Month/Year) 01/2001 06/2001 09/2002 12/2002 04/2003	(Month/Year) 06/2001 09/2002 11/2002 02/2003
Land, Land Easements, Options         Land and Buildings         2. Predesign Fees         3. Design Fees         Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 119 158 316 204 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 15 119 158 316	06/2001 09/2002 12/2002	09/2002 11/2002 02/2003
Land and Buildings         2. Predesign Fees         3. Design Fees         Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 119 158 316 204 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 15 119 158 316	06/2001 09/2002 12/2002	09/2002 11/2002 02/2003
2. Predesign Fees         3. Design Fees         Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 119 158 316 204 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	15 119 158 316	06/2001 09/2002 12/2002	09/2002 11/2002 02/2003
3. Design Fees         Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 0 0 0 0	119 158 316 204 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	119 158 316	06/2001 09/2002 12/2002	09/2002 11/2002 02/2003
Schematic         Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 0 0 0 0 0	158 316 204 0	0	0	158 316	09/2002 12/2002	11/2002 02/2003
Design Development         Contract Documents         Construction Administration         4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 0 0 0 0 0	158 316 204 0	0	0	158 316	09/2002 12/2002	11/2002 02/2003
Contract Documents Construction Administration 4. Project Management State Staff Project Management Non-State Project Management Commissioning Other Costs	0 0 0 0 0	316 204 0	0 0	. 0	316	12/2002	02/2003
Construction Administration 4. Project Management State Staff Project Management Non-State Project Management Commissioning Other Costs	0 0 0 0	204	0				
4. Project Management         State Staff Project Management         Non-State Project Management         Commissioning         Other Costs	0 0 0 0	0		0	204	04/2003	
State Staff Project Management Non-State Project Management Commissioning Other Costs	0		0				04/2004
Non-State Project Management Commissioning Other Costs	0		0			01/2003	02/2003
Commissioning Other Costs	0	0		0	0		
Other Costs			0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0		
		20	0	0	20		
5. Construction Costs	05/2003	05/2004					
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	11,296	0	0	11,296		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	50	0	· 0	50		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	69	0	0	69		
Construction Contingency	0	493	0	0	493		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0	网络普通国家中的中国	
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	and a second	and the second secon
8. Occupancy			Lunner			01/2004	04/2004
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	312	0	0	312		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	30	0	0	30		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	40	0	0	40		
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	15	13,107	0	0	13,122		
9. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		10/2003		1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-			
Inflation Multiplier		9.40%	0.00%	0.00%			per a la practica de la companya de Esta de la companya d Esta de la companya d
Inflation Cost	The second s	1,232	0.00%	0.0070	1,232		
GRAND TOTAL	\$15	\$14,339	\$0	\$0	\$14,354	Net to the second s	(a) A set of the se

# Corrections, Department of MCF-LL - 416-Bed Offender Housing Unit

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	4,160	0	0	4,160
State Funds Subtotal	0	4,160	0	0	4,160
Agency Operating Budget Funds	15	0	0	0	15
Federal Funds	0	10,179	0	0	10,179
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	15	14,339	0	0	14,354

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)						
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09			
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0			
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0			
Building Operating Expenses	0	. 0	0	0			
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0			
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0			
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0			
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0			
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0			
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0			
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	4,160	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	ject applicants should be aware that the following					
requi	requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of					
	the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
	Remodeling Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
	Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects					
INU	(require legislative notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review					
res	Required (by Administration Dept)					
Vaa	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
Yes	Requirements					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology					
res	Review (by Office of Technology)					
Vaa	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept.)					
N1 -	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
No	(as per Finance Dept)					
	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
No	Required (by granting agency)					
	Matching Funds Required					
Yes	(as per agency request)					
	Project Cancellation in 2007					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept)					

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

A master plan (based upon DOCs strategic plan) should be developed for future land use and efficiencies. (Note: Master planning is not a bondable activity)

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

State funds for this project would be used in conjunction with an estimated \$10.179 million of federal funds available under the Violent-Offender-Incarceration/Truth-in-Sentencing (VOITIS) program to add bedspace for violent offenders. The project would give the agency the ability to lock-down a significant portion of offenders in this medium custody facility.

## Governor's Recommendation:

.

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$4.16 million for this project, contingent upon federal funds of \$10.179 million.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE							
Criteria	Values	Points					
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0					
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0					
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0					
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80					
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	35					
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70					
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100					
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	71					
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0					
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0					
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0					
Total	700 Maximum	356					

.

