# Criminal Justice

1998-2003

Presented by Governor Arne H. Carlson to the 80th Legislature



HJ 11 .M6425c 1998/ 2003 Criminal Justice

# MINNESOTA STRATEGIC CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN 1998-2003 -INDEX-

#### **CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

Corrections, Department of

Page Number

H-1



The Governor's 1998-2003 Strategic Capital Budget Plan *Executive Summary* and *Requests for Each Agency* can be viewed at the Department of Finance's web site at: http://www.finance.state.mn.us/bis



	1998 Agency	Agency	Project Reque (\$ by Se		Funds	Statewide	Governor's Recommendation	Governor's Estin	's Planning imate	
Project Title	Priority Ranking	1998	2000	2002	Total	Strategic Score	1998	2000	2002	
MCF-SHK - Bed Expansion	1	\$6,958	\$0	\$0	\$6,958	350	\$6,958	\$0	\$0	
MCF-LL - Admin. Segregation Unit	2	344	0	0	344	480	344	0	0	
MCF-RW - Security Fence	3	1,206	0	0	1,206	320	1,206	0	0	
MCF-OPH - Seg. , MH, and HIth Care Units	4	3,330	11,245	0	14,575	360	3,330	11,245	0	
MCF-SCL - Intake Center	5	1,907	0	0	1,907	300	1,907	0	0	
MCF-SCL - Replumb Education Wing	6	1,275	0	0	1,275	340	0	0	0	
Dept Fire/Life Safety Improvements	7	5,542	0	0	5,542	350	0	0	0	
Dept Asset Preservation	8	3,282	3,594	3,894	10,770	380	4,100	4,100	4,100	
MCF-RW - Vocational/Industry Bldg.	9	89	2,666	0	2,755	220	0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Towers, Wall & Catwalk	10	6,062	0	0	6,062	350	0	0	0	
Dept Roof & Window Replacement	11	6,079	4,546	4,926	15,551	245	0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Education Building	12	47	5,765	0	5,812	160	0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Multi-Purpose Complex	13	38	4,717	0	4,755	135	0	0	0	
TC - Addition to Dormitory	14	568	0	0	568	100	0	0	0	
MCF-SCL - Relocate & Renovate Rooms	15	11	2,741	0	2,752	195	0	0	0	
MCF-RW - Road & Sidewalk Renewal		0	267	0	267		0	0	0	
MCF-WR/ML - Industry Warehouse - ML		0	39	557	596		0	0	0	
MCF-WR/ML - Vehicle Garage - ML		0	148	0	148		0	0	0	
MCF-W/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-WR/ML - Building Maintenance Shop - ML		0	116	0	116		0	. 0	0	
MCF-WR/ML - Green House - ML		0	143	0	143		0	0	0	
MCF-WR/ML - Activities Building WR		0	660	0	660		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Electrical Upgrade - Industry		0	800	0	800		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Sewer Vent - Water Main Replacement		0	1,000	0	1,000		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Receiving Complex & Warehouse		0	17,608	0	17,608		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Master Control Renovation		0	1,611	0	1,611		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Tuckpointing		0	800	416	1,216		0	0	0	
MCF-STW - Infirmary		0	800	0	800		0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - New Maintenance Building		0	0	120	120		0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Renovate Evers Cottage		0	0	375	375		0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Renovate Stowe Cottage		0	286	0	286		0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Renovate Lind Cottage		0	450	0	450		0	0	0	
MCF-SCR - Upgrade Tekawitha Cottage	1	0	255	0	255		0	0	0	

	1998 Agency	Agency Project Requests for State Funds (\$ by Session)				Statewide Governor's Strategic Recommendation		Governor's Planning Estimate	
Project Title	Priority Ranking	1998	2000	2002	Total	Score	1998	2000	2002
MCF-SCR - Renovate Alcott Cottage		0	421	0	421		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Extend Floor in Old Boiler Room		0	0	242	242		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Facility Sewer System		Ô	0	3,214	3,214		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Construct New Plant Operations Building		0	0	3,521	3,521		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Replace Telephone Equipment and Lines		0	0	444	444		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Remodel Basement Areas		0	0	461	461		0	Ō	0
MCF-SCL - Expand Floor - Balcony Level		0	0	318	318		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Toilet Carrier Replacement		0	493	0	493		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Install New Air Handler- Industry Wing		0	388	0	388		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Remodel Administration Building		0	4,504	0	4,504		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Facility Climate Control		0	1,291	0	1,291		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Construct New Warehouse		0	1,171	0	1,171		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Retube Boilers		0	517	0	517		0	0	0
MCF-SCL - Upgrade Security System		0	749	0	749		0	0	0
MCF-RW - New Living Unit		0	124	1,346	1,470		0	0	0
MCF-LL - Replace HVAC Systems - Living Units		0	700	0	700		0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$36,738	\$70,700	\$20,542	\$127,980		\$17,845	\$15,345	\$4,100

#### **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 safe Minnesota. The department is authorized under M.S. 241.

To aid in the achievement of this mission, the department operates 10 correctional facilities including seven for adults, two for juveniles, and one that serves both adults and juveniles. As of 6-1-97, the adult prison population totals 5,172 inmates; juvenile offenders total 216. The department is also responsible for over 12,000 offenders on probation, supervised release, and parole who are supervised by department agents. Through the state Community Corrections Act the department also administers grant funds to units of local government for correctional services. Through grant funding provided by the department, programs serve battered women and their children, victims of sexual assault, and general crime victims.

The department is organized into five programmatic divisions: institutions (adult and juvenile divisions), crime victim and prevention services, community services, and management services. Also, special units include the office of diversity, office of planning and research, and the health unit.

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 department has undertaken a bed space strategic plan that encompasses numerous initiatives to ensure that the agency's capital budget request includes only cost-effective, essential projects. By more efficiently utilizing all space in existing correctional facilities, capacities have been increased by approximately 200 beds. In addition, with the approval of legislation lifting limits on multiple-occupancy celling in custody-level 3 (medium) and 4 (close) institutions, double-bunking is being expanded resulting in increased capacities. Also, double- bunking is incorporated

into construction plans at MCF-Rush City to accommodate projected growth in future years. Through these actions, economies of scale are realized, creating operational cost savings and ensuring that expansion projects are limited to only those which are critically needed. Under current sentencing law and inmate population projections, no bed expansion projects beyond what is contained in this capital request are anticipated. It is the department's position that, in the event any future expansion may be required due to law changes, it will be accomplished at existing facility sites to achieve cost-effectiveness.

It should also be noted that many asset preservation, safety improvements, replacement, and renovation projects have been delayed in prior years due to higher priority given to bed expansions that have been essential to address dramatic inmate population growth.

ADULTS: The capital budget requests for the adult facilities division were first prioritized to deal with the rapidly growing adult female population (at MCF-Shakopee) and to continue the new administrative segregation project at MCF-Lino Lakes. Planning funds for these projects were approved in previous legislative sessions. Other priorities include development of a department-wide infirmary and mental health unit for adult males at MCF-Oak Park Heights and the planning for the replacement of beds lost through this expansion with a high security 60-bed unit at MCF-Oak Park Heights. The intake/reception center project at MCF-St. Cloud is requested to support the department's effort to consolidate three reception centers for adult males into one central reception center at the St. Cloud facility. This request is for staff support area spaces to facilitate the reception center. Security enforcement and repairs to the wall and towers at MCF-Stillwater are necessary to provide an effective perimeter.

Three priority items deal with the department's attempts to improve and maintain its capital assets. These include requests for asset preservation, fire and life safety improvements, and roof and window replacement. Two additional projects at MCF-St. Cloud are requested to support this effort.

JUVENILES: In keeping with the direction and intent of the 1997 legislature, MCF-Red Wing will focus on the serious chronic, and hard core juvenile male population. Therefore, a request for a security fence has been included for this facility. Pending the submittal of a final report to the legislature in January 1998, the current plan for MCF-Sauk Centre is to serve special needs and assessment activities for juveniles under contracts directly with counties and juvenile courts. In addition, all female juveniles committed to the commissioner of corrections will be served at MCF-Sauk Centre. To fully support these programs, an education building and a multipurpose complex are proposed for the facility. Thistledew Camp will continue to be available as a short-term wilderness center offering experiential learning opportunities. The current dormitory neither offers sufficient group meeting/day room space nor does it have a shelter for severe weather. An addition to the dormitory is proposed in this capital budget.

Adult Inmate Prison Population Growth: The number of individuals that the DOC incarcerates is not within the control of the DOC's management. Since the Sentencing Guidelines Commission was created in 1980, Minnesota has had a determinate sentencing structure (fixed time to be in prison). Under the sentencing guidelines grid, an offender is sentenced to a fixed amount of time in prison and on supervised release, based on the offense and previous history. Since 1989, the penalties for serious violent offenders have been increased substantially by the legislature and the Sentencing Guidelines Commission. Penalties for drug offenses have also been increased. Life sentences without the possibility of parole were added for certain murderers and life sentences for certain categories of repeat sex offenders became law. Life sentences were increased from 17 to 30 years before parole consideration. 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 November 1997 population projections show an increase of 1,503 male inmates by 2007. The department has a plan in place to address this growth through a combination of MCF-Rush City; adding up to 120 additional beds through double-bunking; expansions at existing sites; and contracting for beds if necessary.

Adult Males FY End	Projected Population
1998	5132
1999	5211
2000	5399
2001	5543
2002	5755
2003	5957
2004	6179
2005	6324
2006	6455
2007	6635

Adult Female Population: Based on current law, the November 1997 population projections show an increase of 104 adult female inmates by 2007. Minnesota has one facility available to house adult females (MCF-Shakopee) with a capacity of 243. With the utilization of several day rooms as dorms, the temporary capacity at MCF-Shakopee is 280 beds. As of 5-15-97, there was a total of 255 female inmates. By the year 2007, projections indicate a female population of 360.

Adult Females FY End	Projected Population
1998	256
1999	264
2000	289
2001	290
2002	291
2003	319
2004	321
2005	329
2006	337
2007	360

Juvenile Offender Population: The juvenile population at the two state juvenile facilities has remained in the 200-plus range in recent years. The average in F.Y. 1996 and F.Y. 1997 was 233 and 214 respectively. The average was 180 in F.Y. 1994 and 223 in F.Y. 1995. These numbers represent an increase over the previous several biennia and some expansion has taken place. An adult living unit was converted to juvenile use at MCF-Red Wing in F.Y. 1995. A new 30-bed security unit for juveniles was completed at MCF-Red Wing during F.Y. 1996 and the former security unit was converted to a general population unit. Dramatic changes are taking place at both facilities as the department responds to legislative mandates to move the juvenile male population from MCF-Sauk Centre to MCF-Red Wing. Programming specialized for serious, chronic offenders is being established at MCF-Red Wing. Plans call for the moving of 69 adult minimum security inmates from MCF-Red Wing to MCF-Faribault. Also, plans are currently being developed to outline the future uses of MCF-Sauk Centre. Thistledew Camp has expanded recently with the establishment of the new Wilderness Endeavors 21-day program.

