

Project Title	Agency Priority	Funding Source	Agency Request			Governor's Rec	Governor's Planning Estimates	
			2006	2008	2010	2006	2008	2010
Asset Preservation	1	GO	\$5,200	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$5,200	\$6,000	\$7,000
Facility Life-Safety	2	GO	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Range Lead Abatement and Conversion	3	GO	1,029	0	0	1,029	0	0
Facility ADA Compliance	4	GO	1,400	1,200	900	1,400	1,200	900

Project Total	\$8,629	\$8,200	\$8,900	\$8,629	\$8,200	\$8,900
General Obligation Bonding (GO)	\$8,629	\$8,200	\$8,900	\$8,629	\$8,200	\$8,900

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

Agency Profile At A Glance

- ◆ There are currently 12,773 military members of the Minnesota National Guard.
- ◆ The Department of Military Affairs manages 2.4 million square feet (SF) of facilities within 1,450 buildings on 53,000 acres at Camp Ripley; 588,200 SF in 64 National Guard Logistical facilities; and 1.7 million SF in 63 National Guard Training and Community Centers (armories).
- ◆ The agency annually supports 2,500 National Guard men and women through its tuition reimbursement program.
- ◆ The department has overseen 63,243 National Guard man-days in response to state emergencies since 1998.

Agency Purpose

The Minnesota Department of Military Affairs, also known as the Minnesota National Guard, “is comprised of and includes the military forces of the state, the office of the adjutant general, all military reservations, military installations, armories, air bases, and facilities owned or controlled by the state for military purposes, and civilians employed by the state for the administration of the military department.” (M.S. Ch.190.05)

- ⇒ *Federal Mission:* As a federal entity, military members of the Minnesota National Guard serve as a reserve force for the United States Army and Air Force. They are subject to be called to federal active duty for extended periods of time by the President.
- ⇒ *State Mission:* As a state entity, the Minnesota National Guard provides support to local law enforcement agencies during natural disasters and other emergencies at the direction of the governor.
- ⇒ *Community Mission:* The Minnesota National Guard is also involved in community support projects throughout the state. These projects give our soldiers a chance to “give back to the community.”

The vision of the Department of Military Affairs is to provide leadership, resources, and support to the National Guard to assist in accomplishing these three missions.

Core Functions

The Department of Military Affairs provides the structure and resources to accomplish the four core programs that support the Minnesota National Guard:

- ◆ Maintenance of Training Facilities
- ◆ Enlistment Incentives
- ◆ Emergency Services
- ◆ General Support

Operations

The department’s customer base is the 12,773 members of the Minnesota Army and Air National Guard, the directors and managers responsible for the execution of the federal-state cooperative agreements, and the citizens of the state and nation during emergencies.

The **Maintenance of Training Facilities Program** is the primary staff section responsible for maintaining the state’s facilities used to train and house the members of the Minnesota National Guard and to protect the state’s investment in facilities. Each Air National Guard Base also has a Civil Engineering function that is responsible for the maintenance of the federal facilities that are supported with state dollars.

The Enlistment Program is responsible for managing the department’s enlistment incentives and tuition reimbursement programs. These programs provide incentives to the men and women who enlist and maintain their memberships in the Army and Air National Guard.

Emergency Services is managed by the Military Support directorate of the state staff. They provide the command and control services to the governor when the National Guard is activated in response to state emergencies.

General Support provides the general administrative, financial, accounting, budgeting, and human resource support necessary for the operation of the department.

Budget

Of the department's total budget, 67.3% comes from the federal government through cooperative agreements for facilities maintenance, telecommunications, security, firefighting, distance learning, and the STARBASE educational program. The state General Fund accounts for 31.1%, and approximately 1.6% comes from other sources (local government, facility sales, housing operations, etc.).

The Department of Military Affairs is also responsible for an additional approximately \$340 million received from the federal government in the biennium. These funds come directly from the federal government, do not pass through the state treasury, and are paid to individuals and vendors for federal-related activities.

The department's staff includes 258 employees who approximate 256 full-time equivalents. Only 28 of these employees are 100% state-funded. The remainder are predominantly federally funded -- some at 100% and most others at 75% or 80%.

