

2000-2005 MINNESOTA STRATEGIC CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN

03 024

State Government

Presented by Governor Jesse Ventura
to the 81st Legislature

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY



3 0307 00005 1121

2000 - 2005 MINNESOTA STRATEGIC CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN

STATE GOVERNMENT

HJ
11
.M6425c
2000/
2005
State
Govern.

MINNESOTA STRATEGIC CAPITAL BUDGET PLAN 2000-2005

-INDEX-

STATE GOVERNMENT

Administration, Department of
Amateur Sports Commission
Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board
Military Affairs, Department of

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ST. PAUL, MN 55155
JAN 19 2000
RECEIVED

Page Number

F-1
F-83
F-107
F-119

The 2000-2005 Minnesota 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/cb>

This document is available in an alternate format.

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Title	2000 Agency Priority Ranking	Agency Project Requests for State Funds (\$ by Session)				Statewide Strategic Score	Governor's Recommendation 2000	Governor's Planning Estimate	
		2000	2002	2004	Total			2002	2004
Electrical Utility Infrastructure, Phase 4	1	\$2,500	\$500	\$500	\$3,500	310	\$2,500	\$500	\$500
717 Delaware Street (Health Building)	2	4,300	0	0	4,300	425	4,300	0	0
Capitol Security Renovation	3	1,000	0	0	1,000	280	1,000	0	0
Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies	4	400	0	0	400	345	100	0	0
Asset Preservation	5	9,825	9,000	9,000	27,825	385	4,200	4,200	4,200
General Predesign/Schematic Design	6	2,000	0	0	2,000	360	2,000	75,000	75,000
Capitol Project 2005	7	6,600	0	0	6,600	420	3,300	0	0
Bureau of Criminal App. Facility	8	58,000	7,500	0	65,500	375	58,000	0	0
Statewide CAPRA	9	14,500	27,500	25,000	67,000	460	10,000	10,000	10,000
Agency Relocation	10	2,316	0	0	2,316	285	2,316	0	0
Property Acquisition	11	11,000	3,000	3,000	17,000	300	5,700	0	0
InterTechnologies Group Data Center	12	500	3,800	44,797	49,097	175	0	0	0
Statewide Information Technology	13	10,000	10,000	20,000	40,000	160	0	0	0
Capitol Area Predesigns	14	800	10,050	13,200	24,050	255	0	0	0
Statewide Building Access (ADA)		0	10,000	10,000	20,000		0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$123,741	\$81,350	\$125,497	\$330,588		\$93,416	\$89,700	\$89,700

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of Minnesota's Department of Administration (Admin) is "to improve the quality and productivity of Minnesota government." We provide our customers in state and local agencies with business management and administrative services that enable those agencies to better serve the public. Admin is responsible for providing high quality, efficient, responsive, innovative, and cost-effective property-related services for safe and healthy working environments. Included is the provision of office space whether in state owned or privately owned leased facilities.

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

As state agency programs expanded in the 1970s, agency operations became dispersed and fragmented in numerous privately owned leased facilities. In the 1980s, Admin focused on consolidating and co-locating state agency operations for improved operating efficiency and delivery of services. Prior to the construction of the Harold E. Stassen Office Building for the Department of Revenue, the last executive branch offices constructed in the Capitol complex were the Administration Building in 1967 and the Veterans Service Building addition in 1972. The Capitol Square Building, acquired in 1970 and scheduled for demolition in 1999, was the last office building purchased by the state.

Since the 1970s, the state has relied on meeting state agency office space needs by leasing space in privately owned facilities. Today, state operations such as the departments of Children, Family and Learning, Agriculture, Human Services, Natural Resources, Corrections, Commerce, Labor and Industry, Public Safety, Public Services, and several others formerly housed in the Capitol complex are now located away from the seat of government in privately owned leased facilities.

Long-Range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies:

To better manage the state's office space, Admin developed a long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies (Strategic Plan) in the metropolitan area in 1993. This was in accordance with the 1992 Capital Budget Reform report to the Legislature recommending the development of master plans for each state-owned campus. Laws 1994, Chapter 643, Section 39 require Admin to regularly update the long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies and to follow the plan in assigning and reassigning space to agencies. The Strategic Plan was last updated in 1995.

- Based on state agencies' long-range program needs and estimates, state agency rate of growth was projected over the next 20 years with an immediate need for an additional 300 thousand square feet.

- Since the Strategic Plan was released in 1994, the state has leased an additional 350 thousand usable square feet of office space in downtown St. Paul.
- The departments of Health, Corrections, and Human Services have already exceeded their growth projections due to new and expanded programs.
- The current space inventory is comprised of 1.2 million square feet of state-owned and 2.9 million square feet in privately-owned leased office space in the 7-county metropolitan area.
- Since the late 1970s, the amount of office space leased has more than doubled, while the amount of state owned space has remained relatively constant.

By the year 2013, state agency space requirements is estimated to total between 5.0 million to 5.9 million square feet of space in the 7-county metropolitan area. This is an increase of 900 thousand to 1.8 million square feet over the 4.1 million square feet state agencies currently occupy in state owned facilities under Admin's custodial control and in privately owned leased facilities. The average growth would be between 60 thousand to 105 thousand square feet per year.

Own versus Leasing:

Various studies, including the 1996 Legislative Coordinating Commission study, all indicate that it is more economical in the long term to own rather than lease office space. The state currently leases office space in the metropolitan area at a rental cost of about \$43 million annually, or an average rent of \$14.10 per square foot. In 1994, the rental cost was about \$27 million annually, or an average rent of \$13.32 per square foot. If the state continues to meet its future space needs only by leasing privately owned office space, the annual cost would more than double over 20 years based on the current lease rate with no adjustment for escalation in lease rates.

Property Acquisition:

Admin is acquiring additional property to ensure land is available at the lowest cost possible, to meet state expansion needs in the future, and to strengthen the image of the State Capitol as the central location for state government. By increasing the amount of state owned space, the state has the opportunity to control its long-term costs and acquire equity in the buildings it occupies. The Strategic Plan recommends ownership in the Capitol area. Admin will:

- Pursue and analyze on a case-by-case basis such options as constructing, purchasing, or leasing facilities to provide adequate space for state government operations and to take advantage of real estate market opportunities.

- Analyze other alternatives and potential joint development projects, which may be outside the Capitol area.

Lack of acquisition funds has placed Admin at a disadvantage in the acquiring of desired property. It is Admin's experience that property owners prefer to negotiate a sale instead of an option for a possible sale in the future.

Information Technology:

Although new technology will provide some decentralization of agencies, technology will also support and increase the efficiency of central management functions. Telecommuting, telecopying, and electronic information storage help reduce travel demand and document storage space. However, the expansion of personal computer use and associated training and teleconferencing facilities will offset much of the space savings. Until the state has gained more experience in these areas, a significant reduction in agency headquarters functions and space needs is not anticipated. Each state agency will continue to identify its telecommuting opportunities so state facilities are designed with the flexibility to respond to rapid technological advances. In accordance with Minnesota Statutes 16B.335, agencies are required to review the implication of using information technology to decentralize and/or to reduce office space needs.

Code Compliance/Life Safety:

Bringing state owned buildings in the Capitol area into compliance with building codes, fire and life safety codes, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is an ongoing effort. Based on the volume of work to be accomplished and established priorities, Admin will request funds to meet these requirements in several phases.

- To comply with ADA and to make state buildings fully accessible statewide, Admin developed a statewide plan for addressing the volume of work to be accomplished. The legislature has appropriated funds to make buildings fully accessible statewide. Accessibility surveys identified over 200,000 barriers statewide. To date, \$19.5 million has been appropriated. Admin is in the process of reevaluating the amount of work and funds that require continued management by Admin and determining at which point responsibility for ADA compliance can be turned over to each agency. There are currently sufficient funds appropriated to continue this program, making it unnecessary to request additional funds in 2000.
- In accordance with state building codes and the city of St. Paul occupancy requirements, Admin must bring all of the buildings in the Capitol complex up to current life safety standards. The Transportation Building is in the final renovation phase to bring it into compliance with present-day codes and standards. The Capitol Square Building will be demolished because it is beyond its useful life, no longer suitable for office use, and required extensive life safety updating to remain in compliance.

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

Office Space:

The demands on state government have outgrown new state office construction during the past 20 years. As a result, only 29% as compared to 48% (1994) of the state's business is now conducted in buildings owned and managed by the state in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Studies indicate that the state's dependence on leasing privately owned office space is a costly and inefficient method of providing office space over the long term. Short-term leases with escalating rent clauses are not economical long-term uses of state funds. The state currently expends about \$43 million annually for privately owned space in the metropolitan area.

Admin will need to continue to make land and property acquisitions that are economically sound investments for the state. Acquisition of properties in other locations is necessary for the efficient delivery of state agency programs and services to the public. This includes analysis of any property that becomes available for acquisition by the state but is not specifically identified in the Strategic Plan.

Asset Preservation:

Admin seeks to provide environmentally safe facilities and will continue to renovate those facilities that are below occupancy standards. Input received from maintenance personnel as well as from state agencies on facility improvements or space requirements helps Admin to maintain or provide appropriate facilities so state agencies can effectively deliver services to the public. Through the use of technology, Admin can better analyze and prioritize maintenance, renovation, and code related project costs.

Facilities under Admin's custodial control are aging with an average age of 51 years for 18 facilities. There are 8 buildings with an average age of 81 years, 7 buildings with an average age of 37 years, and 3 buildings with an average of 6 years. It is important for the state to protect its investments in state facilities. Many of these facilities have reached the point where the state needs to reinvest in the facility to prevent deteriorating to the point where it becomes costly to make the improvements.

Several buildings in the Capitol complex have had building code and life safety deficiencies, which were identified over 10 years ago. In some situations, the deficiencies were resolved only through major renovation. In other cases, interim steps have been taken until adequate funds are obtained to properly correct the

deficiencies and meet code. There are structural problems that need addressing at the following facilities: State Office Building, Health Building, Ford Building, Centennial Building, Veterans Services Building, and the Administration Building Parking Ramp.

Maintenance and Leasehold (M & L) funds collected through state agency rental leases cover operating costs and most routine building maintenance on state owned buildings in the Capitol complex. However, the M & L funds are inadequate and are not intended to cover the cost of major building improvements such as replacing the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, major renovation of office space, or roof replacement.