### 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 capital asset preservation and replacement account (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 identified a list of projects for F.Y. 1998 totalling \$3,282,000 which have been deferred or delayed due to limited funding. This list represents the most immediate repair needs within the department.

The department received \$300 thousand in the F.Y. 1998-99 biennium to supplement the facilities repair and maintenance budgets. These funds are being used to fund unforeseen repairs and maintenance needs that are limited in scope.

In the future, as the new and renovated buildings age, additional funding will be needed to maintain these state facilities. Also, the need to meet federal requirements such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and code compliance for safety and building standards continues to compete with and consume the limited funding available through the capital budget process.

Following is a list of the correctional facilities under the jurisdiction of the department along with a brief description and assessment of the facilities. The number of beds stated is the total capacity of each facility. Facilities should not operate at more than 98% of total bed design capacity, in order to allow for control of inmates and prison management including emergencies, maintenance, problem inmates, and short-term population issues.

MCF-Faribault opened in F.Y. 1990 on the campus at the Faribault Regional Treatment Center (RTC). It is a level 3 (medium) security facility for adult males with a capacity of 888 and provides an opportunity for inmates to participate in work programs with training and self-discipline. Original construction dates of the buildings range from 1946 to 1990 (new industry building). Buildings are structurally sound, but some upgrading and continued maintenance are needed.

MCF-Red Wing receives and treats delinquent juvenile males and designated extended jurisdiction juveniles (EJJ's) up to 21 years of age committed to the commissioner of corrections from the juvenile courts in 38 southeastern Minnesota counties including Hennepin and Ramsey. With the addition of its new secure cottage, MCF-Red Wing has 133 juvenile beds. Four main buildings at MCF-Red Wing date back to the 1890s; several others date to the early 1900s with the most recent construction of five living units during the 1960s. Window replacement and upgrading are needed. Since this facility will strengthen its focus on serious chronic juvenile offenders, a security fence is included in this capital request.

MCF-Lino Lakes is for adult male offenders in level 3 (medium) security. This facility has undergone major change and growth in recent years. The facility was constructed in 1963 and operated as a juvenile facility until 1978 when it was converted to a medium security adult facility. The facility became an admitting facility in 1993 for offenders who violated technical rules of their release agreement, and in 1994 for offenders who have a pronounced term of imprisonment of 12 months or less, and all probation violators.

The facility transferred a significant portion of its industry program to other correctional facilities. This will make MCF-Lino Lakes the primary therapeutic center for offenders requiring chemical dependency and transitional sex offender treatment. This effort is the result of a major renovation and construction program undertaken during the 1994-95 biennial period. These changes will increase the capacity of this facility from 480 inmates to 1021 in F.Y.1998. However, for control, a new administrative segregation unit is needed at this facility.

MCF-Shakopee provides for adult female offenders and offers activities in education, vocational education, specialized programming, such as chemical dependency, parenting, independent living skills, battered women's groups, work release, and the industry program. Two new living units and a mental health unit opened in July 1994, increasing the capacity to 243 inmates. A 124 bed expansion to the current facility to accommodate the department's population projection for female offenders through 2007 is included in this capital request.

MCF-Willow River/Moose Lake - The facility has two main locations. One, opened in 1988, is on the grounds of the former Department of Human Services' Moose Lake Regional Treatment Center. The other is at the institution's original campsite in Willow River.

Moose Lake is a level 3 (medium) institution for adult males with a capacity of 641. Plans call for continued monitoring to determine to what extent double-bunking can be expanded to increase the overall capacity of this facility. Inmates 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, and industry. Inmates participate in vocational programs including horticulture and barbering, or are employed in industry which encompasses printing, garment-making, mattress making, fishing lure assembly and a wood shop.

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 male and female inmates. The rigorous physical training portion of the program develops the physical and mental well-being of the offender. The maximum capacity of this program is 79 (71 males and 8 females). Inmates participate in the incarceration phase at Willow River for 6 months. This campus has had little renovation in recent years and is in need of CAPRA funding.

MCF-Sauk Centre is a 120 bed facility that receives and treats delinquent males and designated extended jurisdiction juveniles (EJJ's) from juvenile courts in 49 counties in western Minnesota and delinquent females from juvenile courts from all of Minnesota. Several buildings date from 1911 to 1916 with some buildings added in 1963 and 1970. The Mary Lyon School Annex needs to be demolished and a new education building constructed. Living units also need to be replaced.

<u>Thistledew Camp</u> 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. Thistledew Camp is located in Togo, Minnesota, and many of its buildings date back to the 1960s. Buildings need renovation and insulation. The camp averages between 50 and 60 juveniles.

MCF-Stillwater provides academic, vocational, therapeutic, and work opportunities for level 5 (close) inmates. MCF-Stillwater, with a capacity of 1303, is the state's

largest correctional facility. Most of the main buildings at MCF-Stillwater were constructed from 1910 to 1914. With buildings this old, renovation is ongoing and this request includes several projects, both in the capital budget and in CAPRA. This facility will need to remain operational into the foreseeable future.

The capital request includes security upgrades; tuck pointing; replacement of windows, screens, and doors; and repair of the wall and towers of the facility perimeter.

MCF-St. Cloud is a receiving and level 5 (close) facility for adult male offenders with a capacity of 771. MCF-St. Cloud is going to be the intake/reception center for all adult male inmates. The proposed project involves the renovation of day rooms into testing/assessment areas, and the construction of a building to house transport vehicles and offices for staff. In addition to the reception process, programming at MCF-St. Cloud includes academic; vocational; chemical dependency; individual, group and job counseling; and work programs. With a larger percentage of the population being younger male adults, the emphasis is on education, especially vocational education.

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 are in this capital budget for CAPRA funds for upgrading. This facility will need to remain operational into the foreseeable future.

MCF-Oak Park Heights is the state's level 6 (maximum) security facility with a capacity of 393 and is designed to receive inmates transferred from MCF-St. Cloud and MCF-Stillwater. Inmates at MCF-Oak Park Heights are classified as maximum custody or risks to the public, including those convicted of serious person offenses, high escape risks, and dangerous and disruptive management problems from other institutions. It offers various programs to inmates with an emphasis on industry programming.

The proposed expansion of infirmary and mental health beds will effectively meet the increasing medical needs of the inmate population and greatly enhance cost reduction/containment efforts in the inmate health care delivery system. The addition of a high security unit will meet the increased security needs of housing extremely high risk, violent and dangerous inmates in a level 6 (maximum) custody facility. This facility was constructed in 1981 with a warehouse added in 1987. With the relatively new buildings, major renovation is not needed, but tuck pointing, reroofing and maintenance are required.

### DESCRIBE THE AGENCY'S LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC GOALS AND CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN:

In carrying out the mission of the department, the department has the following objectives which 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 inmates;
- To operate cost-efficient facilities to house inmates; and
- To value and respect staff and inmates of all cultures, races, and ethnic backgrounds.

The capital budget requests were first prioritized to deal with the rapidly growing adult female population and to continue the new administrative segregation project.

Projects were then prioritized to deal with health and safety issues that also relate to the growing population demands. The proposed new medical unit at MCF-Oak Park Heights will serve as a central service center for inmates from other facilities. Asset preservation is essential to maintaining state assets.

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

The DOC management seeks input from the wardens and superintendents of all the correctional facilities. General guidelines, including types of projects and department objectives, are provided by management. Each warden or superintendent develops his or her own request which is forwarded to the central office where the commissioner and deputy commissioner consolidate, prioritize, and select those projects needed to meet the mission, goals, and objectives of the department. Data collection is provided by various staff in plant operations and the financial area of the correctional facilities and central office. Consultants and engineers have been consulted in developing the cost estimates for the requests.

The DOC recently created a new Office of Planning and Research. This unit is in the process of developing both a short and a long range plan for the agency, as well as a system to collect necessary data.

### AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1992-1997):

1992	MCF-Shakopee	Expansion	\$ 10,815
1993	MCF-Willow River/		
	Moose Lake	Conversion	9,600
1993	MCF-Red Wing	Planning Secure Cottage	212
1994	MCF-Faribault	300-Bed Expansion	10,832
1994	MCF-Lino Lakes	512-Bed Expansion	10,626
1994	MCF-Willow River/		
	Moose Lake	Conversion	19,000

	Corrections,	Department	of
--	--------------	------------	----

**Strategic Planning Summary** 

1994	MCF-Shakopee	Expansion/Predesign	80
1994	MCF-Red Wing	New 30-Bed Secure Unit	2,700
1994	MCF-Stillwater	Education Building	4,500
1994	MCF-Stillwater	Industry Building	1,700
1994	Thistledew Camp	Education Building	1,200
1994	MCF-Rush City	800-Bed Facility Predesign	2,000
1996	Department	Asset Preservation	1,750
1996	MCF-Rush City	New Level 4 Facility	89,000
1996	MCF-Brainerd	Bed Expansion	1,500
1996	MCF-Lino Lakes	Segregation Unit Predesign	<u>500</u>
		Total	\$166,015

#### CAPRA funds have been received as follows:

1990-1991		\$1,017
1992-1993		1,630
1994-1995		1,973
1996-1997		<u>1,651</u>
	Total	\$6,271

These funds have been used for physical plant preservation including roof and window replacement, asbestos removal, boiler repair, replacement of boilers and air handling, fire alarms, sewer repairs, and power line replacement.

This page intentionally left blank.

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: Shakopee

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,958

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project is for the construction of a two-story living unit that will house up to 124 adult female inmates and will be composed of 62 double-bunked dry rooms. This will increase the total number of beds at MCF-Shakopee to 367. The construction of this living unit accounts for 70 percent of the money requested. The remaining 30 percent of the request would be used for the expansion and modification of the facility's core building that is necessary to accommodate the increasing population. The expanded and modified areas are for inmate related support functions such as education, visiting, discipline, records, and mail.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The project is designed to relieve institution crowding, reduce per diems and accommodate the projected inmate population growth through the year 2007. MCF-Shakopee is currently overcrowded, operating above its design capacity of 243 by temporarily converting dayroom areas into dormitories. Population projections indicate that the adult female inmate population will continue to increase into the 360 range by the year 2007. To accommodate this crowding and projected growth, a new 124-bed living unit is essential.