Contact

Major General Larry W. Shellito
The Adjutant General
Department of Military Affairs
Veterans Service Building
20 West 12th Street
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155
Phone: (651)268-8924
Fax: (651)282-4541

World Wide Web Home Page: <http://www.dma.state.mn.us>

For information on how this agency measures whether it is meeting its statewide goals, please refer to <http://www.departmentresults.state.mn.us/>

At A Glance: Agency Long-Range Strategic Goals

Military Affairs has developed the following long-range capital goals:

- ◆ Through an asset preservation program, upgrade or replace building components and continue our program of repairing the exterior building envelopes at all of the armory buildings.
- ◆ Maintain the health and safety of the users of our facilities by seeking funding for: Americans with Disability Act (ADA) projects; facility fire and smoke alarms, heat detectors, and emergency lighting; and indoor firing range rehabilitation or conversion.
- ◆ Seek funding from various sources to provide facilities for newly acquired units and to replace those facilities that can no longer be maintained to the standards of the department in a cost-effective way.

Trends, Policies and Other Issues Affecting the Demand for Services, Facilities, or Capital Programs

The state of Minnesota has a significant inventory of facilities used by the Minnesota Army National Guard. These include armories, logistical facilities, and various other training facilities located throughout the state. Although state owned, most of these facilities were constructed with some level of federal support and many of them receive federal support for operations. The current inventory consists of over 1,550 facilities with more than 4.4 million square feet of space. The agency’s asset preservation program has been developed as an ongoing, long-range program covering a certain number of facilities each capital bonding period. The Department of Administration intends to significantly reduce the level of Capital Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA) support to state agencies. These funds were previously used for major facility envelope repair and replacement. The Department of Military Affairs has increased its request for asset preservation funds to mitigate the impact of this reduction.

Armories – The Department of Military Affairs’ mission requires a significant investment in training and administrative facilities. The most recognizable of

these facilities is the armory. Also known as National Guard Training and Community Centers, armories serve as the home station for the almost 11,000 members of the Army National Guard. These facilities, located in 62 communities around the state, are also made available to local government, community organizations, and individuals for a wide variety of activities. The armories provide the department with a total of almost 1.6 million square feet of space.

Over the last several years, there have been limited federal funds available for replacement of our aging inventory of armory facilities. Previously, the federal government provided 75% of the construction costs for the basic armory. The remaining 25% was funded cooperatively by the state and the municipality within which the armory was located. The state share (approximately 12½%) was funded via a lease payment to the Minnesota State Armory Building Commission that sold bonds to finance the non-federal share of the construction costs. Without additional funding for replacement of our aging facilities, the ability of the National Guard to train and house military units will continue to be seriously impacted.

This lack of federal funding also impacts on the ability to acquire additional units for the Minnesota National Guard. The Department of Defense, through the National Guard Bureau, is regularly adjusting the unit allowances between the states as some states are much more successful in providing manning for additional units. Because of the Minnesota’s success in recruiting and retaining soldiers, the Minnesota Army National Guard is seeking additional force structure. These authorizations bring federal funds for full-time employees and traditional soldiers and their supporting equipment into the state. However, without permanent facilities for the units and their equipment, we will no longer remain competitive in acquiring additional force structure into Minnesota.

The federal government will generally not provide funds for routine maintenance and repair of current armory facilities. The state must pay all costs of operation and minor maintenance for armory facilities.

The department does not anticipate any reduction in the demand for state military support of emergencies and natural disasters. As evidenced by the fire and tornado support requested since 2003, the demand remains high. This military support is dependent upon the ability of the department to

maintain clean, safe, and functional facilities to train and house the soldiers called to state service by the governor.

Logistical Facilities – The maintenance and repair support for Army National Guard training and logistical facilities (non-armory) remains fairly static. Many of the facilities located on the Camp Ripley reservation, although state-owned, are 100% federally supported. Other logistical support facilities (Organizational Maintenance Shops) are also state-owned and supported federally. The Army National Guard has 15 of these facilities located throughout the state that were, until recently, supported 75% federally and 25% state. The federal government has just changed the operational support and maintenance and repair support to 100% federal.