Air quality problems are a source of concern to building occupants. The HVAC systems in the Administration, Veterans Service, and Health buildings are antiquated and past due for modification or total replacement. It is Admin's plan to renovate, where appropriate, the buildings in the Capitol complex to bring them up to present-day standards and codes. Asset preservation funds are critically needed to maintain the buildings in the Capitol complex.

In its 1992 report to the legislature on capital budget reform, Admin recommended that part of state agency rent be placed in a fund for major repairs and replacements not covered under the current rent structure. Admin's Rent Report to the legislature in March of 1995 recommended establishing a "reserve for repairs" for repair and maintenance of facilities under Admin's custodial care. Typical projects would include roofs, major electrical, plumbing and mechanical projects, elevators, asbestos removal, tuckpointing, window replacement, structural repairs, tunnels, life safety, fire safety, and code compliance.

- In 1997, the legislature authorized Admin to use CAPRA and Asset Preservation funds recovered through rent for asset preservation projects.
- In 1999, the legislature authorized Admin to use depreciation funds recovered through rent for asset preservation effective 7-1-2001.

The Plant Management Division's internal service fund for rent will continue to fund routine maintenance and leasehold items such as painting, carpeting, minor roof patching, and minor mechanical/electrical repairs through the current rent structure. The establishment of a planned maintenance program will give Admin the ability to better maintain the buildings in the Capitol complex using life cycle costing methods to schedule improvements that will preserve the state's capital assets and provide environmentally safe buildings.

Asset preservation funds improve Admin's ability to maintain the buildings in the Capitol complex by planning and budgeting for future cyclical repairs and replacements that extend the useful life of the facilities and reduce the need for long-term capital expenditures for deferred maintenance. The 1999 authorization to use

depreciation funds beginning in F.Y. 2002 will be highly beneficial for maintaining state facilities in the Capitol complex.

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

Admin is taking a leadership role through a strategic focus on facilities management. The selection of office space whether in a state owned or a leased facility will be based on an economic analysis and agency program requirements. Improved maintenance of state owned facilities will stem from implementation of a planned maintenance program that ensures critical building improvements are made to protect the state's building assets. With respect to statewide responsibilities, Admin will continue to request funds to administer the Capital Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA) and the Statewide Building Access programs.

Admin developed a long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies in the metropolitan area. This is a flexible plan to guide where state agencies are located in the future with the financing methods used to acquire the space needed for state agencies. The goals of this plan are to:

- Achieve economy and efficiency in the location, development, and financing of leased and owned state space.
- Ensure the integrity and design quality of state facilities located in the Capitol area and throughout the metropolitan area and preserve the dignity and heritage of the Capitol area.
- Provide efficient flexibility in the Strategic Plan to adapt effectively to change in space needs, the market place, and funding restraints.
- Encourage alternate forms of transportation that increase accessibility and mobility, decrease parking conflicts and congestion around state facilities, and ensure a safer and more convenient environment for pedestrians, transit patrons, and motorists.
- Take a leadership role in environmental stewardship and sound regional growth management.

To realize the long-term cost savings of ownership, Admin's objective is to change the ratio of space it leases and owns with the goal of locating up to 70% of the state's office space in state owned buildings and locating 30% of the space in privately owned facilities by the year 2013. Assuming a moderate rate of growth, the amount of privately owned leased office space will decline from 2.0 million square feet to 1.8 million square feet while the amount of owned office space will increase from 1.8 million square feet to an estimated 4.1 million square feet. To

achieve this increase in ownership of office space, Admin will embark on an aggressive construction and property acquisition plan requiring a significant commitment of state resources.

Admin is requesting funds to update its long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies due to the numerous changes that have occurred since the last update in 1995. It is also requesting funds to perform a major predesign/schematic designs for the departments of Health and Human Services. The laboratory needs of Health, Agriculture, and Natural Resources will also be an important component.

Whenever appropriate, the office buildings will be designed for general office use to provide greater flexibility in meeting information technology and agency program needs.

In addition to increasing the state's ownership of office space through construction, the Strategic Plan provides for increasing office space through the purchase of privately owned leased facilities housing state agency operations. Admin will use The Automated Prospectus System (TAPS), a computer program developed for the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), to do case-by-case analysis of the proposed acquisitions and determine the financing method that is economically beneficial to the state. TAPS uses the life cycle costing method to calculate and compare the costs of providing office space through leasing, building, buying, or adapting existing facilities. The Strategic Plan can be adjusted periodically to reflect significant implementation actions taken and to accommodate government reorganization actions.

As the Strategic Plan is implemented, Admin will request and manage agency relocation funds whenever a state agency needs to relocate, consolidate, or co-locate operations, and the agency is unable to pay for the costs of moving from the agency's operation funds.

AGENCY PROCESS USED TO ARRIVE AT THESE CAPITAL REQUESTS:

A legislative appropriation funded the development of the long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies. Consultants were hired to develop this plan with input from state agencies, legislators, local government, and special interest groups. The plan has the flexibility to be updated as changes occur.

This capital budget request continues implementation of the Strategic Plan, which will be phased over the next 20 years. The new development aspects of the Strategic Plan are integrated with the ongoing capital improvements that are needed for the buildings Admin manages in the Capitol complex. This master plan guides Admin's capital budget requests.

High priority is given to any project that is mandated by law, where life safety improvements are imperative to meet code requirements, where major improvements

are needed to preserve the state's investment in its building assets, and where there are long term economic advantages to the state by increasing ownership of office space through either construction or purchase. In preparing the capital budget requests, Admin uses in-house staff, consultants, or a combination thereof to analyze improvements needed, to develop cost estimates, and to determine the best course of action for recommendation to the Governor and the legislature.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1994-1999):

■ **Ongoing Projects:**

Statewide CAPRA
 Statewide Building Access projects

■ **Projects in Process:**

1999 Appropriation:
 Demolish Capitol Square Building

1998 Appropriation:
 Predesign, design, and construct new Ely Revenue Building
 Predesign new facility space for Department of Public Safety, Capitol Security and part of the Department of Administration's, Plant Management operations.
 Property Acquisition (Rice and University)
 Design new Bureau of Criminal Apprehension offices and labs – St. Paul
 Predesign satellite Bureau of Criminal Apprehension facility – Bemidji
 Relocate Dahl House

■ **Projects Completed:**

1998 Appropriation:
 Upgrade primary electrical distribution system in Capitol complex, current phase
 Upgrade mechanical infrastructure (chiller)

1997 Appropriation:
 Renovate Capitol Building cafeteria
 Design-Build new Revenue Building and Parking Structure
 Asset Preservation:
 State Office Building, replace roof
 Capitol Building, tuckpoint granite base
 Veterans Service Building remove 5th Floor asbestos and replace roof

1996 Appropriation:

Renovate Capitol Building--NE terraces, dome and lantern
Design and construct Korean War Memorial
Construct new Robotic Technical Training Center
Negotiate property acquisition within the Capitol area (Rice and University)
Renovate Transportation Building, Phase IV
Renovate Capitol Area Elevators--Centennial and State Office Building
Acquire land for Support Services

Public Utilities Commission
Department of Trade and Economic Development

1994 Appropriation:

Renovate Transportation Building, Phase III
Replace Capitol roof and restore the Quadriga
Predesign facilities for the departments of Health and Military Affairs
Install security and surveillance equipment
Install a third electrical switchgear in the Capitol area.

Other major agencies previously relocated from state owned facilities to privately owned leased facilities are:

Department of Agriculture
Department of Commerce
Department of Children, Families and Learning
Department of Labor and Industry
Department of Natural Resources

■ **Projects on Hold:**

1998 Appropriation as amended in 1999
Labor Interpretive Center

AGENCY CONTACT PERSON, TITLE, AND PHONE:

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297-7909
E-Mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

■ **Agency Relocation:**

Admin has relocated, consolidated, or co-located all or part of several major state agencies in addition to many smaller agencies.

State Owned Facilities:

Minnesota Tax Court
Workers' Compensation Court of Appeals
Supreme Court
Department of Transportation
Department of Economic Security
Minnesota Historical Society
Department of Employee Relations
Higher Education Services Office
Department of Revenue

Privately Owned Leased Facilities:

Department of Corrections
Department of Public Safety
Department of Health
Department of Human Services
Pollution Control Agency
Office of the Attorney General
Human Rights
Department of Public Service

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,500

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex, St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To upgrade the primary electrical distribution system in the Capitol complex. The current system is obsolete. An upgrade to the primary electrical distribution system in the Capitol complex is critically needed to alleviate system overloading, provide reliable electric service, control electrical load balance, and above all to replace antiquated electrical infrastructure cable and related components that are becoming increasingly dangerous to maintenance and state employees.

Electrical service is a vital backbone for agencies' operations. This work needs to be performed to ensure the electrical system will operate efficiently and safely and that service will be provided without interruption in the future. If the system remains unchanged, future failures could cause serious consequences to state operations.

This fourth phase is to upgrade the electrical infrastructure and provide for the installation of underground electric rooms at the Veterans Services Building, installation of the remaining duct bank, and installation of primary selective distribution into the Administration, Power House, Judicial, Centennial, and Veterans Service Buildings.

The requests for years 2002 and 2004 are to automate switching equipment to provide additional safety for operating personnel, load management, and metering. By automating the electrical switching, operating personnel will not be required to stand next to the switchgear as it is operated, eliminating potential injury as a result of switch failure. Additionally, automation of switching will provide load management tools that will allow the electrical distribution system to be balanced on a regular basis to maximize efficiency, reduce potential failures, and provide for an automated restoration of service to buildings when a utility feeder goes off line unexpectedly.

The following summarizes past upgrades to the capitol complex electrical utility infrastructure and future required work.

Phase 1: A duct bank for the new primary selective service was installed in 1997 from the vault located near the Transportation Building past the Veterans Services Building to the Revenue Building under a "fast track" schedule in order to provide electrical service to the Revenue Building.

Phase 2: A duct bank was installed from the same vault north past the Transportation, State Office, and Capitol Buildings to the Power House. Primary

switch gear was replaced in the Power House and an express feeder was installed from the vault to the Power House to provide a back-up feeder for chillers.