## 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$23,100,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 8

Corrections, Department of

**DOC - Asset Preservation** 

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Bayport, Faribault, Lino Lakes, Moose Lake, Oak Park Heights, Red Wing, Rush City, Shakopee, St. Cloud, Togo, Willow River

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:**

The Department of Corrections (DOC) is requesting funding for asset preservation projects. The DOC has developed a list of projects that identify the capital iceberg that currently exist within the facilities. These projects require completion so that deficiencies can be properly addressed and improvements made to state assets managed by the DOC. By funding this request it is anticipated that major capital requests for asset replacement will be significantly reduced in the future and will result in overall security, safety, and operating efficiencies.

Many of the DOC facilities are 80 to 100 years old. Funding is needed for the removal of safety hazards and mechanical or structural defects; the elimination of hazardous substances; the replacement of roofs and windows; the preservation of exteriors and interiors of buildings; the upgrade/replacement of electronic security equipment; etc.

This request includes phase 2 of the Minnesota Correctional Facility-Stillwater (MCF-STW) perimeter wall repair and modifications, which includes masonry repair of the entire exterior of the perimeter security wall; renovation of the towers for improved visibility; installation of a catwalk around the exterior of the perimeter wall; replacement of the existing perimeter security system with a modern technology system; and installation of razor ribbon on the perimeter wall. Phase 1 of this project was funded (\$1 million) during the 2000 legislative session to repair the inside surface of the security wall. The estimated cost to complete this phase of the project is \$8,076,000.

The MCF-STW was constructed in 1912. The existing perimeter security wall, towers, and partially remaining catwalk are obsolete and inadequate to meet the security needs of the facility. They pose a potential safety threat to the public, and are a safety hazard to staff. Repairs to the existing wall; modifications to the towers; a continuous exterior catwalk; and a new electronic *perimeter intrusion detection* system will add to the level of security and minimize the risk of escape.

The DOC has received an Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) citation and State Fire Marshal order pertaining to emergency lighting issues at the Minnesota Correctional Facility-Faribault (MCF-FRB). The DOC completed a study and cost estimate of the emergency lighting systems at all DOC facilities. The estimated cost of updating this life safety issue is \$12,892,000 for all the facilities. This request includes \$2,950,000 for MCF-Lino Lakes and \$3,100,000 for MCF-STW to address this issue at these two facilities.

The DOC is in the process of completing a study and cost estimate for the removal of asbestos from all DOC facilities. This study was undertaken because of OSHA citations received regarding asbestos issues at the MCF-FRB.

#### IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

No cost increases will result from these projects.

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition							
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign Fees	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	· 0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-State Project Management	. 0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs						07/2002	05/2004
Site & Building Preparation	0	. 0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0		的情報的結果
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	0	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100		
9. Inflation							a niki adaleh parakon kan a
Midpoint of Construction	CALL PLACE AND A						Length Actions
Inflation Multiplier	Alexandra anna an	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		Place Care Story Education Statistics of Care Story	
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0	相比的法律的法律的规范	$\label{eq:product} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{r}_{3}, \mathbf{r}_{3$
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$23,100	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$53,100		

## Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100
State Funds Subtotal	0	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100
Agency Operating Budget Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	23,100	15,000	15,000	53,100

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)				
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0	
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	23,100	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
Pro	ject applicants should be aware that the following					
requi	requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of					
	the bonding bill.					
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
	Remodeling Review (by Legislature)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
	Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects					
NO	(require legislative notification)					
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review					
140	Required (by Administration Dept)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
165	Requirements					
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology					
NU	Review (by Office of Technology)					
Vee	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept.)					
	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
No	(as per Finance Dept)					
	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
No	Required (by granting agency)					
	Matching Funds Required					
No	(as per agency request)					
	Project Cancellation in 2007					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept)					

## Department of Administration Analysis:

Admin policy is to support the appropriation of funds for asset preservation as a means of ensuring appropriate stewardship of current state owned facilities.

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

- Funding of \$1 million for the first phase of the Stillwater perimeter wall portion of this request was provided in the 2000 bonding bill.
- Scoring of 25 given for six-year planning estimates due to the Governor's recommendation of this project for a FY 2001 capital budget and the Stillwater wall project in the 2000 capital budget.

## Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$23.1 million for this request as part of his statewide asset preservation and facility repair initiative. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$15 million in 2004 and \$15 million in 2006.