The Air National Guard will continue to be a major part of the overall Air Force mission support. As the size of the active Air Force continues to be reduced, the missions of the Air National Guard have increased proportionately. The Air Force continues to be confident that the Air National Guard can absorb some of the missions previously accomplished by the active component.

Provide a Self-Assessment of the Condition, Suitability, and Functionality of Present Facilities, Capital Projects, or Assets

The department's facility inventory is rapidly approaching obsolescence. Fully 35 (56%) of the department's 62 armory facilities are over 40 years old. Twelve (19%) are over 70 years old. Many of these facilities were constructed when the demands for space were fairly straightforward – administrative, drill floor, classroom, and storage spaces were all very generic. However, as technology requirements have rapidly increased, so has the demand for upgraded electrical, communications, and computer related wiring and facilities. Additionally, as the missions of the tenant units have become more technology dependent, facilities must be constructed or re-configured to accommodate them.

Some of these facilities have outlived their useful lives. Structural, electrical, plumbing, roof, window, and heating plant repairs are becoming prohibitively expensive and more frequently required. The department has a maintenance backlog estimated at over \$27 million. The operating budget continues to be inadequate to make any appreciable reduction in this

maintenance backlog. Upgrading facilities to meet current code requirements becomes impractical as repairs become more extensive and expensive. For example, many of these facilities were constructed before indoor air quality was recognized as a work-place issue, and consequently they have poor air circulation and aging heating plants. Moreover, expansion to accommodate modern needs is often impractical in older facilities because they are now land-locked.

Agency Process Used to Arrive at These Capital Requests

The Facilities Management Office at Camp Ripley manages the agency's facility maintenance and repair program. That office is staffed with facility planners, architectural and design specialists, environmental specialists, physical plant management staff, building maintenance coordinators, and other support staff.

The asset preservation and facility improvement portions of the budget request are based on our ongoing facility inspections by our facilities management staff and input from the National Guard unit administrators. This facilities status data is referred to the Adjutant General's Facility Committee where other issues such as future stationing and force structure changes are factored into the list of requirements. In developing this plan, high priority is given to those projects necessary to comply with laws and codes, where major improvements are required to protect the state's investment in facilities, and where improvements are required to make the facilities more useable by tenant organizations.

The plan for new construction is based on ongoing evaluations of the facility inventory with respect to functional space requirements of the military organizations assigned to the state. Other factors include: the current structural state of the facility, costs of renovation and/or remodeling, the extent of repairs required which may also require compliance with current code, the ability of the current site to meet the increased demands for space, the opportunities for joint construction projects that meet the capital needs of the department and local communities, and the need to replace the current leased space with space specifically designed for military use.

Senior members of the Adjutant General's staff give broad guidance for the facilities management process through a Facilities Committee. The Facility

Committee is structured into a tiered board system that provides the senior leadership a methodology to prioritize projects out over an extended timeline. Each service (Army and Air Guard) conducts a quarterly Tier II board that addresses their respective priorities. Each service board is chaired by the Assistant Adjutant General for the service. Both boards provide their highest projects prioritized by the fiscal year they are desired to the Tier I Board. The Tier I board provides recommendations to The Adjutant General, as the Chair, for decision and implementation as facility priorities for each Fiscal Year.

Members of our Design and Construction Operations Section staff estimate the construction costs that are then reviewed by our staff architect.

The Minnesota National Guard also uses the Army Communities of Excellence (ACOE) program plan to continuously review operations and facilities plans. Modeled after the Malcolm Baldrige Award program, ACOE allows the organization to take a critical look at all phases of planning and program execution.

Major Capital Projects Authorized in 2002 and 2005

2002:	Asset Preservation statewide	\$2.5 million
	ADA Improvements statewide	\$357,000
	Facility Life-Safety statewide	\$1 million
	Capital Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA) Roof and Boiler	\$1.005 million
	CAPRA Emergency Lead Abatement	\$150,000
2005	Asset Preservation statewide	\$4 million

2006 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$5,200,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 4

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

- ◆ For reducing backlog of maintenance, repair, replacement, and renovation of existing facilities.
- ◆ Depending on the specific project scope of work, federal funds will match either 75% or 50% to state funds.