Phase 3: This phase was initiated out of necessity to provide alternative feeders to the Transportation, State Office, and Capitol Buildings. During completion of Phase 2, a cable between the Power House and the Capitol Building was found to be in failure and had to be taken out of service because it was a serious life-safety threat. This left the Transportation, State Office and Capitol Buildings with a single feed and no redundancy (backup).

This phase is in process and will populate the duct bank from the vault to the Power House, replace primary switch gear at the Northern States Power Upper 87 switch gear, and transfer the Power House, Capitol and Transportation Buildings to the new primary selective service. In Phase 4, full redundancy will be provided.

Phase 4: This phase is to complete the new primary selective distribution system. It puts in place the remaining infrastructure necessary to handle growth to facilities in the future, but more importantly it adds the diversity necessary to operate facilities on the Capitol complex. The Administration Building and buildings on the east side of the complex have limited redundancy because power is distributed from building-to-building. The completion of the primary selective distribution system will provide redundancy that allows each building to be served independently and also allows for the full use of all 3 feeds to the complex.

This phase will include:

- Construction of underground electric rooms on the north side of the Veterans Services Building.
- Installation of a duct bank north from Columbus Street past the Centennial Office and Judicial buildings to the Power House.
- Installation of a duct bank from the north side of the Capitol Building to the Administration Building.
- Installation of feeders through the entire duct bank system.
- Conversion of the Administration, Power House, Judicial, Centennial, and Veterans Services Buildings to the new primary selective service.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Financial Impact:

The cost of the project will be collected through the established rent process, with interest recovered over 20 years and depreciation over 30 years. Specifically, buildings in the Capitol loop will pay an additional \$.05 per square foot for interest and \$.06 per square foot for depreciation.

This electrical upgrade will benefit Admin's customers located in the Capitol complex. In turn, the broader benefit is to the statewide customers and citizens of

Minnesota served by the state agencies. The agencies will have the operational capacity and capability to continue to deliver and expand services that meet the needs of their customers.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

System Overloading:

In August 1993 an engineering analysis was done of the electrical system and recommended installing a third feeder for the Capitol complex to alleviate system overloading resulting from increased demand in electrical power. Northern States Power had addressed concerns earlier about the system's inability to continue to provide reliable electrical service due to growth in demand primarily through the rapid introduction of information technology systems.

Electrical growth in all existing Capitol area buildings has caused system capacities to reach their maximums. Some agencies have expressed grave concern they may not be able to maintain services they provide due to the limitations of the existing Capitol Complex electrical system. Agencies have continued to experience increased electrical demand and have requested information regarding options to satisfy their operational needs for additional electrical capacity.

OSHA Violation:

OSHA has cited the electrical infrastructure and portions remain in violation. OSHA is holding on taking any official action in recognition that Admin is working to rectify the problem and is requesting funds to resolve the outstanding issues.

A "Primary Selective Distribution System" design was selected to provide maximum reliability and load balance and to resolve problem areas cited by OSHA. The system design is also intended to provide capability for future building additions to the Capitol complex.

Serious Consequences:

The following issues will continue and could result in serious consequences if the electrical infrastructure upgrade is not completed.

- The overall electrical infrastructure would remain unchanged with no ability to distribute reliable power to the building users.
- System cable conditions have caused failures and removed redundancy (backup) from the system. Future failures will result in the shut down of buildings for several days to weeks to allow for repair on an obsolete system.
- Code and OSHA safety violations would remain.
- Building substations would remain overloaded, with some projects deferred until more power is available.

- Agency electrical demands would remain unmet and unable to respond to rapidly projected information technology growth patterns in the Capitol complex.

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

Conrad Miller, Technical Services Manager
625 North Robert Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.296.2777
Fax: 651.297.5158
E-mail: conrad.miller@state.mn.us

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0	07/2000	08/2000
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0	08/2000	10/2000
Contract Documents	0	125	0	0	125	10/2000	12/2000
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0	04/2001	10/2001
SUBTOTAL	0	125	0	0	125		
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						04/2001	10/2001
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	6,550	2,375	500	500	9,925		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	6,550	2,375	500	500	9,925		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$6,550	\$2,500	\$500	\$500	\$10,050		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	6,550	2,500	500	500	10,050
State Funds Subtotal	6,550	2,500	500	500	10,050
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	6,550	2,500	500	500	10,050

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 1998, Chapter 404, Section 13, Subdivision 8	5,350
Laws of 1997, Chapter 246, Section 28	600
Laws of 1994, Chapter 643, Section 2, Subdivision 9	600

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	2,500	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 (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 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:

NA.

Department of Finance Analysis:

This high priority project will conclude essential upgrades to the capitol complex electrical system.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB is fully supportive of this critically important work, assuming all restoration of the affected grounds and landscaping, especially around the Capitol, is provided for.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$2.5 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$500 thousand in 2002 and \$500 thousand in 2004.

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	0
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	40
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	20
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0
Total	700 Maximum	310

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,300

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: University of Minnesota Campus, Minneapolis

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To install additional ventilation for the laboratory operations and to upgrade the electrical capacity to the building at 717 Delaware Street on the University of Minnesota campus utilized by the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH). There is an immediate need to increase the air capacity to eliminate negative (or suction) air in the entire building. The window details need modification at all returns to eliminate the transfer of moisture, which has been a constant nemesis of this 32-year-old building.

The negative air pressure in the facility has presented a significant barrier to optimizing available laboratory methods and technologies. The installation of new equipment has been delayed or cancelled due to the lack of available air to support its operation. As MDH, and its public health laboratories in particular, face growing challenges in food safety, bio-terrorism, and emerging infectious pathogens, the ability to make optimal use of available technologies is essential.

Likewise, the deficiencies in electrical systems capacity and distribution within the building, both high and low voltage, have been a barrier to the optimal use of available information and telecommunications technologies. Portions of the building cannot now support full occupancy without an overhaul of the electrical distribution system.

- **Additional Air Ventilation for Laboratory.** This request will address the additional ventilation required for the laboratory operations. Over the years, the demand for exhaust air has increased faster than the amount of tempered replacement air that could be provided. This creates an imbalance in the system, which effects the indoor air quality.
- **Upgrade Electrical Capacity.** Technology expansion has placed huge demands on the current power, data and security systems within the existing Health Building. These capacities need to be increased in order for Health to upgrade and expand its telecommunications systems.

The laboratories and other public health programs located in the 717 Delaware facility are a critical part of the Department of Health's operations. The condition of the existing building continues to deteriorate and must be addressed as a priority concern in order for the agency to operate in the building. Life safety and indoor air quality improvements are critically needed for the continued efficient use of the facility.

The ventilation and electrical improvements will alleviate some concerns but will not address all of the building's deficiencies. This work needs to be done in order for MDH to meet the demands for services and are necessary to assure a healthy and safe environment for staff and visitors. The building located at 717 Delaware SE on the University of Minnesota campus in Minneapolis will continue to be utilized by Health for laboratories and offices space for associated laboratory programs and will be occupied during the renovation.

Future Plans:

The 1995 predesign, prepared for the 1996 legislative session, described a program, siting, systems, and costs for a single, new Health Building to be located in the Capitol complex. The Health Building site was subsequently chosen for the new Department of Revenue Building. The need to select another site for a new Health Building led to the exploration of options for meeting MDH's current space needs. The proposed improvements will allow the Health Department to continue operating their programs at 717 Delaware Street for the interim while their long-term space needs are addressed.

Presently, the departments of Health and Human Services are reviewing and analyzing their operations and space needs with the goal of developing a strategic plan that addresses both agencies' needs. Advantages associated with co-location are being discussed.

In addition, the Health Department is participating with the Department of Agriculture in a study about the future of state laboratories that includes the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Natural Resources. This study is addressing functions and roles of state labs as well as the space requirements and special needs of the labs. This study will be presented to the 2000 legislature.

In a separate request, funding is also being sought for development of a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, which will review state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Inasmuch as the facility at 717 Delaware is structurally sound, and the bonds which financed it are fully retired, the retention of this asset is appropriate stewardship of state resources.

The cost of the project will be collected through the established rent process with interest recovered over 20 years and depreciation over 30 years. Specifically,

tenants in the 717 Delaware facility will pay an additional \$1.03 per square foot for interest and \$1.13 for depreciation.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The existing facility is in need of major improvements and future monies will be required to renovate the facility *if a decision is made that the agency should stay at this location*. More information on the future location of the agency, whether at the existing site or a new location will be known after completion of the updated Strategic Plan.

The work would include asbestos removal, retuckpointing the exterior façade, insulating the exterior walls, and applying a new moisture barrier and finish walls to the perimeter spaces. If MDH continues to occupy the building at 717 Delaware Street, life safety conditions, air quality requirements, and the preservation and stewardship of the building would require the following renovation:

- **Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC).** Upgrades to the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) would be required throughout the facility. The condensation problem within the building can be partly attributed to the lack of airflow within the building. Over the years, the demand for exhaust air has increased faster than the amount of tempered replacement air that could be provided. The result is that less fresh air is available for good circulation at the perimeter of the building and the other non-lab areas. Increasing the amount of steam heat into the building, adding additional airshafts, and adding new equipment to increase fan capacity can provide additional tempered, fresh air. The capacity has been verified with the University of Minnesota.
- **Renovate Exterior Skin and Modify Windows.** The exterior masonry of the building must be totally retuckpointed and recaulked. This would include window modifications to eliminate the penetration of cold air, which has resulted in condensation on the window and damage to interior plaster walls.

It is now evident through investigation of the exterior wall that the negative pressure on the building coupled with energy inefficiency of the wall and windows allows water to condense and creates an environment for potential mold to thrive.

The current building is constructed of a brick veneer over a concrete structure and masonry backup. The building is neither insulated nor contains a vapor barrier. The high humidity level required inside the labs causes condensation on the cold walls, resulting in deterioration of the inside wall finish and the potential formation of mold.

Eventually, the aluminum frames for the window would need to be replaced because they do not contain thermal breaks features, which adds to the

condensation problem. The window glass, though of the insulating type, is not very efficient and needs to be replaced with new, more energy efficient, glass.