To encourage rapid expenditure of these capital funds for immediate economic stimulus, the Governor recommends a sunset date of 6-30-2004 for the 2002 appropriation. Any portion of these funds not spent or encumbered by that date should be cancelled.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE						
Criteria	Values	Points				
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0				
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0				
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0				
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	120				
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	70				
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70				
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100				
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0				
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	60				
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0				
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25				
Total	700 Maximum	445				

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,070,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION: Shakopee** 

Corrections, Department of

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

MCF-SHK - ILC Renovation & Support Space

This request is for funding to remodel the Independent Living Center (ILC) into a 48bed general population living unit; increase space in the kitchen, serving, and eating areas; increase space in the visitation area; and modify the staff control station in the segregation unit to provide adequate space for updated technical equipment and more room for staff.

The Minnesota Correctional Facility-Shakopee (MCF-SHK) is the state's primary facility for adult female offenders. When it opened in 1986, the design population was 132 offenders. As of 7-1-01 the population was 368 offenders. Since 1986, several living units have been added and 128 existing single rooms have been double-bunked.

In an effort to reduce the per diem, the six-apartment, 24-bed ILC was closed in September of 2000. This request is to convert it into a 48-bed general population living unit.

The food service facilities were designed for a population of 132, using a minimum number of offender kitchen workers. The kitchen space is not adequate for the number of workers and contractors now required to service the current population. This request will expand and reconfigure the entire area.

The existing single service line design cannot process offenders quickly enough, resulting in management problems associated with long lines extending beyond the dining room doors. Programming and work time are negatively affected when the dining periods cannot be completed in a timely manner. There is a need to enlarge the food service area into the existing dining hall to allow for a second serving line, and construct additional dining space to accommodate the increased population.

The visiting room operated with seating designed for 132 offenders. Reconfiguring the layout of the visiting room, and downsizing the furniture added 30 seats during facility renovations in 1998 and 2000. Additional visiting space is greatly needed to accommodate the growing population.

To enhance safety and security for staff and offenders, modifications are needed in the segregation unit to provide for additional electronic surveillance equipment in the staff control station. Also a sally port access should be constructed to each segregation area.

## IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Using the current bed space plan with existing facilities, the November forecast by the Department of Finance estimates that the annual cost of adding 48 beds is approximately \$1.2 million. Through operating efficiencies from a more efficient physical plant design, the annual operating costs for the beds in this request would be approximately \$600,000. This would result in an annual net savings of about \$600,000 under the current forecast when these beds are filled.

## **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

This project continues the efficiencies achieved through the double bunking of offenders by doubling the capacity of the ILC. Expansions and modifications to food services, visiting, and the security unit will provide much-needed support for beds added under this and previous capital requests. The end results are enhanced security and safety, relatively low costs for additional beds, and per diem cost control.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition			·····	1			
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign Fees	7	0	0	0	7		
3. Design Fees		L	·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Schematic	0	33	0	0	33	08/2002	09/2002
Design Development	0	44	0	0	44	09/2002	11/2002
Contract Documents	. 0	88	0	0	88	11/2002	02/2003
Construction Administration	0	59	0	0	59	03/2003	12/2003
4. Project Management					•		
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	]	
5. Construction Costs						03/2003	12/2003
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0	1	-
Construction	0	2,195	0	0	2,195	1	
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	220	0	0	220		
Other Costs	0	15	0	0	15		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0	and the second	and the second se
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Occupancy						10/2003	12/2003
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	157	0	0			
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	22	0	0	22		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	10	0	0	10		
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	7	2,843	0	0	2,850		
9. Inflation							and Sandarahan Ar
Midpoint of Construction	Alexandra and a second second second	06/2003			A PRINT PRINT		and the product of the second s
Inflation Multiplier		8.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		227	0	0			的复数制度 化合金
GRAND TOTAL	\$7	\$3,070	\$0	\$0	\$3,077		

## Corrections, Department of MCF-SHK - ILC Renovation & Support Space

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	3,070	0	0	3,070
State Funds Subtotal	0	3,070	0	0	3,070
Agency Operating Budget Funds	7	0	0	0	7
Federal Funds	. 0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	7	3,070	0	0	3,077

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)				
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	· 0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0	
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	3,070	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	Project applicants should be aware that the following requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (require legislative notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)					
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required (as per Finance Dept.)					
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (as per Finance Dept)					
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)					
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)					
Yes	Project Cancellation in 2007 (as per Finance Dept)					

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign for this project has been completed.