The department's goal is to continue housing all women offenders at one facility. This will help ensure economies of scale and control per diem costs by housing adult female offenders at one site. It ensures cost-effectiveness by eliminating the need to duplicate specialized services, programming, and educational and work opportunities for adult female offenders at more than one location. The use of a double-bunked design is also cost-effective in that the facility maintains all custody levels and programming capabilities. The expansion and modification of the core building to accommodate increasing populations was carefully planned to ensure that spaces are converted and reused with only essential changes included.

This expansion taxes the capabilities of the existing site in terms of land available for core building and living unit expansion. Further expansion would require consideration of additional state-owned acreage located north of the current site.

The department has explored alternatives to expansion at the Shakopee facility, including utilizing other secure facilities in cooperation with local governments, utilizing space at other department facilities, and modifying existing Shakopee living units. These options are unacceptable for the following reasons:

Utilizing jail space - An analysis indicates that the number of beds consistently and reliably available for adult female offenders does not meet projected needs, particularly given the reality that future availability is uncertain as local county needs may increase. In addition, these facilities are not designed for longer term inmates and have very limited programming for adult female offenders. Use of local beds is not a permanent solution to the crowding problem.

Other department facilities - Creating a second site for adult female inmates would increase overhead costs dramatically since specialized programming for adult female offenders available at Shakopee would be duplicated at another location. Separate housing, activities, and programming would have to be provided for adult female inmates resulting in inefficiencies, costs, and management problems. Operational costs and per diems would be higher rather than being controlled. Adequate bed space at other adult facilities to accommodate the projected growth is not available for adult female inmates.

Double-bunking existing rooms - To accommodate projected population growth, the facility would be required to increase existing living unit capacity by approximately 50 percent. Shakopee living units and support areas were not constructed for the number of inmates that would result from double-bunking or dormitories. Services such as laundry, day spaces, and shower facilities were not designed to support the number of inmates that would result from double-bunking. There is insufficient square footage in rooms for double-bunking and national standards would no longer be met. The facility would become seriously overcrowded on a permanent basis with the potential for increased tensions and hostilities resulting in management and security problems.

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

To accommodate additional inmates, the annual operating budget would increase to reflect staff compensation for 30.5 positions, building operation expenses, and program related expenses. However, as the inmate population increases in the new double-bunked expansion unit, the estimated per diem is projected to decline.

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

Joseph Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS  All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition		Time Toulo			1 1 2002 00	7 1 00.10	(Monthly Four)	(World Will Car)
Land, Land and Easements, Options	******	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
· ·	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	80	0	0	0	80	01/1997	06/1997
3. Design Fees							ANALYS CAMPLES	
Schematic		0	77	0	0	77	07/1998	09/1998
Design Development		0	103	0	0	103	09/1998	12/1998
Contract Documents		0	232	0	0	232	12/1998	04/1999
Construction Administration		0	103	0	0	103	02/1999	07/2000
	SUBTOTAL	0	515	0	0	515		
4. Project Management							02/1999	07/2000
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	76	0	0	76	1	
	SUBTOTAL	0	76	0	0	76		
5. Construction Costs							08/1999	09/2000
Site & Building Preparation		0	198	0	0	198		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	4,589	0	0	4,589		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	338	0	0	338	]	
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0	]	
Construction Contingency		0	240	0	0	240		
	SUBTOTAL	0	5,365	0	0	5,365		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	02/1999	07/2000
7. Occupancy								
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	234	0	0	234	10/1999	10/2000
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	50	0	0	50	10/1999	10/2000
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0	07/2000	07/2000
	SUBTOTAL	0	284	0	0	284		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			10/1999					
Inflation Multiplier			11.50%	0.00%	0.00%			SAME GOVERNIA
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		718	0	0	718	#344835 (#45.5E)	
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$80	\$6,958	\$0	\$0	\$7,038		

#### **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	80	6,958	0	0	7,038
State Funds Subtotal	80	6,958	0	0	7,038
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	80	6,958	0	0	7,038

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)					
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05		
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	1,313	3,044	3,044		
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	768	1,782	1,782		
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	74	148	148		
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	2,155	4,974	4,974		
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL	0	0	2,155	4,974	4,974		
Change from Current FY 1998-99		0	2,155	4,974	4,974		
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	26.5	30.5	30.5		

PREVIOUS STATE CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS PROJECT (Legal Citations)	Amount
Laws of Minnesota (year), Chapter, Section, Subdivision	
Laws of Minnesota, 1994, Chapter 643, Sec. 7, Subd. 6	80

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	6,958	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	icants should be aware that the following requirements					
will apply	will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
	Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative					
	Notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement					
	(Administration Dept)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
	Requirements (Agency)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review					
	(Office of Technology)					
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
	(Finance Dept)					
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
	Required (Agency)					
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency					
	request)					

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

The predesign submittal meets requirements and received a positive recommendation.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

November 1997 adult female population projections are down slightly from previous projections for most years in the next decade. About half of the 124 new beds requested for this project would be filled around the end of 2002. All of the beds would be filled in 2007 or after, according to the latest projections. Legislative and other changes in sentencing would affect these projections.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$6.958 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	120				
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	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	350				

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: MCF - Lino Lakes

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$344

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To construct an 80 wet-cell (160-bed) administrative segregation unit to provide more restrictive and staff efficient housing for inmates who are unable to live in the general population. This project would replace the existing 120-bed open dormitory housing. The new unit would provide double-bunked locked cells in a two-tier podular layout, directly supervised day rooms, minimal program spaces, and direct connection to staff backup, intake, visiting, and other support functions. The new unit's more efficient design will result in a net staffing reduction compared to the existing dormitory housing, even while increasing the total capacity. This project expansion will lower the facility's per diem costs by adding beds as well as providing more restrictive, staff-efficient housing options for disruptive or vulnerable inmates.

The majority of this project will be financed through federal funds from the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The Act requires a 10% cash match which is reflected in this request and predesign funding from 1996.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The Minnesota Correctional Facility - Lino Lakes is a level 3 (medium) facility for adult male felons transferred from other Minnesota correctional facilities. The facility provides a safe, secure and controlled environment for staff and three male offender categories:

1) Long term medium custody inmates involved in therapeutic programming or work programs; 2) Short term offenders directly admitted from District Courts; and 3) Release violators.

Changes have increased the capacity at this facility from 480 inmates at the beginning of the 1994-95 biennium to 1021 inmates in F.Y. 97. The rapid growth and evolving role of MCF-Lino Lakes have resulted in increasing numbers of inmates who are disruptive to the general population, but whose actions do not meet the criteria for disciplinary detention or a change in classification. The result has been more staff supervision and intervention, overcrowding of existing dormitory housing, and use of county jails or private facilities with more secure cells, all of which have an adverse effect on operating costs. The inmates proposed for this unit are:

- Release Violators (RV's) serving to expiration of sentence.
- Inmates with strong gang affiliations or leadership roles.

- Inmates with violent tendencies toward staff or other inmates.
- Inmates who are vulnerable to coercion or assault.
- Inmates who refuse to participate in programming.

The existing dormitory unit has been occupied at over 100% capacity for the past three years. Reports of incidents involving inmates and staff have steadily increased over the past five years. This project will directly contribute to the mission of ensuring a safe, secure, and humane environment for staff and inmates. As MCF-Lino Lakes becomes the system-wide pre-release center for medium custody inmates, this unit, along with the existing 42-bed segregation unit, will provide an adequate number of secure medium custody beds department-wide.

Predesign and design funding (\$500 thousand) for this unit was appropriated in 1996 legislation. Following selection of a design consultant, MCF-Lino Lakes staff and administration confirmed the mission of the housing unit and established project goals. The original project design was an 80-bed administrative segregation unit which has been increased to an 80 cell (160 bed) unit. This increase allows the department to add beds internally at little additional cost and is consistent with new legislation allowing expanded double-bunking in level 3 (medium) security facilities.

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

Due to a more staff efficient design, construction of this unit will result in a net reduction in staffing compared to the existing dormitory housing. Due to better insulation and glazing, energy costs should not increase significantly. Maintenance costs, due to vandalism and abuse, are expected to decrease as a result of more durable construction and improved environment for inmate management. With the addition of 40 beds, there will be no increase in operating costs. However, as these beds come on line, the per diem for this facility will decline.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

If this unit is not constructed, the safety and security concerns of both staff and inmates will increase.

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

Joseph Miller, Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS All Years and All Funding S		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	04.000	7.11 1 1101 1 0010	7 1 1000 00	1 1 2000 01	11200200	711 Tears	06/1.998	08/1998
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15	1 000	00,1000
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	15	0	0	0	15		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	27	0	0	0	27		
3. Design Fees					I			
Schematic		86	0	0	0	86		
Design Development		115	0	0	0	115	09/1997	12/1997
Contract Documents		257	0	0	0	257	01/1998	04/1998
Construction Administration		0	105	0	0	105	08/1998	10/1999
	SUBTOTAL	458	105	0	0	563	erin er eine stelleren kanne film. Gesen er bilde bilde en kanne film.	
4. Project Management					<del></del>			
State Staff Project Management		0	Ō	0	0	0	1	
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	Ō	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							08/1998	10/1999
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	52	0	0	52	1	
Construction		0	6,457	0	0	6,457		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	25	0	0	25		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	150	0	0	150	]	
Construction Contingency		0	309	0	0	309		
	SUBTOTAL	0	6,993	0	0	6,993		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy								
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	160	0	0	160	08/1999	10/1999
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	40	0	0	40	08/1999	10/1999
Security Equipment		0	10	0	0	10	08/1999	10/1999
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0	08/1999	10/1999
	SUBTOTAL	0	210	0	0	210		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			03/1999					
Inflation Multiplier			8.60%	0.00%	0.00%	Chrandin :	Wasting Way	Sylvidición (c.
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		628	0	0	628		证据的特殊的
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$500	\$7,936	\$0	\$0	\$8,436		PERMITS AT

#### **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	500	344	0	0	844
Federal	0	0	0	0	0
State Funds Subtotal	500	344	0	0	844
Agency Operating Budget Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Funds	0	7,592	0	0	7,592
Local Government Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	500	7,936	0	0	8,436

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)					
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05		
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0		
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
Change from Current FY 1998-99		0	0	0	0		
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	· 网络网络小鸡属	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

PREVIOUS STATE CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS PROJECT (Legal Citations)	Amount
Laws of Minnesota (year), Chapter, Section, Subdivision	
Laws of MN, 1996, Chapter 463, Sec. 16, Sub. 6	500

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS		Percent of
(For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Total
General Fund	344	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	icants should be aware that the following requirements					
will appl	will apply to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
	Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative					
	Notification)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement					
	(Administration Dept)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
	Requirements (Agency)					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review					
	(Office of Technology)					
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
	(Finance Dept)					
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
	Required (Agency)					
Yes	Matching Funds Required (as per agency					
	request)					

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

The predesign submittal meets requirements and received a positive recommendation.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

The 1996 bonding bill funded predesign and design costs for a segregation unit of 80 medium security beds at Lino Lakes. The project scope has been increased to a 160-bed (80 wet-cells) unit. This request would complete design costs and construct the new unit to replace an existing 120-bed open dormitory housing unit.