- **Sprinkler System.** Currently, only a portion of the building is protected by an automatic sprinkler system. The remodeling would extend the sprinkler system to all areas of the building.
- **Telecommunications and Security Systems Expanded and Upgraded.** Future remodeling would need to allow flexibility for work and technological change and provide better security and accommodate information technology systems. The remodeling would increase power capacity and improve its distribution within the building, provide centralized server and wire rooms with appropriate cooling and power, upgrade the infrastructure cabling to current standards, provide new data capabilities, and provide new, improved systems for security for the safety of the Health staff and property.
- **Asbestos Abatement.** The existing building contains materials that have been determined to be inappropriate for the functions that occur in the building. In addition, the lab bench tops contain asbestos that must be removed and the wood lab benches are inadequate for some experiments. The remodeling would correct these problems.
- **ADA Compliance.** The requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act would be incorporated into all areas of the Health Building.
- **Other Remodeling.** The remainder of the office areas of the building would receive a cosmetic refurbishment, including an upgrade of the 30-year-old entrance lobby.

Renovation of the entire facility is estimated to be in the \$30 to \$40 million range. However, if environmental problems are allowed to persist this cost will increase.

The current building is structurally designed to accommodate 2 additional floors. Analysis indicates that the costs involved with this venture, for the amount of usable new space obtained, would be impractical.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Cost

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	800	0	0	800	07/2000	09/2000
Construction Administration	0	60	0	0	60	08/2000	10/2000
SUBTOTAL	0	860	0	0	860		
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						10/2000	10/2001
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	2,975	0	0	2,975		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	172	0	0	172		
SUBTOTAL	0	3,147	0	0	3,147		
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		01/2001	01/2003	01/2005			
Inflation Multiplier		7.30%	17.30%	27.30%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL	293	0	0	293		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$4,300	\$0	\$0	\$4,300		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	4,300	0	0	4,300
State Funds Subtotal	0	4,300	0	0	4,300
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	4,300	0	0	4,300

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	4,300	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 (Legislature)
No	MS 16B.335 (1b): Project Exempt From This Review (Legislature)
Yes	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)
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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	143,865	143,865	143,865	143,865	143,865
Other Program Related Expenses	20,688	20,688	20,973	20,973	20,688
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	3,793	3,125	4,142	4,381	4,381
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	168,346	167,678	168,980	169,219	168,934
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	168,346	167,678	168,980	169,219	168,934
Change from Current FY 2000-01		<668>	634	873	588
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

An update to the earlier Predesign document is needed to supply additional cost data. Currently the Department of Health is developing a strategic plan in conjunction with the Department of Human Services.

Department of Finance Analysis:

Renovations of this scope will ensure the ongoing utility of the space pending further study of the future needs of the agency.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$4.3 million for critical repairs to the Health building.

In addition to this item, the Governor recommends \$100 thousand from the general fund for a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, \$2 million in general obligation bonding for design funding for high priority facilities that will be identified through the strategic plan as needing immediate development, and \$5.7 million in g.o. bonding for property acquisition for such facilities.

It is anticipated that the *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* will review state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

The \$4.3 million recommendation for immediate repairs to the Health building will correct infrastructure deficiencies and eliminate air quality problems in this building, and provide a more suitable environment for the public and employees in this building until a long-term solution for space needs of the Health department can be determined.

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	40
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	40
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25
Total	700 Maximum	425

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex, St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To renovate space in the Capitol Building for the Department of Public Safety's Capitol Security Division and the related Environmental Management operation of the Department of Administration's Plant Management Division. Both operations are being displaced due to the renovation of the southwest terrace of the Capitol. Although funds have been appropriated, the southwest terrace work cannot proceed until Capitol Security is relocated. These 2 operations will relocate to vacant space in the Capitol basement previously occupied by Emergency Management. This vacant space is across the hall from both of these operations current location. Emergency Management is now located with other Department of Public Safety operations in downtown St. Paul.

The high cost of moving Capitol Security and the high tech equipment utilized makes it prudent to move this operation only once to a permanent location within the Capitol Building. Moving the operation out and back in after the terrace work is completed is not a cost-effective use of funds.

Although from 2 separate state agencies, Capitol Security and Plant Management interact daily on all Capitol area events and functions. In recent years this relationship has become more pronounced through the increased use of electronic equipment to monitor Capitol area security and facility management mechanical/electrical systems. There is an established need for these 2 operations to be located and function adjacent to one another. The Environmental Management operation space will increase to accommodate two staff with the majority of the renovated space used to house Capitol Security's operations.

Both organizations operate from quarters inadequate in size or physical layout to house staff and to meet present day high tech operational standards. Due to limited space to house computer monitors, Capitol Security can view only 20% of the approximately 160 cameras in use.

These operations provide daily services to state agencies in the Capitol complex and it is important that they are connected to the Capitol complex by tunnel. It is imperative that the high tech security and environmental monitoring cabling is contained in a utility tunnel and must be on the Capitol complex tunnel system.

In 1990, when funds were appropriated to expand Capitol Security's surveillance equipment, internal space was not increased to account for the additional monitors and added personnel to cover the 24-hour operation. Increases in the number of

events held in the Capitol complex and the demand for services has necessitated increases in the number of call boxes, cameras, and escort services.

Since 1990 state agency facilities in the Capitol area have increased with the construction of the Judicial Center, Minnesota History Center, and the new 1,300 employee Harold E. Stassen Office Building (HSB) in addition to major renovations to the Centennial, Transportation and parts of the Capitol buildings. The space for Capitol Security and Plant Management has not increased to keep pace with additional demands for services.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

The renovation of space in the Capitol Building would be in keeping with Admin's Strategic Plan by consolidating similar overlapping operations into a controlled high tech center fully operational 24 hours a day. The new facility in the Capitol Building would centrally locate all of the existing Capitol area direct digital controls, Capitol Security systems for TV monitors, automated call stations and have the capability to expand to meet increased future demands.

The cost of the project will be collected through the established rent process with interest recovered over 20 years and depreciation over 30 years. Specifically, tenants in the State Capitol Building will pay an additional \$.19 per square foot for interest and \$.21 for depreciation.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The potential of relocating Capitol Security and all of Plant Management's operations in a new facility was investigated. However the cost to relocate Capitol Security any distance from its current location was not fiscally prudent.

Laws of 1999, Chapter 250, Article 1, Section 12, Subdivision 5 appropriated \$520 thousand to rebuild and upgrade electronic security systems in the Capitol complex. These funds were for Y2K work that needed to be performed to ensure the existing security systems continued to operate throughout the Capitol complex. Those funds are separate from any of the funds being requested for this capital budget request.

Admin is also working closely with the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension on the Capitol Complex Security Study authorized by Laws of 1999, Chapter 216, Article 1, Section 7 and Article 5, Section 13. The report due January 15, 2000 is to contain recommendations on ways to improve security, if needed, and include an analysis of increased resources needed to implement the improvements.

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

Richard Cottle, Project Manager
G-10 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 5515-3000
Phone: 651.297.22080
Fax: 651.296.7650
E-mail: richard.cottle@state.mn.us

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
 Fiscal Years 2000-2005
 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	22	0	0	0	22		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	18	0	0	0	18	10/1999	01/2000
Design Development	24	0	0	0	24	01/1999	03/2000
Contract Documents	10	37	0	0	47	03/1999	05/2000
Construction Administration	0	30	0	0	30	05/1999	12/2000
SUBTOTAL	52	67	0	0	119		
4. Project Management						05/2000	12/2000
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						05/2000	12/2000
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	800	0	0	800		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	80	0	0	80		
SUBTOTAL	0	880	0	0	880		
6. Art	0	0	0	0	0	05/2000	12/2000
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	05/2000	12/2000
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0	05/2000	12/2000
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	05/2000	12/2000
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0	05/2000	12/2000
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		09/2000					
Inflation Multiplier		5.60%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL	53	0	0	53		
9. Other	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$74	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,074		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	74	1,000	0	0	1,074
State Funds Subtotal	74	1,000	0	0	1,074
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	74	1,000	0	0	1,074

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497	3,497
Other Program Related Expenses	70	70	70	70	70
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	73	153	351	351	351
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Subtotal	3,640	3,720	3,918	3,918	3,918
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,640	3,720	3,918	3,918	3,918
Change from Current FY 2000-01		80	278	278	278
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 1998, Chapter 404, Section 14, Subdivision 2	52
Laws of 1998, Chapter 404, Section 13, Subdivision 9	22

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,000	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 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:

Predesign for this request has not been reviewed. Predesign fees are indicated at 2.5% instead of the guideline of .5 – 1%.

Design fees are above the range of 7-13% for remodel projects.

Construction Contingency is 10% for a remodel project for an expected range of 2-8%.

There are no occupancy costs. Security and telecom equipment and relocation would be expected in a project of this type.

Department of Finance Analysis:

Capitol Security and Plant Management staff in the capitol building must be moved to provide access for required terrace reconstruction. Funding for this proposal would facilitate that move and provide a permanent solution to space shortages and technology limitations.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB is fully supportive of this relocation, the new site and the request. In addition, with regard to the "special security commission" initiated in 1999, the CAAPB should be informed of and kept abreast of all findings and recommendations that must be carefully coordinated with the ongoing restoration of the Capital Building and planning for the capitol grounds.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1 million for this project.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE		
Criteria	Values	Points
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35
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	40
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25
Total	700 Maximum	280

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$400

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 4 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex, St. Paul, MN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

As required by M.S. 16B.24, subd. 1, a regular update to the long-range strategic plan for locating agencies must be produced and followed in assigning and reassigning space to agencies. The last update to the current plan was made in 1995. This request is to produce a new full strategic plan for locating state agencies based on current and anticipated agency program and operational requirements.

The strategic plan provides a flexible framework for meeting state agencies' space needs for a period of 20 years. Under this plan, current and projected needs of state agencies and the capacity of existing state-owned facilities, sites, and infrastructures are determined. The need for agencies to share, collocate or consolidate are identified. Strategies for ownership and leasing are developed and the objectives for a transportation plan identified. This strategic approach is specific to geographic areas and the development potential of the Capitol area, Capitol City and the Capitol region.

In the existing *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, key recommendations were made; however, many have not been implemented. Most noticeably the goal of achieving 70% state ownership by the year 2013 with a minimum of 30% leased space has not been achieved. Currently, the state owns 31% of its space and leases 69% of its space in nonstate-owned facilities.