Project Description

This request is to address the deferred maintenance needs at armory and training buildings throughout the state. The department maintains approximately 1.8 million square feet in armory buildings along with approximately 2 million square feet of training and housing buildings at Camp Ripley. This project would address some of the backlog of maintenance work order requests submitted by the users and building maintenance coordinators responsible for the upkeep of these buildings.

Since 1995, the Department of Military Affairs (DMA) has continued to develop in-depth facilities audits with our facility managers to identify deferred maintenance needs. This process helped the department determine how large its portion of the “Capital Iceberg” had become. The current operating budget has, at best, been able to keep up with necessary priority repairs, leaving a growing backlog of projects.

Detailed facility audits have revealed a growing backlog of maintenance and renovation requests in excess of \$28 million. Facility aging creates additional maintenance and repair problems. Currently, the average age of the department’s armory facilities is in excess of 42 years. Phasing of asset preservation projects is (in priority order):

- ◆ Envelope Protection;
- ◆ Safety/liability related projects;
- ◆ Sanitary issues (e.g., toilet facilities);
- ◆ Functionality projects (e.g., rehabilitation of training rooms, lighting); and
- ◆ Aesthetics/comfort projects if funding remains.

Some examples of safety/liability issues that are included within the scope of this project are: repairs to curbs, sidewalks and building entrances, updating of electrical service, and their ventilating systems.

Some other examples of the projects anticipated within this request include the repair, replacement, or renovation of:

- ◆ Floors and floor coverings;
- ◆ Toilet facilities (non ADA);
- ◆ Light fixtures and associated wiring;
- ◆ Pumps and motors;
- ◆ Ventilating and air conditioning systems;
- ◆ Interior training rooms;
- ◆ Shower/locker room facilities; and
- ◆ Other projects which extend the life of the facility.

Priority projects include:

- ◆ Redwood Falls – Boiler;
- ◆ Brooklyn Park, Chisholm, Bemidji – Roof;
- ◆ Roseville;
- ◆ Sauk Centre, Morris, Hutchinson, Litchfield – Batched;
- ◆ St James, Pipestone – Batched;
- ◆ Red Wing, Faribault, Rochester – Batched; and
- ◆ Crookston, Detroit Lakes, Fergus Falls – Batched.

Specific projects will be defined once the source of and amount of appropriated dollars is known.

As stated in the agency’s Strategic Plan, Military Affairs must focus its attention on maintaining and upgrading existing buildings. With federal grant funding for new buildings greatly reduced, it is imperative the department

Asset Preservation

keep its building assets in good working order and repair to meet the needs of the buildings users.

The department's goal is to minimize or eliminate the agency's backlog of maintenance and repair projects on its Asset Preservation list, while at the same time methodically eliminating the existing "iceberg" of projects. Funding at the levels requested could be efficiently managed by the department personnel and parallels backlog reduction goals identified in the agency performance report.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

Because these projects deal primarily with backlog, there will not be a direct impact on the operating budget. However, energy savings will occur with better insulation, motor efficiencies, etc. That will allow a reduction in utility costs which in turn stretches the operating budget dollars.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

Capital Budget

FY 2005	\$4.0 million
FY 2002	\$2.5 million
FY 1998	\$250,000
FY 1996	\$500,000

Centrally Managed Capital Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA) (\$6.075 million)

FY 2002	\$1.0 million
FY 2000	\$2.4 million
FY 1998	\$1.65 million
FY 1996	\$1.025 million

Other Considerations

None.