Federal funding of \$7.592 million is available to match 10% state funding of the costs of this project under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. The state match would consist of the \$500 thousand previously appropriated for this project and the \$344 thousand requested here.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$344 thousand for this project, contingent upon federal funds of \$7.592 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	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	90					
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0					
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	20					
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	50					
TOTAL	700 Maximum	480					

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: Red Wing

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,206

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Design and construct a security fence around the perimeter of MCF-Red Wing.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The mission of MCF-Red Wing within the context of the Department of Corrections' mission is to protect the public and to serve the individuals committed to its care so that they may return to the community and avoid further involvement with the criminal justice system.

State officials and the Department of Corrections have determined Minnesota's delinquent youth should be incarcerated and treated in Minnesota. MCF-Red Wing has been designated to receive, detain, and treat serious and chronic offenders, and will make efforts to receive placements of high risk juveniles currently programmed out-of-state. This facility is located within the city limits of Red Wing, and is presently without a perimeter fence of any type. Average yearly escapes from this facility number 32 (past 5 years). Escapees cause personal property damage and fear in the community. They are also very costly for the Department of Corrections, local police departments and the court system. With this facility located adjacent to residential areas, and with this major change in the type of offender being housed at this facility, it has been determined that a fence is needed for the protection of the community. The perimeter of this institution is a rough rectangle approximately 1,200 yards by 300 yards. The fence will enclose all buildings on the campus except the administration building.

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

The lighting and electronic controls will increase utility usage. Maintenance costs for the fence, lighting, and electronic controls will be ongoing.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Public perception of this facility may change as MCF-Red Wing converts from an open campus to a secure facility.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sou		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	11003	All Thor rears	1 1 1990-99	112000-01	112002-03	All Teals	(Worth rear)	(Month/Year)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	·	
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		1
January and Land	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							New Service CARCO	A RESIDENCE
Schematic		0	3	0	0	3	05/1998	06/1998
Design Development		0	12	0	0	12	06/1998	08/1998
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	15	0	0	15		
4. Project Management							08/1998	10/1998
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							08/1998	10/1998
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction		0	856	0	0	856		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	155	0	0	155	1	
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction Contingency		0	111	0	0	111		
	SUBTOTAL	0	1,122	0	0	1,122		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. 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		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation							2001年 東北大学中央	
Midpoint of Construction			09/1998					
Inflation Multiplier			6.10%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		69	0	0	69	TARKETER STATE	
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	. 0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$1,206	\$0	\$0	\$1,206		The Arms Agents

#### **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	1,206	0	0	1,206
State Funds Subtotal	0	1,206	0	0	1,206
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	1,206	0	0	1,206

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)					
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05		
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Building Operating Expenses	0	6	12	12	12		
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure Subtotal	0	6	12	12	12		
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL	0	6	12	12	12		
Change from Current FY 1998-99	Sagarata, Itali	6	12	12	12		
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	1964 7515	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,206	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

Project appli	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS icants should be aware that the following requirements by to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative Notification)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement (Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign is not required for projects of this nature.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Over the last year programming at Red Wing has moved towards treating the more serious and chronic juvenile offenders. The fencing proposed here would significantly reduce or virtually eliminate the escape risk that now exists with the open campus.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.206 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	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	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	320					

Corrections, Department of MCF-OPH - Seg. , MH, and HIth Care Units

#### AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138 thousand)

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: Oak Park Heights

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 4 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,330

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project consists of three interrelated components.

Design & construction funds are requested to:

- Convert Complex 4 from a 52-bed general population living unit to a 45-bed department wide mental health unit; and
- Convert the existing 22-bed mental health unit into a 39-bed department-wide infirmary

Predesign, schematic and partial design development funds are requested for:

3. A new 60-bed high security unit to replace the beds lost in the general population unit conversion in #1 above.

The DOC has committed \$40 thousand to initiate predesign and planning initiatives for these projects.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The primary purpose of this request is to expand existing infirmary space from an inpatient capacity of 13 beds to 39 beds. Inmate health care delivery is an agency priority and a process is underway to develop a long range strategic plan to reduce escalating costs while maintaining a community standard of care.

The evaluation process of the existing care delivery system is very extensive and will include the use of Regions Health Center (formerly St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center), the degree of privatization staffing patterns, and high cost items such as pharmacy and laboratory, etc. The infirmary expansion is a key component and will greatly enhance cost reduction/containment efforts in the inmate health care delivery system.

Expanded infirmary space will reduce the costly hospital beds at Regions Health Center and expand the types of medical care provided within the system. As a result, decreased costs in the health care budget will be realized. Reductions in the number of special transports for hospital and specialty clinic visits will result. Special transports represent a significant cost factor in the health care delivery system. Another critical benefit of this expansion is the ability to greatly reduce the

number of times level 6 (maximum) or levels 4 and 5 (close) custody inmates must be taken out of the facility. In addition, this expansion is designed to position the department to better meet the challenges posed by an aging inmate population and increases in AIDS, hepatitis and other chronic health care needs.

This project will effectively meet the increasing medical needs of the inmate population in a much more cost effective way than a previous capital budget request to construct a department health services center at MCF-Stillwater.

This expansion is made possible by a series of changes that would take place within MCF-Oak Park Heights.

#### **EXISTING**

#### **CONVERTED TO**

• 42-bed unit:

• 39-bed infirmary unit

13 infirmary beds
7 administrative isolation
22 mental health beds

• 52-bed living unit

• 45-bed mental health unit

#### **New construction**

60-bed segregation unit to replace 52-bed living unit which becomes mental health unit. Net increase of 50 beds.

Conversion of Complex 4 would increase the capacity of the mental health unit by 23 beds and allow more effective management of the mental health needs of inmates. Admits to the mental health unit have increased and the unit currently operates at nearly full capacity. The department currently is only able to treat the most severely mentally ill inmates. The expanded space will allow a broader range of treatment and allow for expanded aftercare programming.

Conversion of the mental health unit, however, results in the loss of a 52 bed general population living unit. The facility cannot lose these beds and continue to manage the difficult inmate population. The addition of a high security self contained punitive segregation unit at MCF-Oak Park Heights is proposed. This unit will have "super maximum" security capabilities to house extremely high risk, violent, dangerous inmates who have committed serious offenses within the prison system and who pose a high degree of security risk to the public, staff, and other inmates. The need for this unit is also supported by the significant increases experienced in staff assaults at this facility. This unit would also provide relief for the population of the existing segregation unit which currently runs 50 percent over capacity.

The system is currently experiencing growth as well as changes in the behaviors of

the inmate populations. New offenders are committing increasingly violent offenses and continuing that behavior in prison. With changes in legislation that resulted in commitments for some offenders to life without parole, increasingly longer sentences for predatory and assaultive inmates, gangs and leaders, it is essential to be able to isolate disruptive and predatory inmates from the general population. These high risk inmates must be controlled to prevent them from harming staff and other inmates once they have been isolated.

This overall project will accommodate the needed expansion of the infirmary and mental health unit, resulting in an additional 50 beds, in a cost effective manner and meet the increased security needs at the department's level 6 (maximum) custody facility.

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

This project will increase the operating budget beginning in F.Y. 2000. However, per diems should not increase because there will be 50 additional beds. Estimated operating cost increases are for the mental health and infirmary expansions and the new high security unit.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

During the 1996-2001 Capital Budget Process, MCF-Stillwater requested nearly \$24 million to construct a health services center. The entire cost of expanding the infirmary and mental health unit and adding a high security unit will be less than the project requested last biennium.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

#### **Project Cost**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Source	ces	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition					11200200	711110010	(World Vear)	(WOTH TEAT)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	11	70	0	0	81	07/1997	05/1998
3. Design Fees							- 50% (45.45). <sub>10</sub> 4%	
Schematic		0	135	0	0	135	08/1998	09/1998
Design Development		0	180	0	0	180	09/1998	11/1998
Contract Documents		0	399	0	0	399	11/1998	02/1999
Construction Administration		0	42	147	0	189	02/1999	10/1999
	SUBTOTAL	0	756	147	0	903		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	1	
5. Construction Costs							08/2000	02/2002
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	50	0	50	1	
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	35	0	0	35	1	
Construction		0	1,707	7,655	0	9,362		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	42	186	0	228		}
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction Contingency		0	179	779	0	958		
	SUBTOTAL	0	1,963	8,670	0	10,633		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy								Hari taki ili ili bal
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	198	334	0	532	02/2001	10/2001
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	46	204	0	250	10/2001	10/2001
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	244	538	0	782		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction		1.4221. V. 16784.547	06/1999	07/2001			Maria and Million	Activities Febr
Inflation Multiplier			9.80%	20.20%	0.00%			REMINISTRACTS
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		297	1,890	0	2,187		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	_ 0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$11	\$3,330	\$11,245	\$0	\$14,586		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	3,330	11,245	0	14,575
State Funds Subtotal	0	3,330	11,245	0	14,575
Agency Operating Budget Funds	11	0	0	0	11
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	11	3,330	11,245	0	14,586

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Current Projected Costs (Without Inflation)					
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05		
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	2,706	4,292	4,976		
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	198	573	882		
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0		
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	2,904	4,865	5,858		
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL	0	0	2,904	4,865	5,858		
Change from Current FY 1998-99		0	2,904	4,865	5,858		
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	34.0	49.0	49.0		

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS	Amount	Percent of
(For bond-financed projects) General Fund	- <b>Amount</b> 3,330	<b>Total</b> 100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

1	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
	icants should be aware that the following requirements
	y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
	Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
	Notification)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
	(Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
	Requirements (Agency)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
	(Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
	(Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
	Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency
	request)

**Project Analysis** 

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

A predesign document is in the process of being developed; and a recommendation will be issued upon completion.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

This project would convert two units at Oak Park Heights to increase infirmary and mental health beds and would provide funding through partial design development for a new 60-bed high security unit to replace beds lost through the conversions. There would be a net increase of 50 beds.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$3.33 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$11.245 million in 2000.