The timing for a new Strategic Plan is right. Numerous changes have occurred in the last 5 years. One major facility has been built and another brought off-line in the capitol area; several agency operations have been consolidated; land and buildings have been added to the states inventory of property and new technologies and information on life-cycle costs offer the opportunity for innovative approaches to meeting the state's spacing needs. Coupled with the Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board's newly published *Comprehensive Plan for the Capitol Area*, the strategic plan will be a guideline for action well into the future.

Several major state agencies are approaching the end of their tenancy in leased space. Preliminary discussions indicate that synergies of goals and purpose exist that encourage either shared common facilities or co-location. Coupled with prudent additional land acquisition and general predesign planning, this strategic plan will result in smart growth in the state's real property investment.

The strategic plan will deal with immediate state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

Systematic Analysis of Alternative Office Trends

As part of the Strategic Plan update, it is timely to conduct a long-range cooperative interagency analysis for the purpose of developing an alternative office policy to assure future state facilities have the physical and electronic capacity that allow creative, interactive, flexible work environments in order to meet agency needs and address ever-increasing customer service.

Over the past decade, information technologies (IT) have increased dramatically in the operation of every state agency and in doing so have altered the way the state provides customer service. Even though IT has expanded the state's overall foundation for electronic services, each automated program has been developed and implemented provincially by individual agencies with very little interaction between agencies.

Questions have been raised whether individual state employees could work efficiently by relocating to telework centers in Greater Minnesota. This would include state employees from separate agencies sharing a progressive, flexible, high-tech work center that has all of the present day automated programs, systems and networks the Capitol area has to offer.

This study does not presume that agencies must be co-located but will address the future individual workplace habits of shared space, group address, free address, hoteling or activity settings. This analysis would be for interagency involvement, address the expanded needs of "Connect Minnesota," and develop an operational plan to properly administer staff budgets while providing inter-active, prompt and accurate service to the state's customers.

Initially to accomplish this task, Admin proposes to work directly with the Department of Employee Relations, state agency IT personnel, and key IT consultants to form an operational proforma. This matrix will analyze traditional personnel descriptions, current employee needs, future trends to establish long range physical space allocations for the flexible state employee to perform in an expeditious and automated manner.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Since 1993, Admin has been able to research, review and record numerous and actual facility data not available at the time of the original report.

There are significant long-term savings in owning state facilities rather than leasing space and this theme should be brought out in a more detailed, analytical

presentation of that data. Due to changes in technology the updated strategic plan can be located on the Internet for ready access.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Just as state agencies are required to draft a "fiscal note" to arrive at the overall cost impact of an operation, Admin would like to establish "facility notes" during the Pre-design phase to establish the background for either owning or leasing. At present, Admin has the electronic data to support this premise, but a revised and updated strategic plan is required to prepare the content properly for the governor, the legislators and all state agencies.

In late 2000, Admin will have on-line the Computer Integrated Facilities Program (CIFM), which will assist state agency personnel to properly organize their long-range facility plans. This program will greatly assist in revising an updated *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Cost

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
6. Art	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other	420	400	0	0	820	07/2000	07/2001
GRAND TOTAL	\$420	\$400	\$0	\$0	\$820		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
General Fund Projects	420	400	0	0	820
State Funds Subtotal	420	400	0	0	820
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	420	400	0	0	820

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 1992, Chapter 558, Section 12, Subdivision 6	420

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

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

The last update to the statutorily mandated strategic plan for locating agencies took place over 5 years ago. Since that time many conditions have changed that prompt a new vision and direction. This funding would provide the opportunity to do thoughtful and thorough planning.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB fully supports this program. It is critically important that, as before in the 1993 original work, the CAAPB is involved in any siting and program issues, and that any recommendations be compatible with the 1998 Comprehensive Plan for the Capitol Area, or if not, fully meeting with the review and approval of the CAAPB.

Governor's Recommendation:

This project is part of a larger initiative recommended by the Governor to address the critical need for land acquisition, design and development of important state buildings in or near the Capitol complex.

In this initiative, the Governor recommends \$100 thousand from the General Fund for a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, \$2 million in general obligation bonding for design funding for high priority facilities that will be identified through the strategic plan as needing immediate development, and \$5.7 million in general obligation bonding for property acquisition for such facilities.

It is anticipated that the *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* will review state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

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	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	105
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	20
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	345

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$9,825

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 5 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To preserve and maintain state's facilities under the custodial control of the Department of Administration (Admin). Admin's deferred maintenance needs total over \$21 million, for the 3.4 million square feet of space maintained in Capitol complex facilities and various outlying buildings. Regular and continued provision of funds for asset preservation is required to prevent further deterioration of facilities under Plant Management's custodial control. State facilities in the Capitol complex are aging as summarized in the table below.

**CAPITOL COMPLEX BUILDING INVENTORY
(Parking Structures Excluded)**

Age	Average Age	No. of Buildings	Building Percentage	Square Feet	Square Feet Percentage
51 - 96	81	8	44%	816,044	28%
11 - 50	37	7	39%	1,080,255	37%
1 - 10	6	3	17%	1,040,415	35%
TOTAL	51	18	100%	2,965,359	100%

Admin has reviewed its list of high priority projects and identified 4 that need immediate attention. The high priority was determined by existing conditions and the negative consequences of not performing the required work. Failure to complete the repairs will result in:

- Further deterioration and structural decay.
- Rapidly escalating repair costs or emergency repair.
- Detrimental indoor air quality conditions.

In all cases the repairs are past due and critically needed. The 4 projects are:

- State Office Building Exterior Renovation (68 years old).
- 321 Grove Street Roof Replacement (original building is 53 years old and the addition is 38 years old).
- Governor's Residence Improvements (88 years old)
- Centennial Building Exterior Renovation and Window Replacement (41 years old)

The goal of Admin's asset preservation program is to ensure that all facilities under the Plant Management Division's custodial control are operated and maintained in a

cost-effective manner that ensures preservation of the state's assets. One key objective of the asset preservation program is to reduce the amount of deferred maintenance and renewal commonly known as the capital iceberg.

Admin's asset preservation program as managed by the Plant Management Division includes all aspects of the buildings, grounds, monuments, memorials, statues, sidewalks and easements. Projects have been prioritized based on life safety, tenant/staff safety/comfort, and facility preservation. Projects fall under the following broad categories.

- Electrical upgrades, switchgear replacement, motor controls and emergency power needs.
- Life/safety issues and code compliance, to include fire alarm and sprinkler modifications.
- Building envelope projects including roof replacement/major repair, window and door replacement, and exterior façade repair/replacement to include tuckpointing and caulking.
- Mechanical system upgrades/replacements including domestic water, climate control and air distribution systems, humidification and dehumidification systems.
- Whole or partial building remodeling.
- Grounds, sidewalks, monuments, and open public spaces.

Asset preservation is an ongoing need. Funding this request will preserve the state's assets and improve service and operation that otherwise would be deferred since they are outside the scope of existing funds. Preventive maintenance and a planned coordinated repair and replacement program is significantly less expensive than emergency repairs or full replacement of facilities.

Admin maintains an ongoing list of projects that are prioritized into high, medium, and low categories. The list is updated as additional asset preservation information becomes known and needs are identified or resolved. The entire asset preservation list is available upon request.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

The cost of the project will be collected through the established rent process, with interest recovered over 20 years and depreciation over 30 years.

Asset preservation funds were not appropriated for F.Y. 2000, although these projects were already considered high priority. Asset preservation funding

scheduled to be available in F.Y. 2002 will not cover the costs of these highest priority projects. This asset preservation work should not be deferred any longer. Although the Laws of 1999, Chapter 250 permit the use of depreciation funds for asset preservation beginning in F.Y. 2002 (7-1-2001), those funds would first need to accumulate before any expenditures could occur.

Historically there has not been a funding source for planning and implementing long-term replacements and/or repairs. Plant Management's lease activity provides funding for Maintenance and Leasehold (M & L) projects; this work includes carpet replacement, painting and general building repair. The M & L budget is insufficient for any major repair or replacement. On occasion these funds have been used for emergency repairs when no alternate funding source has been available; however, use of M & L funds for emergency repairs defers annual preventive maintenance type of activities.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Continued deferral of these projects will cause continual, serious structural damage and deterioration to the asset and will significantly reduce the life expectancy. A continual escalation of the existing capital iceberg will occur without additional funding specifically directed toward timely repair and replacement. The total impact of not addressing deferred maintenance is more than a financial issue. Associated projects and continuous inefficient "patching" of items that need replacement have a substantial cost that is not calculated. Factors not considered when calculating the capital iceberg are: long-term facility depreciation, a change in the useful life of the facility, and the satisfaction and effectiveness of the facility, in meeting the needs of those using the facility.

Asset preservation funds appropriated in 1997 were used for the following projects:

- State Office Building roof and gutter replacement in Fall 1998.
- State Capitol Building tuckpointing of the granite base.
- Veterans Services Building Fifth Floor ceiling asbestos removal and roof replacement.
- Capitol Complex continuation of electrical utility infrastructure work.
- Centennial Building roof replacement.

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

Nick Turner, Building Manager
Plant Management Division
625 North Robert Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
Phone: 651.297.2922
Fax: 651.297.5158
E-mail: nick.turner@state.mn.us

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296-6852
Fax: 651.297-7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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						06/2000	06/2002
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	4,500	9,825	9,000	9,000	32,325		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	4,500	9,825	9,000	9,000	32,325		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,500	\$9,825	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$32,325		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	4,500	9,825	9,000	9,000	32,325
State Funds Subtotal	4,500	9,825	9,000	9,000	32,325
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	4,500	9,825	9,000	9,000	32,325

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 1997, Chapter 202, Article 1, Section 12, Subdivision 3	4,500

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	9,825	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 (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:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

Continuing support of asset preservation is a prudent use of resources and should be directed toward the most urgent needs as identified by the Department.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB fully supports this request, clearly recognizing that work at both the State Office and Centennial Office Buildings are critically needed and long overdue.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends a partial appropriation of \$4.2 million for high priority asset preservation needs. This appropriation is from general obligation bonding funds. The Commissioner of Administration is asked to determine project priorities 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	80
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	70
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	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	40
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25
Total	700 Maximum	385

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 6 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

Based on the findings of a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, this request will explore the long-range statewide potential to co-locate facilities of major state agencies whose missions interrelate or whose activities have common technological or infrastructure needs.