Having tripled in population since 1986, when will this facility reach maximum capacity? A master plan of this facility should be done to determine options for future growth and when/if the state need to look at a  $2^{nd}$  facility or if there is adjacent land available for expansion of this facility. (Note: Master planning is not bondable)

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Recent population projections estimate that the current bed space of 407 at Shakopee will be full by January 2004.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$3.07 million for this project.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE						
Criteria	Values	Points				
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0				
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0				
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0				
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80				
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	0				
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70				
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75				
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0				
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0				
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0				
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25				
Total	700 Maximum	250				

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$906,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 4 of 8

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:** Bayport

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:**

The Department of Corrections (DOC) is requesting predesign/design funds to construct a new 150-bed segregation unit at the Minnesota Correctional Facility-Stillwater (MCF-STW). The building is to be constructed on the facility grounds.

The current segregation unit, located in Cell Hall A, contains 112 living units (cells) and four observation units. On any given day, the unit is at full capacity and 50 to 90 inmates are on *in-house* segregation status, which is spending time locked in the cells, not in the segregation unit. This unit was converted from a general living unit to a segregation unit several years ago. There are four tiers with each cell facing an open activity area. On each tier, two cells have been converted for showers.

The segregation unit houses offenders who have violated department rules. Many of the offenders have been sentenced to the unit for aggressive/assaultive behavior against staff or other offenders. Some of the offenders have emotional/psychological problems that prevent them from functioning effectively in the general offender population and cause them to act inappropriately. This type of behavior results in sentencing to the segregation unit.

The current segregation unit is inadequate in providing a safe work environment for staff. Staff is often required to physically restrain an out-of-control offender. Staff have been injured during such physical interactions. The cells are 6 by 10 feet and contain a bed, toilet and washbowl. It is difficult to maneuver in the present cells to control or remove an aggressive/assaultive offender.

Factors of consideration:

- Per diem costs will actually be lowered.
- Construction of a new unit will not require additional staffing. Current staffing complements in the segregation unit will be adequate. This will add 150 level 5 offenders to the population with no increase necessary for staffing.
- The current segregation unit will revert to a general offender population unit. Current Cell Hall A-West staffing complement will be adequate to provide necessary coverage for the entire unit.
- Construction of a new unit will provide for American Corrections Association (ACA) standards of large living unit size; provide cells with doors instead of bars; and all living units will be contained on one or two floors.

- Safety for staff and offenders will increase dramatically. Rooms will be larger and can be easily entered by a team of officers if warranted. Maneuverability of staff within the unit will lessen potential injury to staff and offenders.
- Accessibility to each cell will also lessen staff potential for injury. As an example, staff currently must hand carry food trays to each tier three times a day. This involves moving food carts up four tiers. With a one-floor construction or a short lift minimal lifting would occur.

## IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Personnel costs will not be affected by this proposed request. It is anticipated that the current staffing complement will be adequate to staff the new segregation unit as well as combining the vacated segregation unit to Cell Hall A-West unit. With the additional 150 offenders, per diem costs will decrease. The new unit will decrease the potential Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) violations, provide ADA access for staff and offenders, and decrease work related injury costs.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition						] .	
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign Fees	0	90	0	0	90	01/2003	05/2003
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	133	0	0	133	05/2003	08/2003
Design Development	0	175	0	0	175	09/2003	01/2004
Contract Documents	0	508	0	0	508	01/2004	04/2004
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
4. Project Management	-J		L	L.,	A		
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	]	
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	1	
5. Construction Costs	-l		L				
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0	j	
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0	-	
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	-	
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0			
8. Occupancy	<u> </u>						L
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	1	
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	0	906	0	0	906	海北市市市市市市	
9. Inflation			1		1		
Midpoint of Construction							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		14. 中国法国达美国	
Inflation Cost	hadden staat de st	0	0	. 0		and stork Transport Section	建制建筑和高度
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$906	\$0	\$0			

## Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	906	0	0	906
State Funds Subtotal	0	906	0	0	906
Agency Operating Budget Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	906	0	0	906

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)					
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09		
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0		
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0		
Building Operating Expenses	0	· 0	0	0		
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0		
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0		
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0		
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0		
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	906	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
Pro	Project applicants should be aware that the following requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (require legislative notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)					
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required (as per Finance Dept.)					
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (as per Finance Dept)					
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)					
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)					
Yes	Project Cancellation in 2007 (as per Finance Dept)					

.