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	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	360				

This page intentionally left blank.

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Cloud

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 5 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,907

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project is a combination of remodeling existing areas and new construction. MCF-St. Cloud is going to be the department's reception center for all adult male inmates. The proposal is to remodel three former inmate dayrooms into office and testing/assessment areas for the inmates (250 to 300 per month) who will be processed as they are received at MCF-St. Cloud. Additionally, the project calls for the construction of a 6,600 square foot transportation building that will be used to house the department's transport bus and vans and offices for staff.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

This project is an integral part of the department's strategic plan. As the DOC completed its self assessment in an effort to improve on the delivery of services with reduction in long term costs, one decision was to centralize reception (from three adult male reception centers to one). MCF-St. Cloud is the designated reception center and will begin processing all adult male inmates by the end of FY98. Given current admission statistics, the number of inmates to be processed will average 275 per month.

The reception process includes all testing, assessments, interviews, orientation, program planning, and custody classification of all admissions. Such a process requires space for such activities to occur and this project calls for the remodeling of old dayroom areas into space suitable for the reception process. Along with the remodeling, there is a need for a building to house the department's transport vehicles and staff. In addition to the intake of an average of 275 inmates per month, MCF-St. Cloud will have to transfer out a similar number of inmates. The movement of all these inmates will be coordinated out of MCF-St. Cloud, and transported by the department's transportation staff.

The benefits of this project include an increase in efficiency and consistency in dealing with new admissions. All adult male inmates will be processed similarly with consistent assessment and testing that will result in better program plans and more cost efficient use of the department's resources. Inmates will be placed in programming that coincides with their length of sentence, needs, and security level. The project will also reduce the costs of inmate clothing issue by centralizing the process and tracking the inmate's state clothing issue from facility to facility. By centralizing the reception process, the department will be able to do a more uniform

job of gathering data about admissions so that better long term plans about future programming can be developed. Such improved planning will lead to reduced costs through the reduction or elimination of duplicate programming or unnecessary programs. Projections indicate inmate population will continue to increase at least through the year 2008. This facility will need to remain operational into the foreseeable future.

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

While the addition of this project to MCF-St. Cloud could have had major impact on the operating budget, it will not. No new staff are requested, nor are additional current expense operating funds requested. Existing staff from other facilities and current expense funds from other facilities will be utilized to allow this project to proceed. There will be a small increase in the cost of utilities for the new transportation building.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

The department has already committed funds to initiate the reception center. If this project is not funded or is deferred, the ability of the DOC to operate a centralized reception center will be greatly hampered and the process will be extremely limited and inefficient. The ability of MCF-St. Cloud to effectively operate a reception center requires that it have, at least, the space to provide such a program.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition						:	
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign SUBTOTAL	7	0	0	0	7	07/1997	12/1997
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	17	0	0	17	08/1998	10/1998
Design Development	0	22	0	0	22	10/1998	11/1998
Contract Documents	0	45	0	0	45	11/1998	01/1999
Construction Administration	0	28	0	0	28	01/1999	07/1999
SUBTOTAL	0	112	0	0	112		
4. Project Management						01/1999	07/1999
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							07/1999
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	1,241	0	0	1,241		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	50	0	0	50		
Construction Contingency	0	124	0	0	124		
SUBTOTAL	0	1,415	0	0	1,415		
6. Art SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	07/1999	08/1999
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	80	0	0	80	05/1999	07/1999
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	50	0	0	50	01/1999	07/1999
Security Equipment	0	80	0	0	80	01/1999	07/1999
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	210	0	0	210		
8. Inflation						""。	
Midpoint of Construction		06/1999					用数据统约
Inflation Multiplier		9.80%	0.00%	0.00%			State at a
Inflation Cost SUBTOTAL		170	0	0	170		
9. Other SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$7	\$1,907	\$0	\$0	\$1,914	行数据数据数据数据	esignésséssés e

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	1,907	0	0	1,907
State Funds Subtotal	0	1,907	0	0	1,907
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	1,907	0	0	1,914

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)				
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99 FY 2000-01		FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	9	9	9	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	9	9	9	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0	0	9	9	9	
Change from Current FY 1998-99	4234442444	0	9	9	9	
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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,907	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

STATUTORY 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 (Legislature)				
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This				
	Review (Legislature)				
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative				
1	Notification)				
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement				
	(Administration Dept)				
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation				
	Requirements (Agency)				
Yes	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review				
	(Office of Technology)				
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required				
	(Finance Dept)				
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review				
	Required (Agency)				
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency				
	request)				
	<del></del>				

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

A predesign document is in the process of being developed; and a recommendation will be issued upon completion.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

This project would allow the department to complete its plans to make St. Cloud the intake/reception center for all adult male inmates. The request includes remodeling costs to convert three dayrooms into processing areas and offices for the reception functions and construction costs for a transportation building for the department's transport bus and vans.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.907 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	120			
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	300			

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Cloud

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY:** 6 of 15

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,275

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project involves the necessary replumbing of the education building, including all water, sewer, and condensate lines and removal of all asbestos insulation in these buildings.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The education building was completed in 1926. Plumbing and steam lines in this building are the original lines. These lines have exceeded the life expectancy of the plumbing. The institution has a health issue with methane gas escaping from the sewer lines.

This project would preserve current assets. Currently there is a health hazard developing due to leaking sewer vent pipes along with lead in the pipe joints. This project would eliminate the hazard. The asbestos is a health hazard and must be removed.

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

This is a replacement project and will have no impact on current operating budgets.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

Without this replumbing, the health hazard will continue for both staff and inmates.

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

Joseph Miller
Capital Resources Administrator
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COST		Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Costs	Project Start	Project Finish
All Years and All Funding So	ources	All Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	All Years	(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition								
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees								
Schematic		0	14	0	0	14	10/1998	12/1998
Design Development		0	18	0	0	18	12/1998	12/1998
Contract Documents		0	36	0	0	36	03/1999	05/1999
Construction Administration		0	22	0	0	22	07/1999	04/2000
	SUBTOTAL	0	90	0	0	90		
4. Project Management							07/1998	04/2000
State Staff Project Management		0	45	0	0	45		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	45	0	0	45		
5. Construction Costs							07/1999	04/2000
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	14	0	0	14	1	
Construction		0	900	0	0	900		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	90	0	0	90		
	SUBTOTAL	0	1,004	0	0	1,004	1	
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy					•		F. C. S.	5,74665554541
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	- O	0	0	0		
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction		7. 36. 36. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6. 6	11/1999			3945035544	a per Alberta (P.A.)	A STATE OF STATE
Inflation Multiplier			11.90%	0.00%	0.00%		Power States	
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		136	0	0	136		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$1,275	\$0	\$0	\$1,275		. Ujiya eyrifada a sa

# **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	1,275	0	0	1,275
State Funds Subtotal	0	1,275	0	0	1,275
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	1,275	0	0	1,275

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99	rti Diologica distrib	0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	artist gire karıyı	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,275	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

STA	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
	Project applicants should be aware that the following requirements					
	y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.					
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major					
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This					
	Review (Legislature)					
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative					
	Notification)					
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement					
	(Administration Dept)					
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation					
	Requirements (Agency)					
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review					
	(Office of Technology)					
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required					
	(Finance Dept)					
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review					
4	Required (Agency)					
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency					
	request)					

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign is not required for projects of this nature.

### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

This project would complete current replumbing efforts at the Saint Cloud correctional facility.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor does not make a specific recommendation of capital funds for this project. The Governor has recommended \$4.1 million for asset preservation under a separate request in this budget. The agency may use those fund for this project in a manner that prioritizes asset preservation needs across the state's correctional facilities within available funding.

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	105			
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75			
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	340			

Corrections, Department of Dept. - Fire/Life Safety Improvements

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138 thousand)

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: Lino Lakes, St. Cloud, Stillwater

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY:** 7 of 15

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$5,542

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Department of Corrections (DOC) has an Interagency Agreement with the Department of Public Safety, Fire Marshal Division so that each DOC facility is inspected at least annually. The purpose of the inspection is to establish compliance levels with various building codes and life safety codes. Recently the fire inspector has identified several areas of the facility that do not comply with existing codes and require specific action by the DOC. These projects are as follows:

MCF-Lino Lakes	Sprinkle Activities Building	\$ 100
MCF-St. Cloud	Sprinkle All Inmate Living Areas,	
	School Building, and Paint Shop	500
MCF-Stillwater	Life Safety Issues/Fire Code Violations	<u>1,256</u>
	•	\$ 1.856

#### Other projects that have life safety implications are:

MCF-St. Cloud	Replace Cell Hall Locks (A,B,C,D,		
	and Seg. with Electric Locks)	\$	2,433
MCF-St. Cloud	Purchase and Install Generator		<u>838</u>
		\$	3,271
	Inflation	\$	415
	Total	¢	5 542

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The department knows and understands that compliance with established building and life safety codes can and will prevent human tragedy and the loss of the state's assets. Compliance with these codes must be achieved.

# IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

There will be no cost increase resulting from these projects.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

There exists the possibility of fines by the state fire marshal if these orders are not completed in a timely manner.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612-603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	041003	7011 Hor Teals	11 1000 00	112000-01	112002-00	Air rears	(World Fear)	(Worth Fear)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees								
Schematic		0	0	0	0	0	07/1998	09/1998
Design Development	**************************************	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents		0	390	0	0	390	09/1998	10/1998
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	390	0	0	390		
4. Project Management								-
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							11/1998	05/1999
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	4,737	0	0	4,737		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	4,737	0	0	4,737		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. 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		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			02/1999					
Inflation Multiplier			8.10%	0.00%	0.00%			Height wild by the heid.
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		415	0	0	415		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$5,542	\$0	\$0	\$5,542		

# Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	5,542	0	0	5,542
State Funds Subtotal	0	5,542	0	0	5,542
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	5,542	0	0	5,542

IMPACT ON STATE	Current Projected Costs (Without Inflation)				on)
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99	Seat Million Street	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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	5,542	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

1	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
, , ,,	cants should be aware that the following requirements y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
	Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
	Notification)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
	(Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
	Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
	(Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
	(Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
	Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency
	request)

### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign is not required for projects of this nature.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Maximum scoring points are given for Safety/Code concerns. Scoring points cannot given for Critical Life Safety Emergency or Critical Legal Liability without specific documentation of urgent and unavoidable corrective action necessary or known and substantiated legal liability which is currently pending.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not make a specific recommendation of capital funds for this project. The Governor has recommended \$4.1 million for asset preservation under a separate request in this budget. The agency may use those fund for this project in a manner that prioritizes asset preservation needs across the state's correctional facilities within available funding.