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer, Comptroller
 Department of Military Affairs
 Veterans Service Building
 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098
 Phone: (651) 268-8948
 Fax: (651) 282-4541
 E-mail: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Lieutenant Colonel Jama M. Davidson
 Facilities Management Officer
 Camp Ripley
 15000 Highway 115
 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
 Phone: (320) 616-2602
 Fax: (320) 632-7473
 E-mail: jama.davidson@mn.ngb.army.mil

Michael W. Ramsdell
 Facilities Management Office-Operations
 Camp Ripley
 15000 Highway 115
 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
 Phone: (320) 616-2635
 Fax: (320) 632-7473
 E-mail: mike.ramsdell@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$5.2 million in FY 2006 for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$6 million in FY 2008 and \$7 million in FY 2010.

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
1. Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0
2. Predesign Fees	0	0	0	0	0
3. Design Fees	0	0	0	0	0
4. Project Management	0	0	0	0	0
5. Construction Costs	8,750	5,200	6,000	7,000	26,950
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
8. Occupancy	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inflation	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,750	5,200	6,000	7,000	26,950

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	8,750	5,200	6,000	7,000	26,950
State Funds Subtotal	8,750	5,200	6,000	7,000	26,950
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	8,750	5,200	6,000	7,000	26,950

CHANGES IN STATE OPERATING COSTS	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)			
	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	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	5,200	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.	
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required
No	MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required
No	MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)
Yes	MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2011

2006 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 4

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

- ◆ Life/Safety alterations to existing National Guard Training/Community Centers throughout the state.
- ◆ Will match \$3 million of federal funds to the \$1 million of state funds (Shared 75/25%)

Project Description

The purpose of this request is to address the required Life/Safety alterations to existing National Guard Training/Community Centers (Armories) throughout the state. Requested project funding would greatly enhance personnel safety. Life/safety upgrades/repairs are generally funded three federal for each state dollar.

These projects are considered significant, permanent and long overdue major improvements to our armory facilities. Many of the armories have been used for emergency shelters. Facilities are not to current building codes and personnel are working in potentially dangerous/unsafe buildings, i.e. mold, no egress in case of fire, poor ventilation, asbestos etc. These projects provide needed improvements in the facilities, which will make their use much safer and would include: fire/smoke alarm system, emergency egress lighting, ventilation system improvements, etc.

Projects are programmed as follows (programmed locations may vary within the three biennia):

FY 2006-07

Litchfield
Duluth
Hutchinson
Ortonville
Appleton
Alexandria
Pine City
Bloomington
Morris

FY 2010-2011

AASF
Roseville
Stillwater
Willmar OMS
Camp Ripley, 15-001
Hastings
Brooklyn Park
Camp Ripley Facilities
Sauk Centre

FY 2008-09

Appleton OMS
Cloquet OMS
Detroit Lakes OMS
Hibbing OMS
New Brighton OMS
Rochester OMS

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$1 million in FY 2002 (Capital Budget)

Other Considerations

None.

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer, Comptroller
Department of Military Affairs
Veterans Service Building
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098
Phone: (651) 282-8948
Fax: (651) 282-4493
E-mail: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Facility Life-Safety

Lieutenant Colonel Jama M. Davidson
Facilities Management Officer
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
Phone: (320) 616-2635
Fax: (320) 632-7473
E-mail: jama.davidson@mn.ngb.army.mil

Michael W. Ramsdell
Facilities Management Office-Operations
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
Phone: (320) 616-2635
Fax: (320) 632-7473
E-mail: mike.ramsdell@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.0 million in FY 2006 for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$1.0 million in FY 2008 and \$1.0 million in FY 2010.

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
1. Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0
2. Predesign Fees	0	0	0	0	0
3. Design Fees	0	0	0	0	0
4. Project Management	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
5. Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
8. Occupancy	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inflation	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	1000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
State Funds Subtotal	1000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
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	1000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000

CHANGES IN STATE OPERATING COSTS	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)			
	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	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	1000	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.	
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required
No	MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required
No	MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)
Yes	MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2011

Range Lead Abatement and Conversion

2006 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,029,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 4

PROJECT LOCATION: Albert Lea, Bloomington, Brainerd, Duluth, Jackson, Montevideo, Moorhead, Rochester, Rosemount, St. Peter

Project At A Glance

- ◆ Lead abatement and conversion of indoor firing ranges (IFR) in ten National Guard Training/Community Centers.
- ◆ Indoor ranges are considered unsafe. Further usage is not authorized because ranges do not meet current minimum health and safety standards.
- ◆ Most require lead abatement of range and adjacent areas occupied by full-time staff or utilized by community.
- ◆ Indoor ranges will be converted to much needed storage, classrooms, offices, etc.