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Without a predesign document being submitted prior to the request it is not possible to evaluate the request further. The construction funding should be indicated in a future year biennia and phases defined.

A master plan (based upon DOCs strategic plan) should be developed for future land use and efficiencies. (Note: Master planning is not a bondable activity)

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

This project would add prison beds for 150 level 5 offenders. The agency anticipates no change in total staffing.

## **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor recommends a partial appropriation of \$90,000 for [describe project scope/phase/etc]. This appropriation is from [identify the funding sources].

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE						
Criteria	Values	Points				
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0				
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0				
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0				
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80				
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	35				
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70				
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75				
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0				
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0				
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0				
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0				
Total	700 Maximum	260				

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,938,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 5 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Red Wing

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

This request is to provide funding for design and construction of a new vocational building at the Minnesota Correctional Facility – Red Wing (MCF-RW). A new combined classroom and shop complex in close proximity to the academic school building will enable the facility to best provide the vocational preparation and education needed by the juvenile resident population.

Per legislative mandate, the MCF-RW is the only state juvenile facility authorized to receive juvenile males committed to the commissioner of corrections. The current vocational education buildings are old, in various stages of disrepair, and not well suited to the provision of quality programs. The structures are not located near the academic education building, and are too small to be developed into comprehensive vocational education classrooms and shops. Not all spaces are accessible to disabled persons. The existing shops are costly to maintain and cannot provide for shared utilities.

A new complex, with designed in flexibility, will make it possible to maximize the potential for future marketable vocational skills provided to the residents of the facility. This is especially important considering that the majority of residents being released from the MCF-RW will be entering the job market in our communities, and living independently.

## IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Fuel and utilities - \$66,000 per fiscal year.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
<ul> <li>All Years and All Funding Sources</li> </ul>	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition							
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign Fees	27	0	0	0	27	02/1999	06/1999
3. Design Fees						an de la companya de Companya de la companya de la company	時時期にしたい
Schematic	0	50	0	0	50	08/2002	09/2002
Design Development	0	67	0	0	67	10/2002	12/2002
Contract Documents	0	133	0	0	133	01/2003	03/2003
Construction Administration	0	83	0	0	83	05/2003	05/2004
4. Project Management							]
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	. 0	0		
5. Construction Costs						05/2003	05/2004
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	5	0	0	5		
Construction	0	3,839	0	0	3,839		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	202	0	0	202		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Occupancy				<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		03/2004	05/2004
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	100	0	0	100		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	25	0	0	25		
Security Equipment	0	10	0	0	10		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	27	4,514	0	0	4,541	的目的分词通知的	tala danata danata dan dari dari dari dari dari dari dari dari
9. Inflation						Certa nelsonnes da Core Maria Mila Mila Core	State States
Midpoint of Construction	Part States	10/2003					的。你们就是这些
Inflation Multiplier		9.40%	0.00%	0.00%		编制这些明治和	
Inflation Cost		424	0		424		$ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{2} + 1$
GRAND TOTAL	\$27	\$4,938	\$0	\$0	\$4,965	Songer Part and All Songer	·····································

-

## Corrections, Department of MCF-RW - New Vocational Building

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	4,938	0	0	4,938
State Funds Subtotal	0	4,938	0	0	4,938
Agency Operating Budget Funds	27	0	0	0	27
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	27	4,938	0	0	4,965

CHANGES IN Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Infla				
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	132	132	132
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	132	132	132
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CHANGES	0	132	132	132
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	4,938	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS						
	Project applicants should be aware that the following requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.						
Vee	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major						
Yes	Remodeling Review (by Legislature)						
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This						
INO	Review (by Legislature)						
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects						
INO	(require legislative notification)						
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review						
res	Required (by Administration Dept)						
Vaa	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation						
Yes	Requirements						
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology						
res	Review (by Office of Technology)						
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required						
165	(as per Finance Dept.)						
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required						
	(as per Finance Dept)						
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review						
	Required (by granting agency)						
No	Matching Funds Required						
	(as per agency request)						
Yes	Project Cancellation in 2007						
	(as per Finance Dept)						

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

A master plan (based upon DOCs strategic plan) should be developed for future land use and operational efficiencies on a campus wide basis. (Note: Master planning is not a bondable activity)

## Department of Finance Analysis:

Recent offender populations at Red Wing have fluctuated from 121 to 169. This project has been designed for institution populations up to 300.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE						
Criteria	Values	Points				
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0				
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0				
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0				
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80				
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	70				
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35				
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	50				
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0				
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0				
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0				
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25				
Total	700 Maximum	260				

#### **Project Narrative**

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$346,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 6 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Faribault

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

This request is for predesign/design funds to reduce the two existing inefficient and severely undersized food preparation, dining and storage areas into one secure and efficient area. This requires renovation of existing inmate dining space into storage and additional food preparation space and the construction of additional inmate dining space.