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	105				
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	60				
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	350				

PROJECT LOCATION: Faribault, Red Wing, Lino Lakes, Shakopee, Willow River, Moose Lake, Sauk Centre, Togo, Stillwater, St. Cloud, Oak Park Heights

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 8 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,282

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request is for design and construction funding of projects identified as the department's capital "iceberg" (deferred maintenance and renewal). The department has developed a listing of projects that identify the capital "iceberg" that currently exists at its facilities. These projects result from several factors and need to be completed so that the state's asset preservation can be improved and its deficiencies identified. This currently identified "iceberg" will be funded through CAPRA, operating repair and betterment, this request, and future capital requests. At this time, the department is requesting \$3 million for capital asset preservation.

Department Asset Preservation Needs	\$13,434
Less (without inflation):	
Asset Preservation Request - 1998	( 3,000)
Asset Preservation Request - 2000	(3,000)
Asset Preservation Request - 2002	( 3,000)
Remaining Asset Preservation Needs	\$4,434

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The department knows that the capital 'iceberg' exists and wishes to preserve the state's assets by providing the funding to bring all facilities to a proper balance of normal maintenance and project renewal. By funding these projects in this manner, it is anticipated that major capital requests for asset replacement will be significantly reduced in the future and will result in overall operating efficiencies. Square footage to be maintained is shown below:

		l otal
	Opened/	Sq Ft
Facility	Converted	(thousands)
MCF-Faribault	1990-1996	559
MCF-Red Wing	1899	292
MCF-Lino Lakes	1963	444
MCF-Shakopee	1986	172
Willow River	1951	38
Moose Lake	1988-1997	625

MCF-Sauk Centre	1911	187
Thistledew Camp	1955	57
MCF-Stillwater	1914	1,208
MCF-St. Cloud	1889	604
MCF-Oak Park Heights	1982	<u>358</u>
TOTAL		4,544

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

The funding for these projects will affect facility staff in terms of time spent on construction details and in time spent identifying additional iceberg items. It is also anticipated that the operating repair and betterment funding will be adjusted in the future to more clearly reflect the funding required. No cost increases will result from these projects.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	odioco	7411 Hor Tears	11 1000 00	1 1 2000-01	112002-00	Airicais	(World Wiear)	(Month Fear)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees					L			
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		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							07/1998	06/2000
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		1,750	3,000	3,000	3,000	10,750		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	1,750	3,000	3,000	3,000	10,750		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. 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		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			05/1999	06/2001	06/2003			
Inflation Multiplier			9.40%	19.80%	29.80%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		282	594	894	1,770		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$1,750	\$3,282	\$3,594	\$3,894	\$12,520		

# **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	1,750	3,282	3,594	3,894	12,520
State Funds Subtotal	1,750	3,282	3,594	3,894	12,520
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	1,750	3,282	3,594	3,894	12,520

IMPACT ON STATE	Current Projected Costs (Without Inflation)				
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99	60 Col. 2, 24 6; 5	0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

PREVIOUS STATE CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS PROJECT (Legal Citations)	Amount
Laws of Minnesota (year), Chapter, Section, Subdivision	
Laws of Minnesota 1996, Chapter 463, Section 16, Subdivision 2	1,750

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	3,282	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

Project appl	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS icants should be aware that the following requirements y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (Legislature)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative Notification)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement (Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

This will allow the agency to reduce its backlog of its deferred maintenance and renewal facilities program.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

A funding increase of \$150 thousand per year was provided in the 1997 appropriations bill to supplement existing operating funds for facility repair and maintenance. Asset preservation funding of \$1.75 million was provided in the 1996 capital appropriations bill.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$4.1 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$4.1 million in 2000 and \$4.1 million in 2002. The agency may also use these funds for asset preservation needs identified under the separate requests for Fire/Life Safety Improvements; MCF-SCL Replumb Education Wing; MCF-STW - Towers, Wall & Catwalk; and Roof & Window Replacement, in a manner that prioritizes asset preservation needs across the state's correctional facilities.

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	70			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	50			
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	50			
TOTAL	700 Maximum	380			

Corrections, Department of MCF-RW - Vocational/Industry Bldg.

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138 thousand)

**Project Narrative** 

**PROJECT LOCATION: Red Wing** 

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 9 of 15** 

**1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$89** 

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Schematic and partial design development of a new vocational education-industry building to consolidate several outmoded and space limited shop and classroom areas.

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

Presently several vocational and prevocational programs at MCF-Red Wing are located in separate buildings or spaces in buildings which date from 1889 to 1938. These spaces are too small to be developed into comprehensive vocational or industrial spaces. These shops are separated from the main school complex and from one another, making the sharing of classroom spaces impractical. Shops are, in some cases, very difficult and/or prohibitively expensive to make accessible to disabled persons. They are expensive to maintain as shops and cannot provide for shared special utilities such as compressed air or air exchange and filtration. Remodeling of these spaces is difficult and cost prohibitive.

A new combined classroom and shop complex in close proximity to the existing academic school building will enable the institution to best provide the vocational preparation and education needed by youth incarcerated at MCF-Red Wing. A new complex, with designed-in flexibility, will make it possible to explore more fully the potential for future marketable vocational skills for incarcerated youth. Present space and flexibility limitations make program changes to meet changing markets difficult, if not impossible. Future directions in corrections demand the flexibility that is not now available for institution program planners. Likewise, the potential for industrial training and practice cannot be fully explored or developed.

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

Utilization of current staffing will allow MCF-Red Wing to operate this new building without additional positions. Funding for utilities and maintenance will be needed for the new building.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

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

Joseph Miller
Capital Resources Administrator
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219
Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition		7		2000 01	1 1 2002 00	7.11 ( 00.10	(World V Car)	(Mortaly Fear)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	·	
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	2	0	0	0	2	01/1998	02/1998
3. Design Fees								an a Maria
Schematic		0	31	0	0	31	08/1998	10/1998
Design Development		0	53	0	0	53	10/1998	01/1999
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	84	0	0	84		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							02/1999 12	12/1999
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	0	2,400	0	2,400		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	2,400	0	2,400		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. 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		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			10/1998	09/1999				
Inflation Multiplier		Corresponding to the	6.50%	11.10%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL	(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	5	266	0	271	Park Color	
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$2	\$89	\$2,666	\$0	\$2,757		

# **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	89	2,666	0	2,755
State Funds Subtotal	0	89	2,666	0	2,755
Agency Operating Budget Funds	2	0	0	0	2
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	2	89	2,666	0	2,757

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)				
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	18	18	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	18	18	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0	0	0	18	18	
Change from Current FY 1998-99		0	0	18	18	
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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	89	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
icants should be aware that the following requirements
y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
Remodeling Review (Legislature)
MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
Review (Legislature)
MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
Notification)
MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
(Administration Dept)
MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
Requirements (Agency)
MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
(Office of Technology)
MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
(Finance Dept)
MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
Required (Agency)
Matching Funds Required (as per agency
request)

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

There is no predesign document on record to support this request. Predesign would have to be completed before the submitted costs could be confirmed.

### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

The current request is for design fees for a new vocational education-industry building at Red Wing. Construction costs would be funded in the subsequent capital budget.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor does not recommend capital funds 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	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	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	220			

Corrections, Department of MCF-STW - Towers, Wall & Catwalk

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138 thousand)

**Project Narrative** 

**PROJECT LOCATION: Stillwater** 

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 10 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,062

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Repair masonry of entire interior and exterior of perimeter security wall, renovate the towers for purpose of improved visibility, install catwalk around the exterior of the perimeter wall, and replace existing perimeter security system with a modern technology system along with installation of razor ribbon on perimeter wall. A predesign study, with cost estimate, has been performed on this project.

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The interior and exterior of the perimeter security wall are in need of major masonry repair. The towers need to be renovated as visibility from the existing towers is poor and visibility is a critical security concern. Installation of a catwalk around the entire perimeter security wall will greatly improve observation and staff safety as the existing catwalk is severely deteriorated and unusable. A new modern technology perimeter security system is needed to replace the existing system which is obsolete and inadequate. In conjunction with the new electronic system, razor ribbon will be installed on top of the wall to maximize security. Projections indicate the inmate population will continue to increase at least through the year 2008. This facility will need to remain operational into the foreseeable future since it currently provides for about 25 percent (1303) of the adult male prison beds.

# IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

None

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

Without immediate major repair, the perimeter security wall will continue to deteriorate, becoming an increasing critical concern as repairs continue to be delayed. Without security enhancements; detection, assessment, delay and response are severely compromised.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219 Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COS All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	<del></del>						07/1998	10/1999
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	7	0	0	0	7		
3. Design Fees								
Schematic		0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development		0	606	0	0	606	07/1998	12/1998
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	606	0	0	606		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							12/1998	10/1999
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0	]	
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	4,392	0	0	4,392		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	30	0	0	30		
Construction Contingency		0	446	0	0	446		
	SUBTOTAL	0	4,868	0	0	4,868		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	39	0	0	39	07/1999	12/1999
7. Occupancy							1637 4517 (1887 Ug/)	
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	17	0	0	17	07/1999	12/1999
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	11	0	0	11	07/1999	12/1999
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	28	0	0	28	18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (18 (	
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			05/1999					请你知识的是
Inflation Multiplier			9.40%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		521	0	0	521		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$7	\$6,062	\$0	\$0	\$6,069	APPROPRIE	

Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	6,062	0	0	6,062
State Funds Subtotal	0	6,062	0	0	6,062
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	6.062	0	0	6.069

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)				
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	
Change from Current FY 1998-99		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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	6,062	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

STATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREME	NTS
I make the great the title and the contract	
Project applicants should be aware that the following	
will apply to their projects after adoption of the bo	
Yes MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major	or
Remodeling Review (Legislature)	
No MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt F	rom This
Review (Legislature)	
No MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Le	gislative
Notification)	_
No MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Require	ment
(Administration Dept)	
No MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservati	on
Requirements (Agency)	
No MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technol	ology Review
(Office of Technology)	
No MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Requi	red
(Finance Dept)	
No MS 16A.695: Program Funding Rev	iew
Required (Agency)	
No Matching Funds Required (as per a	gency
request)	

## **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign is not required for projects of this nature.

### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Although many security concerns are raised by this request, it is in the lower half of the agency's priority listing of their current requests.