Project Description

The Minnesota Army National Guard (MN ARNG) currently has 10 IFRs at its Training and Community Centers (TACCs), formerly known as National Guard Armories. The MN ARNG has IFRs at: Moorhead, Duluth, Brainerd, Bloomington, Rosemount, Montevideo, St. Peter, Jackson, Albert Lea, and Rochester.

IFR Environmental Management Study: RESPEC Environmental, Inc., was contracted by the Facilities Management Office, Department of Military Affairs, to perform an IFR study. The overall scope of work for this project was:

- ⇒ Investigate and Document Range Designs and Utilization. Investigate and record existing range operation, management practices, uses and users, existing design and technologies.

- ⇒ Determine Environmental and Safety Compliance. Determine the applicable environmental and safety laws, rules, regulations and ordinances (air, water, waste management and Occupational Safety and Health Act) where outside agencies have regulatory authority and oversight of department activities. Determine existing conditions through testing and analysis and compare to the environmental and safety standards.

- ⇒ Propose Course of Action. Propose corrective actions including cost estimates for each course of action. Determine best management practices and include design criteria for “state of the art” future ranges. Include cost for closing and decontaminating ranges for other uses.

Results of Study: The result of the study indicated that most of the IFR’s exceeded the lead concentration regulatory level, which requires extensive interior cleanup. If any IFR is to remain in operation, then rehabilitation would be required with state of the art technology.

Impact: The MN ARNG no longer has a requirement for the IFRs. All range firing is conducted at Camp Ripley on state-of-the-art outdoor firing ranges. However, five of the 10 IFRs were utilized extensively by state, county, and city law enforcement agencies. Numerous letters were forwarded to civilian users of the IFRs and meetings were conducted with the civilian range users. Based on these discussions the Department of Military Affairs developed plans to clean and convert the range spaces to storage, classrooms, or offices. These facilities are short on space, based upon federal military facility criteria for type of unit and the number of personnel assigned. These conversions will greatly impact how units use space in their facilities.

Range Lead Abatement and Conversion

Cost Estimates per IFR: Range cleanup and conversion

	<u>Cleanup</u>	<u>Conversion</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Albert Lea:	\$37,000	\$68,000	\$105,000
2. Bloomington:	\$125,000	\$64,000	\$189,000
3. Brainerd:	\$47,000	\$62,000	\$109,000
4. Duluth:	\$47,000	\$68,000	\$115,000
5. Jackson:	-	\$70,000	\$70,000
6. Montevideo:	-	\$70,000	\$70,000
7. Moorhead:	\$68,000	\$51,000	\$119,000
8. Rochester:	\$52,000	\$68,000	\$120,000
9. Rosemount:	-	\$39,000	\$39,000
10. St. Peter:	<u>\$27,000</u>	<u>\$66,000</u>	<u>\$93,000</u>
Totals:	\$403,000	\$626,000	\$1,029,000

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The funding and completion of these projects will ensure that state operating budget dollars will not be needed for future cleanup costs. Also reduces money spend rehabilitating existing space to accommodate lack of storage.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

Department of Administration approved Capitol Asset Preservation and Replacement Account applications and provided funds in the amount of \$150,000 for cleanup only of Jackson, Montevideo, and Rosemount Training and Community Centers. (FY 2002)

Other Considerations

None.

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer
 Comptroller
 Department of Military Affairs
 Veterans Service Building
 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098
 Phone: (651) 282-8948
 Fax: (651) 282-4493
 E-mail: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Lieutenant Colonel Jama M. Davidson
 Facilities Management Officer
 Camp Ripley
 15000 Highway 115
 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
 Phone: (320) 616-2602
 Fax: (320) 632-7473
 E-mail: jama.davidson@mn.ngb.army.mil

Michael W. Ramsdell
 Facilities Management Office-Operations
 IFR Project Officer
 Camp Ripley
 15000 Highway 115
 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
 Phone: (320) 632-7568
 Fax: (320) 632-7473
 E-mail: mike.ramsdell@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.029 million for this project.