This project is to provide sufficient, safe, and secure food service capacity to accommodate population increases at the Minnesota Correctional Facility-Faribault (MCF-FRB). The food preparation and dining areas are disjointed and difficult to supervise. One food preparation area would enable the facility to provide security coverage during all hours of operation. It will also assist in the management of offender movement and provide a more secure area for product. There would be one storage area for deliveries inside the facility, reducing delivery vehicle traffic.

#### IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

The food service building improvements at the MCF-FRB will not significantly impact current operating budgets related to food service.

It may be anticipated that some savings can be achieved in the following areas:

- Reduced energy costs due to exterior wall insulation, air doors, upgraded exhaust hoods and associated makeup air and ventilation systems.
- Reduced maintenance costs due to upgraded equipment.
- Reduced food costs with the potential for increased bulk buying accommodated by new storage capacity.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

The MCF-FRB has two kitchen facilities. These kitchens were constructed to serve a population of 800 offenders. We have exceeded this population to 1,137 offenders. The existing kitchens are disjointed, difficult to supervise, inefficient, and not large enough to accommodate the number of offenders and food service staff currently working in the facility. The kitchens were not designed to serve this many offenders. Offender movement and traffic flow are difficult to monitor and manage.

The Linden Unit kitchen was constructed in 1991 in several separate areas, which are not designed to function efficiently. The storage area located primarily in the lower level is accessed through a narrow stairway; the dishwashing room is across the hall; and the bakery is in a remote area down the hall. The Fern Unit kitchen was added in 1995 with some of the same efficiency issues. Although productions space is better, the dish room is across the hall from the kitchen and the dry storage area is completely detached from food services and needs to be accessed by a separate outside building entrance. The area is difficult to supervise and the weather can be a problem when transporting dry items from the storage area to the kitchen. These issues result in higher staffing levels and require greater offender labor supervision in both kitchen areas.

By operating one kitchen, security and safety will be enhanced while operating a more efficient kitchen. Security staff concerns for offender movement and dining behavior problems would be reduced through a better kitchen design and traffic flow. One kitchen would allow the facility to provide continuous security coverage without additional staffing.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

-

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	<b>Project Finish</b>
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition							
Land, Land Easements, Options	· \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0			
2. Predesign Fees	0	30	0	0	30	01/2003	04/2003
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	68	0	0	68	05/2003	07/2003
Design Development	0	84	0	0	84	08/2003	11/2003
Contract Documents	0	164	0	0	164	12/0003	03/2004
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	· 0		
4. Project Management				· · · · ·			
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	-	
5. Construction Costs					-		1
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction	0	0	0	0			
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	-	
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	<u></u>	
8. Occupancy					·····		L
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	-	
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0			
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0			
Other Costs	0	0	0	0		-	
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	0	346	0	0			
9. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0.0070	0.0070	0.00 //	and the second		a) South State (Section 2010) and the section of
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$346	\$0	\$0			

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	346	0	0	346
State Funds Subtotal	0	346	0	0	346
Agency Operating Budget Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	346	0	0	346

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)				
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0	
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	346	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	ject applicants should be aware that the following					
requi	requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of					
	the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
100	Remodeling Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
NU	Review (by Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects					
NO	(require legislative notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review					
res	Required (by Administration Dept)					
X	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
Yes	Requirements					
Vaa	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology					
Yes	Review (by Office of Technology)					
Vee	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept.)					
NIa	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
No	(as per Finance Dept)					
Nia	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
No	Required (by granting agency)					
N1-	Matching Funds Required					
No	(as per agency request)					
Vaa	Project Cancellation in 2007					
Yes	(as per Finance Dept)					

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

For future decision-making, a master plan (based upon DOCs strategic plan) should be developed for the facility. A master plan can give direction for future land use and operational efficiencies for the campus. Without the predesign being completed a thorough analysis is not possible. Admin suggests that funding for predesign only be considered.

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Suggest that the agency complete its analysis of infrastructure and capacity options at Faribault and other converted facilities before capital funding is provided for renovation and reconfiguration projects such as this.

## Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE						
Criteria	Values	Points				
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0				
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0				
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0				
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	40				
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	35				
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35				
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	25				
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0				
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0				
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0				
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0				
Total	700 Maximum	135				

#### **Project Narrative**

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,523,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 7 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION: Willow River** 

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:**

Minnesota Correctional Facility-Willow River/Moose Lake (MCF-WR/ML) – Activities Building at Willow River.

This project would demolish the existing structure and construct a new activities building to be used for physical training as required by statute for the Challenge Incarceration Program (CIP) at the Willow River site.

With the CIP and its statutory requirements of physical training and various programming aspects, an activities building is required.

The existing structure was built by offenders in 1963, and has major structural and mechanical deficiencies (i.e. deteriorating block walls, leaky roof, outdated electrical and heating equipment, and no ventilation system). Repair and remodel of this building to meet current standards would be prohibitively expensive.

A life cycle cost analysis would indicate that a new structure would be far more cost effective and energy efficient.

The activities building has been previously requested in the 1994, 1996, and 2000, capital budget requests. Funding has not been approved.

The consequence of deferring this project would severely limit the facility's ability to accomplish the directives indicated in the Minnesota Rules, Chapter No. 571, Section 5 of M.S. 244.17.

With the state experiencing offender population increases, the DOC will not close down older facilities. Rather, the DOC will need to keep older facilities, like the one at Willow River open to meet the bed space demands.

The Willow River site was chosen for the CIP based on its space and layout. The CIP programming must be separated from the general population of offenders and must have its own grounds to be successful.

## IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

This project would significantly reduce repair, maintenance, and energy costs associated with the operation and use of the existing structure. The cost of this project includes design fees, constructions costs, and materials.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition						02/1999	05/1999
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	]	
Land and Buildings	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign Fees	10	0	0	0	10		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	13	0	0	13	07/2002	09/2002
Design Development	0	17	0	0		09/2002	12/2002
Contract Documents	0	33	0	0	33	12/2002	03/2003
Construction Administration	0	17	0	0	17	03/2003	11/2003
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	]	
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs						03/2003	11/2003
Site & Building Preparation	0	36	0	0	36		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	53	0	0	53		
Construction	0	1,095	0	0	1,095		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	20	0	0	20		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	10	0	0	10		
Construction Contingency	0	54	0	0	54		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0		Canal Caracteria
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Occupancy				1		08/2003	11/2003
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	24	0	0	24		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0			
Security Equipment	0	25	0	0		1	
Other Costs	0	0	0	0			κ.
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8)	10	1,397	0	0			
9. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		09/2003					
Inflation Multiplier		9.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		126	0	0	126		Philippine and a start of the
GRAND TOTAL	\$10	\$1,523	\$0	\$0			

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	1,523	0	0	1,523
State Funds Subtotal	0	1,523	0	0	1,523
Agency Operating Budget Funds	10	0	0	0	10
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	10	1,523	0	0	1,533

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)				
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	· 0	0	0	
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CHANGES	0	0	0	0	
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,523	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS			
requirements will apply to their projects after adoption of				
	the bonding bill.			
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major			
163	Remodeling Review (by Legislature)			
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This			
140	Review (by Legislature)			
No MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects				
140	(require legislative notification)			
Yes MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review				
100	Required (by Administration Dept)			
Yes MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation				
100	Requirements			
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology			
100	Review (by Office of Technology)			
Yes MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required				
100	(as per Finance Dept.)			
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required			
110	(as per Finance Dept)			
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review			
140	Required (by granting agency)			
No	Matching Funds Required			
140	(as per agency request)			
Yes	Project Cancellation in 2007			
165	(as per Finance Dept)			

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

A predesign was prepared for the FY 2000 capital budget request and costs have been updated for FY 2002. The scope should be expanded to include a water source for necessary fire fighting capacity.

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

The agency should verify its commitment to maintaining CIP and provide evidence that the program's outcomes are cost effective and efficient. This request has been made several times, but has been low on the list of priorities for the department.

## Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE					
Criteria	Values	Points			
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0			
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0			
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0			
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	40			
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	70			
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	25			
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0			
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0			
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0			
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25			
Total	700 Maximum	195			

## **Project Narrative**

#### 2002 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$8,070,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 8 of 8

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Saint Cloud

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:**

Minnesota Correctional Facility-St. Cloud (MCF-SCL) – Vocational Building

This project would provide for the design and construction of a new vocational building and the remodeling of an existing vocational building. The project could consolidate vocational programming in one area, eliminating the use of old outdated buildings and program space.