# **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor does not make a specific recommendation of capital funds for this project. The Governor has recommended \$4.1 million for asset preservation under a separate request in this budget. The agency may use those fund for this project in a manner that prioritizes asset preservation needs across the state's correctional facilities within available funding.

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	105			
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	50			
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	350			

PROJECT LOCATION: Faribault, Lino Lakes, Oak Park Heights, Stillwater

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 11 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,079

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request is for design and construction for reroofing and window replacement at four of the department's correctional facilities. The roofs need replacement and the windows have deteriorated to the point that complete replacement is required. While these roof and window replacements have been included in previous capital budget requests, insufficient funding has not permitted them to be completed. The following projects now require specific and timely attention:

MCF-Faribault MCF-Faribault MCF-Faribault MCF-Lino Lakes	Reroof Tamarack Reroof Redwood Reroof Norway Reroof Power Plant, Pump House	\$ 47 67 26
WOT EITO EAROO	Valve House, and Walkway	90
MCF-Oak Park Heights	Reroof entire facility	<u>1,008</u>
	Roof Subtotal	\$ 1,238
MCF-Faribault MCF-Lino Lakes MCF-Lino Lakes	Replace Windows - Birch Replace Windows - South Operations Replace Windows - Kenny, Kellogg, Andrews, Carver, Bishop, Mayo, and	\$ 286 90
MCF-Stillwater	Sibley Replace Windows & Doors in Industry and Windows and Screens of entire	75
	facility (over a six year period, \$3.8 million each biennium)	3,807
	Window Subtotal Inflation	\$ 4,258 583
	Projects Total	\$ 6,079

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

Every effort should be made to preserve the building envelopes of the state's assets. To replace unsound roofs and windows will help provide facilities for long range department goals and needs. If the basic structure is sound, the state's assets can be modified to meet DOC needs for many years.

The \$11,422,000 window and door replacement project at MCF-Stillwater is being requested in three equal sums of \$3,807,000 during the 1998, 2000, and 2002 capital budget sessions.

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

The funding of these projects will result in increased energy (heating) efficiency at each of the four facilities. Savings obtained are expected to assist in covering increased utility costs due to inflationary pressures for no net increase in cost.

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

Joseph Miller
Capital Resources Administrator
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	<u>L</u>	I					(**************************************
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTA	L 0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign SUBTOTA	<b>L</b> 0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	439	0	0	439	07/1998	08/1998
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	. 0	0		
SUBTOTA	L 0	439	0	0	439		
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTA	<b>L</b> 0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs						09/1998	07/2000
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	5,057	3,807	3,807	12,671		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTA	L 0	5,057	3,807	3,807	12,671		
6. Art SUBTOTA	<b>L</b> 0	0	0	0	0		
7. 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		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTA	<b>L</b> 0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		08/1999	05/2001	05/2003			
Inflation Multiplier		10.60%	19.40%	29.40%			
Inflation Cost SUBTOTA		583	739	1,119	2,441		
9. Other SUBTOTA		0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTA	<b>L</b> \$0	\$6,079	\$4,546	\$4,926	\$15,551		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	6,079	4,546	4,926	15,551
State Funds Subtotal	0	6,079	4,546	4,926	15,551
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	6,079	4,546	4,926	15,551

IMPACT ON STATE	Current Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			on)	
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99		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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	6,079	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

Project appl	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS icants should be aware that the following requirements by to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative Notification)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement (Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

#### **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign is not required for projects of this nature.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Projects similar to the smaller ones listed under this request have been funded out of agency operating budgets and asset preservation budgets in the past. They should be considered in the context of all asset preservation needs of the department.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not make a specific recommendation of capital funds for this project. The Governor has recommended \$4.1 million for asset preservation under a separate request in this budget. The agency may use those fund for this project in a manner that prioritizes asset preservation needs across the state's correctional facilities within available funding.

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	70			
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	50			
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	245			

**PROJECT LOCATION: Sauk Centre** 

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 12 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$47

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

MCF-Sauk Centre needs to replace the present education buildings (Mary Lyon School and annex), which are wood frame structures built in 1920 and 1916, with a multi-functional complex that is better suited toward meeting the needs of facility programs.

This education and family conference center would provide basic skills instruction; vocational training activities via cooperative arrangements from technical colleges; employee development video conferencing; physical activity areas; programs fostering family involvement, educational, and counseling services; and possibly living spaces for families involved in these transition services.

This facility is requesting funding for the predesign of this project during 1998-99. This study would determine the cost estimates for the design and construction in 2000-2001 and would include furniture, fixtures, and equipment cost break-down and the cost of demolition of Mary Lyon School and the school annex buildings in 2000-2001.

### PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

MCF-Sauk Centre is undergoing dramatic programming and service delivery changes. In January, 1999, the facility will convert to a fee-for-service model (similar to Thistledew Camp) as mandated by the 1997 legislature. Juvenile males under the custody of the commissioner of corrections will be transferred to MCF-Red Wing. Juvenile females will continue to be programmed at MCF-Sauk Centre for the immediate future. The department intends to operate MCF-Sauk Centre as a iuvenile facility providing programming as dictated by district and county juvenile needs per contracts with counties and juvenile courts. A statewide needs assessment is in process to gather information from counties and juvenile justice stakeholders regarding programming needs. This assessment will assist the department in preparing a report to the legislature in January 1998 which will outline what kinds of programming should be offered at MCF-Sauk Centre. MCF-Sauk Centre has enhanced programming for special needs juveniles (i.e. female, sex offenders, etc.) in the past 3-4 years and will be looking to other special needs programming (i.e. mental health) if the statewide assessment dictates a need for services. Education is an essential component of all juvenile programming.

The Mary Lyon School building and annex at MCF-Sauk Centre are inadequate for the type and extent of programming necessary for its clientele. Education programs for family living skills, art, and photography are located in the school annex building which is a wood frame building constructed in 1916. The primary access to the second floor education areas is via an exterior fire escape. This building is not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible and is in extremely poor condition and needs to be replaced immediately.

The Mary Lyon building remains in service but has inadequate numbers and size of classrooms, inadequate physical activity areas, lack of space for vocational programs, a poor heating system, cooling via window units, and shows signs of deterioration and wear.

A multi-functional complex addresses these issues while incorporating program innovations, allowing for expanded education into vocational venues, enhanced technological capabilities, and greatly improved supervision of both residents and program staff.

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

Operating costs for this new complex should be offset by the reduced operating costs from the decommission of other buildings.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

Lease space is not available locally. Alternate education areas are not available on the grounds.

The state fire marshal has voiced serious concerns about these buildings, based on their poor egress and wood frame construction. However, other classroom space is not available. Continued use of these buildings will require a questionable investment for repair, renovation, and Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003

Dollars in	Thousands (	(\$137,50	0 = \$138	thousand)

TOTAL PROJECT COST All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition	Juices	All Thor Tears	111330-33	7 1 2000-01	112002-03	Airrears	(Worth rear)	(MOTHER)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1	
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	1	
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	44	0	0	44	07/1998	12/1998
3. Design Fees								
Schematic		0	0	352	0	352		
Design Development		0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	Ö	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	352	0	352		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0	]	
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	1	
5. Construction Costs					•		07/2000	06/2002
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction	_	0	. 0	4,400	0	4,400		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	4,400	0	4,400	]	
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	Ō	44	0	44		
7. 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		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction		\$25746 (219 <b>3</b> 09);	09/1998	07/2001			Esperante de la composition della composition de	
Inflation Multiplier			6.10%	20.20%	0.00%	自然 <b>是</b> 多数的		状態酸も影響
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		3	969	0	972	the and the state	Marchelle
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$47	\$5,765	\$0	\$5,812		y Kaloktykia

# **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	47	5,765	0	5,812
State Funds Subtotal	0	47	5,765	0	5,812
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	47	5,765	0	5,812

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Proj	ected Costs (	Without Inflati	on)
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99	ลิสสมภัศษาเมื่อป	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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	47	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

STA	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
	icants should be aware that the following requirements y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
	Review (Legislature)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
	Notification)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
	(Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
<b></b>	Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
	(Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
	(Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
	Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency
	request)

# **Department of Administration Analysis:**

This request follows the preferred approach for capital requests as it seeks to investigate a specific project with the intent of following up with design and construction requests in future biennia.

#### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Legislation enacted in 1997 proposed significant changes in the role of the Sauk Centre facility. Further discussion of these issues will take place during the 1998 legislative session after the receipt of a report from the Department of Corrections with recommendations on the proposed use of this facility. Significant capital expenditures should not be considered until those issues are resolved.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funds 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	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	25			
TOTAL	700 Maximum	160			

**Project Narrative** 

**PROJECT LOCATION: Sauk Centre** 

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 13 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$38

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request is for predesign funding for construction of a multipurpose complex that would include separate living units and programming areas for specialized program populations in one physical plant. This multipurpose complex will create self-contained program/living areas which permit a greater number of residents to live in and be programmed for in one area. This will result in cost efficiencies, enhanced program effectiveness, and increased observation and security. This complex would be fully ADA accessible.

Five of the program living units currently in use were built between 1911-1914 with another built in 1963. None of these living units are fully ADA accessible, although three have been remodeled to provide program accessibility with accessible entries, restrooms, circulation, and sleeping rooms on the first floors. The security unit has been remodeled to provide access to both occupied floors.

MCF-Sauk Centre is requesting funding for the predesign portion of this project during 1998-99. This study would determine the cost estimates for the design and construction during 2000-2001.

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The MCF-Sauk Centre is undergoing dramatic programming and service delivery changes. In January, 1999, the facility will convert to a fee-for-service model (similar to Thistledew Camp) as mandated by the 1997 legislature. Juvenile males under the custody of the commissioner of corrections will be transferred to MCF-Red Wing. Juvenile females will continue to be programmed at MCF-Sauk Centre for the immediate future. The department intends to operate MCF-Sauk Centre as a juvenile facility providing programming as dictated by district and county juvenile needs per contracts with counties and juvenile courts. A statewide needs assessment is in process to gather information from counties and juvenile justice stakeholders regarding programming needs. This assessment will assist the department in preparing a report to the legislature in January 1998, which will outline what kinds of programming should be offered at MCF-Sauk Centre. MCF-Sauk Centre has enhanced programming for special needs juveniles (i.e. females, sex offenders, etc.) in the past 3 - 4 years and will be looking to other special needs programming (i.e. mental health) if the statewide assessment dictates a need for services.