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
1. Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0
2. Predesign Fees	0	0	0	0	0
3. Design Fees	0	0	0	0	0
4. Project Management	0	0	0	0	0
5. Construction Costs	0	0	0	0	0
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
8. Occupancy	150	1,029	0	0	1,179
9. Inflation	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	150	1,029	0	0	1,179

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	150	1,029	0	0	1,179
State Funds Subtotal	150	1,029	0	0	1,179
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	150	1,029	0	0	1,179

CHANGES IN STATE OPERATING COSTS	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)			
	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	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	1,029	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.	
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required
No	MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required
No	MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)
Yes	MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2011

Facility ADA Compliance

2006 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,400,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 4 of 4

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

- ◆ Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) alterations to existing National Guard Training/Community Centers in locations throughout the state.
- ◆ Will match \$4.2 million in federal funds to this \$1.4 million of state funds (Shared 75/25%)

Project Description

The Minnesota National Guard's mission is threefold: federal, state, and community. The purpose of this request is to address the required interior alterations to existing armory and training facilities throughout the state to meet the intent of the ADA. The department maintains approximately 1.8 million square feet in armory buildings along with approximately two million square feet of training and housing buildings at Camp Ripley.

Projects are programmed as follows (programmed locations may vary within the three biennia):

<u>FY 2006-07</u>	<u>FY 2010-2011</u>	<u>FY 2008-09</u>
(\$1,400,000)	(\$900,000)	(\$1,200,000)
Litchfield	AASF	Appleton OMS
Duluth	Roseville	Cloquet OMS
Hutchinson	Stillwater	Detroit Lakes OMS
Ortonville	Crookston	Hibbing OMS
Appleton	Camp Ripley, Bldg 15-001	New Brighton OMS
Alexandria	Hastings	Rochester OMS
Pine City	Brooklyn Park	Willmar OMS
Bloomington	Pipestone	Camp Ripley Facilities
Morris	Sauk Centre	

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$357,000 in FY 2002 Capital Budget

Other Considerations

None.

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer, Comptroller
 Department of Military Affairs
 Veterans Service Building
 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098
 Phone: (651) 282-8948
 Fax: (651) 282-4493
 E-mail: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Lieutenant Colonel Jama M. Davidson
 Facilities Management Officer
 Camp Ripley
 15000 Highway 115
 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
 Phone: (320) 616-2635
 Fax: (320) 632-7473
 E-mail: jama.davidson@mn.ngb.army.mil

Facility ADA Compliance

Michael W. Ramsdell
Facilities Management Office-Operations
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173
Phone: (320) 616-2635
Fax: (320) 632-7473
E-mail: mike.ramsdell@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.4 million in FY 2006 for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$1.2 million in FY 2008 and \$900,000 in FY 2010.

Military Affairs, Department of
Facility ADA Compliance

Project Detail
(\$ in Thousands)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
1. Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0
2. Predesign Fees	0	0	0	0	0
3. Design Fees	0	0	0	0	0
4. Project Management	0	0	0	0	0
5. Construction Costs	357	1,400	1,200	900	3,857
6. One Percent for Art	0	0	0	0	0
7. Relocation Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
8. Occupancy	0	0	0	0	0
9. Inflation	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	357	1,400	1,200	900	3,857

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	357	1,400	1,200	900	3,857
State Funds Subtotal	357	1,400	1,200	900	3,857
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	357	1,400	1,200	900	3,857

CHANGES IN STATE OPERATING COSTS	Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation)			
	FY 2006-07	FY 2008-09	FY 2010-11	TOTAL
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0
Building Repair and Replacement Expenses	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	0	0	0	0
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	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	1,400	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.	
No	MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review Required (by Administration Dept)
Yes	MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy Conservation Requirements
No	MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology Review (by Office of Technology)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required
No	MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required
No	MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)
Yes	MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2011