The existing vocational programs are housed in buildings and space that date from the early 1900s. The spaces are small and not designed for comprehensive vocational programming. They are located separately and make the sharing of classroom space for related instruction impossible. The buildings also lack air exchange, filtration, and appropriate lighting.

A new facility built adjacent to the existing vocational building, constructed in the early 1970s, will provide adequate space for the training needs of the offenders at the MCF-SCL. In addition to housing the existing vocational programs, the new building will allow for the expansion of current enrollment from 70-80 students to 120-130. By centralizing the programs in one building, the supervision of offenders is improved, sharing of space is possible, and communication between educational staff is increased.

The expansion of vocational programming will be coordinated with Minnesota State Colleges & Universities/St. Cloud Technical College to utilize their ongoing research into the regional job market. Curricula selections will focus on "living wage" not "minimum wage" jobs.

#### IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

The expansion of vocational programming will require the addition of vocational instructors and teaching assistance. Additional correctional officers will also be needed to provide security coverage for the area. A total of 15 new FTEs will result in an estimated annual cost of \$743,500. The projected cost for utilities and maintenance is \$59,968.

#### PROJECT CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, ADDRESS, PHONE, FAX, AND E-MAIL:

Joseph R. Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 St. Paul, MN 55108-5219 Phone: (651) 642-0247 Fax: (651) 603-0150 E-mail: jmiller@co.doc.state.mn.us Corrections, Department of MCF-SCL - New Vocational Building

## AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 2002-2007 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding Sources	All Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	AILFIIULTEAIS	112002-03	112004-05	112000-07	Airtears		(Monal/Tear)
Land, Land Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Land and Buildings	<del>0</del>	<del>لې</del> 0	0	<del>0</del>	<u> </u>		
2. Predesign Fees	14	0	0		14		
3. Design Fees	14	0	0	0	14		
Schematic	0	65	0	0	65	07/2002	09/2002
		85			85	09/2002	12/2002
Design Development	0		0	0			
Contract Documents	0	170	0	0	170	01/2003	02/2003
Construction Administration	0	110	0	0	110	05/2003	05/2004
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0		0	-	
Non-State Project Management	0	0	0	0	. 0		
Commissioning	0	0	0		0		
Other Costs	0	. 0	0	0	- 0	05/0000	05/0004
5. Construction Costs						05/2003	05/2004
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0		0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	5,378	0	0	5,378		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	269	0	0	269		
Other Costs	0	27	0	0	27		
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0		0		
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Occupancy		4 400			1 100	03/2004	05/2004
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	1,166	0		1,166		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	30	0		30		
Security Equipment	0	0	0		0		
Other Costs	0	30	0	0	30		
SUBTOTAL: (items 1 – 8) 9. Inflation	14	7,330	0	0	7,344		
	Ingersaliates states	40/0000		T	and the Association of the 1924		
Midpoint of Construction	Addition and the second second	12/2003	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Multiplier		10.10%	0.00%		740		
	A 4 4	740	0		740		
GRAND TOTAL	\$14	\$8,070	\$0	\$0	\$8,084	ng ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	

PAGE H-74

Corrections, Department of MCF-SCL - New Vocational Building

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	8,070	0	0	8,070
State Funds Subtotal	0	8,070	0	0	8,070
Agency Operating Budget Funds	14	0	0	0	14
Federal Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14	8,070	0	0	8,084

CHANGES IN	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)			
STATE OPERATING COSTS	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	1,487	1,487	1,487
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	120	120	120
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	1,607	1,607	1,607
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CHANGES	0	1,607	1,607	. 1,607
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	0.0	15.0	15.0	15.0

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects only)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	8,070	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

ST	ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
	ject applicants should be aware that the following rements will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (require legislative notification)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required (as per Finance Dept.)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (as per Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)
Yes	Project Cancellation in 2007 (as per Finance Dept)

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign has been completed in coordination with the St. Cloud Technical College.

A master plan (based upon DOCs strategic plan) should be developed for the facility to look at future development and land use on the campus.

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

This project would improve vocational education programs at St. Cloud. Operating costs would increase for additional staff, utilities, and maintenance.

## Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE					
Criteria	Values	Points			
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0			
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0			
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0			
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	40			
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	0			
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	25			
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0			
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0			
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0			
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0			
Total	700 Maximum	100			