MCF-Sauk Centre has been developing juvenile correctional programs in the areas of sex offenders and chemical dependency. In order to meet the specific issues of these special populations, MCF-Sauk Centre has attempted to remodel old structures into units that provide increased security and observation levels. But with continued specialization, the facility has fallen out of compliance in this regard. MCF-Sauk Centre needs a facility that meets the needs of these special populations in an effective manner and presently does not have any readily available buildings. This multi-complex addresses these issues of program space, accessibility, and security as well as ongoing concerns about the inadequacies of the current living units.

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

Operating costs for this new multi-complex will be determined once predesign is complete.

#### **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

MCF-Sauk Centre currently has two unheated and unoccupied buildings that once were used as living units. Richard and Pettit Cottages were built in 1911 and 1924 respectively. Both buildings have been unheated since about 1978 and deteriorated to the extent that major remodeling for juvenile or adult occupancy would be cost prohibitive.

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

Joseph Miller
Capital Resources Administrator
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219
Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

PAGE H-59

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Source	es	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition								
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	,	
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	36	0	0	36	07/1998	11/1998
3. Design Fees								Transfer balling
Schematic		0	0	288	0	288		
Design Development		0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	288	0	288		
4. Project Management								
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	. 0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs							07/2000	06/2002
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Construction		0	0	3,600	0	3,600		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	3,600	0	3,600		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	36	0	36		
7. Occupancy							(1.1.1(g) (2.26) (1.1.1)	
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	0	0	0	0	·	
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		ALC: HELVELY H
8. Inflation			-					
Midpoint of Construction			09/1998	07/2001		1980-250-250-20080		
Inflation Multiplier			6.10%	20.20%	0.00%		Harrist Harrist	
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		2	793	0	795	SEPARATE AND STREET	
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$38	\$4,717	\$0	\$4,755	E GAST PARTIES	

# **Project Detail**

# AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST Fiscal Years 1998-2003

Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138 thousand)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	38	4,717	0	4,755
State Funds Subtotal	0	38	4,717	0	4,755
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	38	4,717	0	4,755

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0	
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	
Revenue Offsets	. 0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	
Change from Current FY 1998-99		0	0	0	0	
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	Pagasidi, ket	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	38	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
	icants should be aware that the following requirements y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
	Review (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
	Notification)
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
	(Administration Dept)
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
	Requirements (Agency)
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
	(Office of Technology)
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
	(Finance Dept)
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
	Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency
	request)

# **Department of Administration Analysis:**

This request follows the preferred approach for capital requests as it seeks to investigate a specific project with the intent of following up with design and construction requests in future biennia.

## **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Legislation enacted in 1997 proposed significant changes in the role of the Sauk Centre facility. Further discussion of these issues will take place during the 1998 legislative session after the receipt of a report from the Department of Corrections with recommendations on the proposed use of this facility. Significant capital expenditures should not be considered until those issues are resolved.

#### Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funds 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	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** 

**PROJECT LOCATION: Togo** 

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 14 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$568

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project will provide a 40' x 50' addition to the existing dormitory. Addition would include a ground floor and basement level. The basement level would be an adequate storm shelter for students and staff in emergency situations such as a tornado warning. Elevator and stair access would be included to the basement level.

Ground floor would include a much needed addition to the student day room area plus a supervisory office and private bathroom facilities for staff. Also included would be a dedicated intake area for new students.

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

This project would enhance safety of staff and students plus provide much needed living area for students. The present day room is very small and students tend to congregate in the dorm center and bunk areas when they are in the building. If more space is provided in the day room, the dorm/bunk area would be a more private and quiet space.

The additional day room area would be designed for full visability from the dorm control room for security and student safety. This would also create a new entrance to the dorm that would eliminate a difficult to supervise area.

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

Maintenance and heating or cooling impact on the budget would be minimal and would be absorbed by existing normal budget. There would be no additional staffing costs.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COST All Years and All Funding So		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition		77.1.01.104.10		2000 01	11200200	7111 1 0010	(Months ( car)	(World V Car)
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							DEFAULTS SERVED	Note that the second
Schematic		0	6	0	, 0	6	07/1998	09/1998
Design Development		0	8	0	0	8	09/1998	12/1998
Contract Documents		0	16	0	0	16	12/1998	03/1999
Construction Administration		0	10	0	0	10	03/1999	04/1999
-	SUBTOTAL	0	40	0	0	40		
4. Project Management							07/1998	10/1999
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	5	0	0	5		
	SUBTOTAL	0	5	0	0	5		
5. Construction Costs							04/1999 10/1	10/1999
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	455	0	0	455		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	455	0	0	455		
6. Art	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy								
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	14	0	0	14	08/1999	10/1999
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	14	0	0	14		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			08/1999					
Inflation Multiplier			10.60%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		54	0	0	54		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$568	\$0	\$0	\$568		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	568	0	0	568
State Funds Subtotal	0	568	0	0	568
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	568	0	0	568

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Proj	ected Costs (	Without Inflati	on)
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	4	4	4
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	4	4	4
Revenue Offsets	0	. 0	<4>	<4>	<4>
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99	a standing the	0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel	reservativa (1990).	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS		Percent of
(For bond-financed projects)	Amount	Total
General Fund	568	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS
icants should be aware that the following requirements
y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.
MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major
Remodeling Review (Legislature)
MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This
Review (Legislature)
MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative
Notification)
MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement
(Administration Dept)
MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation
Requirements (Agency)
MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review
(Office of Technology)
MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required
(Finance Dept)
MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review
Required (Agency)
Matching Funds Required (as per agency
request)

**Project Analysis** 

# **Department of Administration Analysis:**

Predesign has not been submitted in order to determine these costs.

# **Department of Finance Analysis:**

Same as above.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor does not recommend capital funds 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	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			

**Project Narrative** 

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Cloud

**AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 15 of 15** 

1998 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$11

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Funding is requested for predesign to determine the most appropriate site for relocating the existing visiting room from the second floor entrance area to one of two ground level sites. Two ground level sites are being considered in order to achieve the least costly approach to the project. The first site is the current institution laundry area. In order to have inmate access to this area, a corridor will need to be added that will require the medical x-ray room to be moved and brought up to code. The second site is the institution's former mattress shop area. This site would not require the relocation of the medical x-ray room. However, it would require extensive remodeling.

# PROJECT RATIONALE AND RELATIONSHIP TO AGENCY LONG-RANGE STRATEGIC PLAN AND CAPITAL PLAN:

The current visiting room is undersized for the population of MCF-St. Cloud. Additionally, its location is poor for security purposes and requires staff and visitors to use the same entrance. The existing visiting room also has numerous structural support pillars that block good security vision providing access for inmates to have contraband passed by visitors.

This project fits into the department's strategic plan. The relocation of the visiting room would improve security and it would help to accommodate the increased number of inmates anticipated with the facility becoming the reception center.

Funding for this project was requested in FY96 and was not approved.

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

This project will have a minimal impact on the operating budget since it is for renovating existing space.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

If deferred, the security coverage of the current visiting room will continue to be a problem and allow for the introduction of contraband into the institution. The institution's visiting room would continue to operate with inadequate spacing and would not meet the needs of an increased inmate population.

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

Joseph Miller Capital Resources Administrator Minnesota Department of Corrections 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55108-5219

Phone: 612/642-0247 FAX: 612/603-0150

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 1998-99	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition					I		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Land, Land and Easements, Options		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land		0	0	0	0	0		
SUE	STOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
2. Predesign SUE	STOTAL	0	10	0	0	10	07/1998	10/1998
3. Design Fees								ja jak jar
Schematic		0	0	25	0	25	01/2001	04/2001
Design Development		0	0	32	0	32	04/2001	07/2001
Contract Documents		0	0	65	0	65	07/2001	10/2001
Construction Administration		0	0	41	0	41	07/2000	10/2001
SUE	BTOTAL	0	0	163	0	163		
4. Project Management							11/2001	11/2002
State Staff Project Management		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management		0	0	80	0	80	1	
SUE	STOTAL	0	0	80	0	80		
5. Construction Costs						<u>*</u>	11/2002	11/2002
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0	1	
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	0	1,630	0	1,630		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	162	0	162		
SUE	STOTAL	0	0	1,792	0	1,792		
6. Art SUE	STOTAL	0	0	15	0	15	11/2002	12/2002
7. Occupancy								
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		0	0	210	0	210	09/2002	12/2002
Telecommunications (voice & data)		0	0	20	0	20	11/2001	11/2002
Security Equipment		0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
SUE	STOTAL	0	0	230	0	230		
8. Inflation								
Midpoint of Construction			01/1999	07/2001				
Inflation Multiplier		iz tropical programme	7.70%	20.20%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost SUE	BTOTAL	Profit post of the	1	461	0	462		
9. Other SUE	BTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND	TOTAL	\$0	\$11	\$2,741	\$0	\$2,752		

# **Project Detail**

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	11	2,741	0	2,752
State Funds Subtotal	0	11	2,741	0	2,752
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	11	2,741	0	2,752

IMPACT ON STATE	Current	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
OPERATING COSTS	FY 1998-99	FY 1998-99	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05
Compensation Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0
Change from Current FY 1998-99		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)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	11	100.0%
User Financing	0	0.0%

	TUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS			
Project applicants should be aware that the following requirements				
will apply	y to their projects after adoption of the bonding bill.			
Yes	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major			
	Remodeling Review (Legislature)			
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This			
	Review (Legislature)			
No	MS 16B.335 (2): Other Projects (Legislative			
	Notification)			
Yes	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Requirement			
	(Administration Dept)			
No	MS 16B.335 (4): Energy Conservation			
	Requirements (Agency)			
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review			
	(Office of Technology)			
No	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required			
	(Finance Dept)			
No	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review			
	Required (Agency)			
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency			
	request)			
	·			

# **Department of Administration Analysis:**

This request follows the preferred approach for capital requests as it seeks to investigate a specific project with the intent of following up with design and construction requests in future biennia.

### **Department of Finance Analysis:**

The agency should consider going ahead with predesign work out of operating funds if it wishes to seek funding for design and construction as part of its request for the 2000 session.

#### **Governor's Recommendation:**

The Governor does not recommend capital funds 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	40			
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	35			
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70			
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			