Specifically, this request is to explore the potential of co-location of facilities for the Department of Human Services, and the Department of Health and the feasibility of shared laboratory facilities for Health, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Natural Resources and the Pollution Control Agency. Predesign studies will be conducted, possible alternatives for site locations determined, and finally, schematic designs would be completed.

These agencies have submitted individual capital budget requests elsewhere in this document; this request will emphasize long-range potentials of co-location.

There are numerous functions that overlap between Health and Human Services that presently require a customer to visit both agencies in order to fulfill a request or receive approval. This dual activity is caused both by physical location and organizational structure. These factors warrant the examination of potential of co-location:

Possibilities to explore include:

- Create one central source for customer service.
- Create efficiencies by reducing staff travel time and combining similar activities.
- Reduce the overall size of facilities by joint usage or overlapping functions.
- Reduce capital costs.
- Share costly technological systems and programs.

The other relationship to examine focuses on a shared laboratory facility between Agriculture, Health, the DNR, and potentially, some minor functions for Pollution Control Agency (PCA).

Agriculture has reached a zenith in its leased space and needs to expand into much larger, efficient quarters to effectively meet Federal and state of Minnesota food guidelines.

A "joint" laboratory facility would allow independent departmental laboratory experiments to take place, and provide a joint "commons" to allow these agencies to share office, conference and storage space, clean rooms and technological services, thereby, reducing overall operating costs.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Studies and experience have shown that owning occupied space is more economical than occupying leased space. This proposal could realize additional savings through collaboration and consolidation of agency activities.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

This project is one part of a 3-prong effort to strategically plan the future of state real property siting. In conjunction with a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* and the prudent acquisition of land in the capitol area, the general predesign and schematic design of next major state-owned facilities will provide the state the needed flexibility to plan and administer programs and services for years to come.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	500	0	0	500	07/2000	07/2001
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	1,500	0	0	1,500	07/2001	03/2002
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	1,500	0	0	1,500		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,000		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	2,000	0	0	2,000
State Funds Subtotal	0	2,000	0	0	2,000
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	0	2,000	0	0	2,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	2,000	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 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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

Funding of predesign in advance of design funding is the preferred sequence.

Department of Finance Analysis:

This project would begin the process of implementing a new plan for state agency siting, leading to economies in operating budgets.

Governor's Recommendation:

This project is part of a larger initiative recommended by the Governor to address the critical need for land acquisition, design and development of important state buildings in or near the Capitol complex.

In this initiative, the Governor recommends \$100 thousand from the general fund for a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, \$2 million in general obligation bonding for design funding for high priority facilities that will be identified through the strategic plan as needing immediate development, and \$5.7 million in g.o. bonding for property acquisition for such facilities.

It is anticipated that the *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* will review state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

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	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	105
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	20
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	40
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0
Total	700 Maximum	360

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,600

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 7 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

This request would fund 4 integrally linked projects in the Capitol Building: renovation and upgrade of the mechanical and electrical systems of the east wing; renovation of the basement; restoration of the east wing's historic public space and; restoration of Hearing Room 123.

With exterior projects either completed or funded for completion, the focus of work is now on the Capitol's interior. There is an urgent need to renovate and upgrade the Capitol to correct critical fire/life safety and ADA inadequacies. There is also the need to meet present day demands and prepare the Capitol for its next 100 years of use as we approach the Capitol Building's centennial in the year 2005.

These 4 projects include the following:

- Renovating and upgrading of the mechanical and electrical systems throughout the entire east wing (all floors) to meet fire/life safety code deficiencies and requirements (\$2.5 million).
- Renovating and conversion of space within the basement level for office, storage, and public space (\$1 million).
- Restoration of the east wing's ground floor space as a historic public space and Port Cochere entry for the building, matching what was accomplished in the "Great Hall" of the west wing (\$2.3 million). A newly created accessible entry, started as part of the northeast terrace project, could then be completed and provide access through the restored Port Cochere. This work is contingent on space being found for offices currently located in this area.
- Restoration of the Capitol Building's Hearing Room 123 (\$800 thousand), following a sequence that has already allowed for such work in Rooms 107, 112, 118, and 318. Similar in scope to these previously restored Hearing Rooms, this request would update HVAC systems, lighting, and interior historical finishes, furniture, and equipment. Each of these restoration projects had been studied and budgeted in the "1988 Preservation Plan and Implementation Strategy for the Minnesota State Capitol Building," prepared for the CAAPB by Miller-Dunwiddie Associates, which has served well as the predesign for the Capitol Building's ceremonial spaces and a comprehensive restoration program.

The State Capitol Building has undergone major rehabilitation, renovation, and historic restoration over the past decade and a half. Guided by the 1988 Comprehensive Preservation Plan, a long-term Strategic Plan was developed for the completion of the Capitol Restoration. The long-term Strategic Plan emphasized 4 major areas:

- Building Exterior
- Building Systems
- Interior Restoration/Rehabilitation
- Functional use of the Capitol

Phased work programs were identified by carefully considering the logistical problems involved in restoring and rehabilitating a fully occupied building over an extended period of time.

In the mid to late 80s, the "Senate" west wing and the "House" north wing were renovated. The governor's office in the west wing was expanded and the adjoining attorney general's suite was renovated to meet their requirements. New mechanical systems, electrical service, lighting, hazardous material removal as well as restoration work were the premise of those extensive projects.

Aside from this activity, temporary senate space was added to accommodate Senate Counsel staff in what was originally the east Capitol concourse on ground floor. This was the only deviation from the historic plan for the Capitol during that restoration period.

While this activity was in progress, the Minnesota Judicial Center was just beginning to take form across the street, integral with the (then) existing Historical Society Building. This led to the almost complete evacuation of the east Capitol wing, which in turn was converted to both House and Senate office/support space as it, exists today.

The focus of Capitol projects would have continued to be the interior of the building had it not been for the remodeling of the south Porte Cochere. As that project progressed, structural failures of building materials were uncovered that resulted in testing and analysis of the building's tolerance to the "elements" and age. It became necessary to focus work on the building's exterior. Significant structural improvements have required an entire new roof, including skylight restoration, rehab of the 4 terraces surrounding the building, a complete renovation of the dome, lantern and Quadriga, and restoration of the cafeteria. Primarily, recent work has been to the building's exterior; however, the cafeteria work was prudently combined with the extensive rebuilding of the north terraces and allowed an expansion of the basement by 5,000 square feet, the first such expansion to the Capitol Building.

These upgrades and additions are recommended because they will increase the efficiency within the building, and provide greater working space to offset the cost of

ceremonial space in the facility. More importantly, the East Wing is the only area of the Capitol deficient in fire/life safety system and necessary ADA upgrades. Coordination of this work with the scheduled work for the south terrace in 2000 and 2001 has the potential for both schedule and cost savings efficiencies.

Cost projections for this request are based on the aforementioned 1988 Preservation document and its updates. This same document serves as the support for moving forward now with all interior restoration sequenced in a logical timeline while work continues on other parts of the building. Any delay invites greater inflationary cost for a project that is clearly needed.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET (FACILITIES NOTE):

The entire east wing of the Capitol and lower level offer both the Senate and House potential office and support space, more functional areas for the press, renovated space for the legislative pages, more adequate storage facilities and the potential of expanding the capitol's "commons" area out from the recently completed cafeteria. All of these adjustments will greatly increase the effectiveness of the facility and allow more efficient use of space in an area not originally programmed for major change.

Likewise, in order to accomplish any form of major historic renovation on the ground level of the east wing, space must be found for those staff currently occupying that area. The ability to renovate the south perimeter of the Capitol in the lower level will increase the square footage availability in the facility.

The cost of the project will be collected through the established rent process with interest recovered over 20 years and depreciation over 30 years. Specifically, the tenants in the Capitol Building will pay an additional \$1.26 per square foot for interest and \$1.38 per square foot for depreciation.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

This request represents the first phase of work projected in out-year funding as identified in the CAAPB's request for Interior Restoration Predesign.

Funding of this request simultaneously with the CAAPB request for predesign will save time and money as we move forward on a critical path focused on accomplishing the majority of the 1988 Comprehensive Preservation Plan by the Capitol's Centennial in 2005.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	30	0	0	30	06/2000	10/2000
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	95	0	0	95	10/2000	02/2001
Design Development	0	125	0	0	125	10/2000	05/2001
Contract Documents	0	280	0	0	280	01/2001	08/2001
Construction Administration	0	125	0	0	125	06/2001	08/2002
SUBTOTAL	0	625	0	0	625		
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						06/2001	08/2002
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	350	0	0	350		
Construction	0	4,390	0	0	4,390		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	440	0	0	440		
SUBTOTAL	0	5,180	0	0	5,180		
6. Art							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	42	0	0	42	10/2001	10/2002
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	42	0	0	42		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		01/2002					
Inflation Multiplier		12.30%	0.00%	0.00%			
SUBTOTAL		723	0	0	723		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$6,600	\$0	\$0	\$6,600		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	6,600	0	0	6,600
State Funds Subtotal	0	6,600	0	0	6,600
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	6,600	0	0	6,600

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	6,600	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)
Yes	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)
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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

There is no predesign to serve as the basis for this construction request.

Department of Finance Analysis:

The restoration of the interior of the capitol building in anticipation of its 100th birthday may be an activity that Minnesotans would want to participate in through their efforts and financial support. The Department of Administration and the Capitol Area Architectural Planning Board are encouraged to explore private funding for portions of this project.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB fully supports this request, even at the higher level that would fund all four aspects of the request, originally proposed by the CAAPB.

It is assumed that this project will be extensively coordinated with the CAAPB.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends a partial appropriation of \$3.3 million for renovations within the capitol building. This appropriation is from general obligation bonding funds. The Commissioner of Administration, in cooperation with the Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board, is urged to explore opportunities for private fund raising to complete funding 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	105
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	420

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$58,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 8 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Ramsey County, City of St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To construct a new Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) containing office space and forensic laboratories at a Maryland Avenue and Prosperity Avenue site on the east side of St. Paul.

The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension needs a new facility to house lab, investigation, training, criminal justice, and administration operations to continue delivering services to the Minnesota criminal justice community.

Since the predesign was completed in 1998, additional programs have been added, making it necessary to perform an updated review of BCA's space needs with the architectural design team. The additional area and cost increases since the request submitted in 1998 is due in part to inclusion of required BCA program space and related staff needs that were of insufficient size to meet the need, such as Forensic Science, Investigations, and Criminal Justice Information Systems spaces.

Currently, the BCA is located in a facility that is 78 years old (circa 1921) and has undergone multiple modifications and functions. Through advancement in technology, the demand for more testing of criminal evidence continues to grow. The current 78 thousand gross square foot building, previously a Department of Transportation garage facility, is not able to handle the increased programs. The BCA's space needs are predicted to be approximately 225 thousand gross square feet by 2009.

Current Conditions:

The facility is grossly inadequate for support of BCA programs. The growth in legislatively-mandated programs and the necessary personnel to support those programs has left the BCA situated in a building with multiple problems.

- The building is fully occupied with no room for growth including staff housed in corridors and other functional space. The building also lacks the functional adaptability to support the BCA program evolution into the future, particularly as facility requirements increase and become more diverse and more technologically and environmentally demanding. A flexible facility is needed that provides the ability to easily upgrade, as new information technology becomes available.
- The building was never designed for laboratory functions. Poor module size, inadequate ceiling heights, inaccessible service and utility corridors all result in

inadequate space for laboratory functions. Cross circulation opens up the possibility for cross contamination of evidence. Temperature and humidity systems are inadequate, presenting the possibility of equipment shutdown when conditions exceed sensitive laboratory operating ranges.

- The facility infrastructure required to restrict and control biohazards, including airborne pathogens, cannot be achieved within the limitations of the facility. Additionally, the growing need for sterile, contamination free environments is very difficult to achieve in the existing facility, and cannot be reliably certified.
- The utilities and environmental systems are aging with equipment life cycles nearing their conclusions. Inadequate power for computer and equipment intensive laboratory environments and the requirement for special gases and chemicals, cause potentially hazardous situations in most areas of the building. The building was not designed to safely and efficiently house hazardous materials and meet the increased electrical loads.
- Spatial allocations are inadequate. Evidence and sample storage facilities, some with specialized requirements for security and environmental control, have not been expanded despite increasing volumes of evidence required to be stored. Other storage has been relocated to public corridor space, which is a fire hazard. Investigative facilities are inadequate, forcing interviews in areas where undercover officers and informants may be inadvertently recognized.
- The facility also suffers from a building support point-of-view. Marginal insulation around the building perimeter creates uncomfortable workspace. The lunchroom was recently moved to an interior space and reduced to half its size, currently handling only 10% of the building occupancy at one time. The library has been reduced to one-third its original size and is inadequate to house current collections, and training areas are ill equipped, too small, and without space for larger group assemblies.
- The site fails to meet requirements for parking, service deliveries, visual control, or expansion. There is no short-term visitor parking, and limited parking for legal staff, vendors, contractors, and repair/service personnel. Additionally, there is insufficient fleet parking to handle agency vehicles.

The inadequacies above represent only a few of the problems with the existing building. The BCA must secure proper facilities in order to continue to fulfill its mission beyond the year 2000.

To provide expansion space at the current facility would require the purchase of adjacent property to build a laboratory annex, loading facilities, additional mechanical support, classroom/training facilities, and a parking ramp on the current surface parking area. This option is plagued with cost, health and safety hazards, and would disrupt agency operations during construction.

New Facility:

A new facility will be constructed on the east side of St. Paul at Maryland and Prosperity Avenue. This new site is located in a rejuvenated office park in St. Paul, adjacent to a major urban artery to ensure a visible identity and easy access for the state criminal justice community and access to bus routes. This facility would allow full accessibility by the criminal justice community, facilitate loading/unloading capabilities outside the public flow, accommodate future growth in the facility, and provide sufficient surface parking for all needs.

The laboratory portion of the facility would be organized to provide access to an evidence intake area from the main access point and another approach for service area/garage for the crime scene van and vehicle processing for collecting evidence.

A service area for loading/unloading activities would be linked to the office wings and interactive space. A service access drive would segregate staff and public traffic from secure areas. A service court area would provide ample room for parking undercover vehicles and expand parking to meet additional security needs.

Parking for 350-365 vehicles would be provided in a surface lot, including 40 state vehicles requiring enclosed, secure parking. Access to evidence intake would be provided by an entrance separated from the staff and public entrances.

Benefits of a new building include space for all BCA programs and services to fully accommodate law enforcement clients and employees. There will be little or no disruption to current programs and services during the construction period. This can be accomplished without the health and safety hazards that have occurred with on-site construction/remodeling projects in the past.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Both the departments of Administration and Finance have subjected this project to rigorous scrutiny. As a result, the costs were reduced to the amount requested. Any further reductions would result in major redesign costs and delays to the project schedule.

The cost of the new facility will be collected through the established rent process administered by Admin. The costs would be included in future budgets divided appropriately among the Administration, Laboratory, Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Systems, and Training and Development sections.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Consequences of deferral or no action taken.

- The BCA has reached the point where constant move and renovation projects have eliminated all common area and classroom space, making it necessary to hold all Training and Development classes off-site. Constant crowding increases staff frustration and employee disenchantment.
- Work space with limited or no room for expansion for additional employees may lead to limiting of services. This has a direct negative effect on law enforcement's ability to respond to crime and on the perception of the BCA with the public, legislature, and the criminal justice community.
- Continued certification of the Forensic Science Laboratory by the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD-LAB) will become hard to accomplish.
- It is anticipated that due to crowding in the building, the facility could be cited for egress and ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) violations.
- Due to failure of the building's mechanical systems, health and safety hazards could result in employee illnesses and injuries.

Future of 1246 University Avenue:

The Department of Administration will evaluate the 1246 University facility to support a recommendation on the future of the current facility after BCA vacates in 2002. This may include but is not limited to evaluating the condition, improvements needed, potential reuse, renovation costs, possibility of demolition, construction of a new facility on the site, feasibility of selling, and performing an economic cost analysis. A rough cost estimate on potential cost range from \$2 million to demolish the facility to \$7.5 million to renovate the facility. If renovation of the facility is recommended, Admin's intent is to locate small state agencies and boards in this facility. However, before any state offices are relocated to this facility, major internal and external remodeling will need to occur.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: Kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition						06/1998	11/1999
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Buildings and Land	1,127	0	0	0	1,127		
SUBTOTAL	1,127	0	0	0	1,127		
2. Predesign	0	0	0	0	0	09/1998	02/1999
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	1,066	0	0	0	1,066	02/1999	06/1999
Design Development	1,542	0	0	0	1,542	07/1999	10/1999
Contract Documents	2,000	0	0	0	2,000	11/1999	03/2000
Construction Administration	0	1,571	0	0	1,571	09/2000	06/2002
SUBTOTAL	4,608	1,571	0	0	6,179		
4. Project Management						04/1998	06/2003
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	165	1,400	0	0	1,565		
SUBTOTAL	165	1,400	0	0	1,565		
5. Construction Costs						09/1999	06/2002
Site & Building Preparation	1,187	0	0	0	1,187		
Demolition/Decommissioning	40	0	0	0	40		
Construction	0	41,000	0	0	41,000		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	20	0	0	0	20		
Construction Contingency	54	2,759	0	0	2,813		
SUBTOTAL	1,301	43,759	0	0	45,060		
6. Art	0	391	0	0	391	11/1999	06/2002
SUBTOTAL	0	391	0	0	391		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	3,375	0	0	3,375	07/2001	06/2002
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	1,475	0	0	1,475	09/2001	06/2002
Security Equipment	0	925	0	0	925	09/2001	06/2002
Commissioning	0	125	0	0	125	09/2001	06/2002
SUBTOTAL	0	5,900	0	0	5,900		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		06/2001					
Inflation Multiplier		9.39%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		4,979	0	0	4,979		
SUBTOTAL		4,979	0	0	4,979		
9. Other	0	0	7,500	0	7,500		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	7,500	0	7,500		
GRAND TOTAL	\$7,201	\$58,000	\$7,500	\$0	\$72,701		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	7,201	58,000	7,500	0	72,701
State Funds Subtotal	7,201	58,000	7,500	0	72,701
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	7,201	58,000	7,500	0	72,701

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	58,000	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 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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	24,672	24,672	24,672	24,672	24,672
Other Program Related Expenses	23,914	23,914	23,971	24,028	24,028
Building Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0
State-Owned Lease Expenses	1,619	1,619	6,437	9,625	4,625
Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses	125	125	125	125	125
Expenditure Subtotal	50,330	50,330	55,205	58,450	53,450
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	50,330	50,330	55,205	58,450	53,450
Change from Current FY 2000-01		0	4,875	8,120	3,120
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 1999, Chapter 216, Section 19	3,386
Laws of 1998, Chapter 404, Section 13, Subdivision 11	3,815

Department of Administration Analysis:

Pre-design for this request was previously completed.

The following comments are a strict analysis of Admin's general guidelines. Due to the complexities of this project, these variances are considered acceptable:

The construction contingency of 4.3% is above the expected range for new projects of 2-4%.

The design fee for a new project is 15.6% which is above the expected range of 6-10%.

Project management is 7% which is above the guideline of 4%.

Occupancy is 15.2%. This is above the guideline of 5-7%.

Department of Finance Analysis:

The construction of a new facility for the BCA is key to the successful performance of the bureau's mission and mandate. Both the executive and legislature have supported the concept of a new facility that would enhance this operation and, consequently, the service to Minnesota's criminal justice community.

This project has been subjected to critical internal review during the budget process to ensure that financially prudent choices have been made in the design of the facility. Major revisions to the project's design and scope have resulted in a significant cost reduction to this building request. Revisions to staffing estimates will also result in significant savings in out year operating budgets. Planning estimates are included for future budget years so that all choices for re-use or decommissioning of the existing facility are explored.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$58 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	105
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	50
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	20
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	375

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$14,500

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 9 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Administration, Corrections, Economic Security, Human Services, Natural Resources, Military Affairs, Perpich Center for Arts Education, Residential Academies, Veterans Homes Board, MN Zoological Garden, and Minnesota Historical Society

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Capitol Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA), established under M.S.16A.632, is a statewide fund for removal of mechanical or structural defects and safety hazards, elimination of hazardous substances, replacement of roofs and windows, preservation of exterior and interiors of buildings and unanticipated emergencies of all kinds. The projects are generally non-recurring and usually cost between \$25 and \$350 thousand each. This request is broken down into 2 parts.

Part A: CAPRA - \$12 million Bond Fund

Part B: Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Classification System – \$2.5 million General Fund

Part A: CAPRA

CAPRA is centrally managed by the Department of Administration (Admin). Higher education is funded separately under Higher Education Asset Preservation and Renewal Account (HEAPR).

CAPRA is a statewide fund for projects that are generally too large or unexpected to be funded from agency repair and replacement operating budgets.

Before funds are allocated to a particular CAPRA project, the building in question is evaluated not only on the specific building deficiency, but also on the rest of its components to determine if its life cycle characteristics and program suitability are in balance. The goal is to produce a logical and sequential application of building management techniques that will yield the most efficient utilization of space over a building's effective life span. In some cases, demolition may be determined to be the best alternative, although CAPRA funds are not used to fund demolition projects.

This CAPRA request is based on agency requests in excess of \$62 million. Since the program was created in 1990, \$48.9 million has been appropriated for CAPRA projects that are beyond agency asset preservation and operating budget repair and replacement allocations.

Three large unanticipated emergencies have occurred during the last 2 years.

- The Minnesota Correctional Facility at Lino Lakes has had 2 separate emergencies, a fire in the food storage area and storm damage to a roof. The fire damage funded by CAPRA amounted to \$576 thousand.

- The storm damage at Lino Lakes, which was \$470 thousand, was partially covered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA reimbursed the CAPRA account approximately \$343 thousand for the repairs to the roof.
- The third emergency was at the Minnesota Veterans Home in Luverne. This project started as an investigation to identify the cause of mold growth. The cause of the mold growth was associated with building construction and mechanical system issues. The total project cost is estimated at \$6.2 million of which \$4.2 million has been funded from CAPRA. The remaining \$2 million is being funded from the Minnesota Veterans Homes Board operating budget for building maintenance. This emergency has been very taxing on the CAPRA account. CAPRA projects were put on hold, and agencies were very cooperative in dealing with the problem at Luverne. In 1999, a CAPRA appropriation of \$3 million replenished all but \$1.2 million of the funding used for Luverne.

Part B: Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Classification System

In light of the findings at the Minnesota Veterans Home in Luverne and other buildings, such as the Capitol Square Building in the Capitol complex, Admin is requesting funding for Capital Asset Preservation of Air Quality (CAPAQ). CAPAQ is a part of the CAPRA program to address the indoor air quality issues in state-owned buildings. CAPAQ will test, evaluate, report, and recommend remedies to bring the indoor air quality of state-owned buildings into compliance with nationally recognized standards

Minnesota Statutes section 16B.31 called for the Department of Administration to develop a classification system for state-owned buildings. This classification effort, in part, rated buildings according to several parameters on a "good, fair, poor" rating system. One of the parameters is the indoor air quality of the building.

In May of 1995, the Department of Administration led a task force consisting of the departments of Employee Relations, Health, Transportation, the Community College System, the Technical College System (now known as Minnesota State Colleges and Universities), Economic Security, Human Services and Administration. The task force produced an Indoor Air Quality Guideline manual that was distributed to agencies using the Department of Employee Relations (DOER) safety officer network. Over the past several years, DOER has responded to numerous calls, made many investigations into air quality issues of state-owned buildings, and added to the knowledge of cause and effect of various building systems that contribute to air quality. The experiences of DOER and other agencies gives Administration the direction to make a budget request to address the state's indoor air quality needs.

CAPAQ will use the results from the classification system, the guidelines and results of DOER's investigations as a starting point to address the most immediate needs first. CAPAQ will initially concentrate on buildings that received a "poor"

rating in the classification system. State employees from DOER consisting of 2 industrial hygienists, 1 clerical person, and 1 information technology person will do the work. The DOER personnel will be temporarily relieved of their current duty and dedicate their efforts full time to CAPAQ. The requested funds will pay the payroll, travel, lodging, and logistics, test equipment, sample testing for microbial growth and analysis.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTES):

Part A: CAPRA

Through the process of funding CAPRA, there will be a reduction in operating expenditures for recurring maintenance specific to each project improvement funded by CAPRA. Certain energy savings will also result from some improvements along with reduced potential liability costs associated with correcting code, or unsafe and hazardous conditions. The availability of CAPRA funds has provided critically needed funds for agencies to quickly respond to unanticipated emergencies and helped avoid additional damage or deterioration that could occur if the deficiency were not properly addressed.

It should be noted that CAPRA is viewed as a supplement to repair and replacement funding in agency operating budgets. Agencies are expected to request sufficient funding from the Legislature and manage their operating budgets accordingly to keep current with ongoing repair needs.

In 1998, Minnesota Statutes 1996, section 16A.11 was amended by adding a subdivision to read:

“Subd. 6. [BUILDING MAINTENANCE.] The detailed operating budget must include amounts necessary to maintain state buildings. The commissioner of finance, in consultation with the commissioner of administration, the board of trustees of the Minnesota state colleges and universities, and the regents of the University of Minnesota, shall establish budget guidelines for building maintenance appropriations. Unless otherwise provided by the commissioner of finance, the amount to be budgeted each year for building maintenance is 2 percent of the cost of the building, adjusted up or down depending on the age and condition of the building.”

In response to this legislation, the Department of Finance charged the Statewide Facilities Management Group (SFMG), which formed a subcommittee, to establish budget guidelines. The SFMG consists of representatives from 15 agencies who manage and maintain the state's capital assets.

The subcommittee developed building maintenance guidelines for use in determining the amount of funds needed to maintain buildings. Based on the guidelines, the annual amount of funding needed for building maintenance of the current building inventory is **\$271 Million**. The amount allotted in agency operating

budgets for repair and replacement (R&R) in F.Y. 1998 was **\$32 Million** or almost 12%. Therefore, the current annual building maintenance funding needed or shortfall is **\$239 Million** or 88%.

While these guidelines provide a framework for building maintenance, they do not address the issue of deferred maintenance. The deferred maintenance backlog, or the capital iceberg, has been estimated at between \$1.5 and \$2 billion. The continued funding of Asset Preservation, CAPRA and HEAPR, in addition to funding building maintenance from the operating budget, is necessary to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog.

When building maintenance is fully funded, per the guidelines, from the general fund, debt service obligations to the taxpayer from bonded funds would be reduced, and greatly increase the net amount invested in building improvements. Capital bonding appropriations for Asset Preservation, CAPRA and HEAPR amounts would subsequently diminish, in 8 to 10 years, then capital bonding can be limited to new construction and major remodeling projects.

Part B: IAQ Classification System

In the event that indoor air quality testing finds deficiencies, agencies will not be required to expend operating and programmatic funding for remediation. The payroll savings in DOER will be used to pay for services being displaced by the hygienists that are transferred to IAQ.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The building deficiency audits being implemented through participating state agencies will continue to identify projects for funding from CAPRA.

Included in this request is 20% per biennium for hazardous material management and abatement.

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

Bill Olson,
G-10 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155
Phone: (651) 297-2208
Fax: (651) 296-7650
E-mail: bill.olson@state.mn.us

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Construction Costs						07/2000	12/2002
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
Other Costs	45,900	12,000	27,500	25,000	110,400		
SUBTOTAL	45,900	12,000	27,500	25,000	110,400		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other						07/2000	12/2002
SUBTOTAL	0	2,500	0	0	2,500		
GRAND TOTAL	\$45,900	\$14,500	\$27,500	\$25,000	\$112,900		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	45,900	12,000	27,500	25,000	110,400
General Fund Projects	0	2,500	0	0	2,500
State Funds Subtotal	45,900	14,500	27,500	25,000	112,900
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	45,900	14,500	27,500	25,000	112,900

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	12,000	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 (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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 1998, Chapter 404, Section 13, Subdivision 2	15,000
Laws of 1996, Chapter 463, Section 13, Subdivision 2	12,000
Laws of 1994, Chapter 643, Section 2, Subdivision 2	9,900
Laws of 1992, Chapter 558, Section 12, Subdivision 2	6,500
Laws of 1990, Chapter 610, Section 1, Subdivision 18(a)	2,500

Department of Administration Analysis:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

CAPRA funding is essential if state facilities are to be maintained. The funding for indoor air quality assessments appears to be related to the creation of a new program initiative and, as such, should be considered during the operating budget cycle.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends a partial appropriation of \$10 million for CAPRA projects as determined by the Department. This appropriation is from general obligation bonding funds.

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	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	40
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	50
Total	700 Maximum	460

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,316

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 10 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Department of Administration is requesting agency relocation funds to move 4 state operations from their existing locations to alternative locations.

■ **Department of Public Safety, Capitol Complex Security Division and Department of Administration, Plant Management Division**

Terrace reconstruction in the Capitol will require that Capitol Security and Plant Management operations vacate the Southwest terrace. In order to meet the current project schedule, the agencies will move by the end of 2000.

■ **Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA)**

A 2000 Capital Budget request to construct a state owned facility for BCA on the East Side of St. Paul has been submitted. The estimated occupancy date for BCA is May of 2002. Relocation funds are needed in early 2002 to facilitate the agency's move into the new facility.

■ **Department of Health (Health)**

A 2000 Capital Budget request to perform life-safety work in the building occupied by Health at 717 Delaware Street has been submitted. Relocation funds are needed to move portions of Health within the building to accommodate initial exterior wall work.

■ **Department of Administration – Technology Policy Bureau (formerly Office of Technology)**

This position of the request would move the Technology Policy Bureau out of downtown St. Paul, at lease expiration, to space in a state-owned building so that the agency is closer to the Department of Administration of which it is now a part.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

Agency	Furn/Equip Move	Telecom Move	Equip Purch	Furn Purch	Rent Differential	Plant Mgmt Rent Loss	Total
Public Safety Capitol Security	278	45	0	32	79	37	\$471
Admin Plant Mgmt	22	0	0	5	8	0	\$35
Public Safety BCA	373	0	0	0	0	133	\$506
Health (717)	16	189	0	143	0	544	\$892
Admin - Technology Policy Bureau	15	30	0	117	0	0	\$162
Unanticipated Moves	250	0	0	0	0	0	\$250
TOTAL	\$954	\$264	\$0	\$297	\$87	\$714	\$2,316

Agency	Rate Per Square Foot Existing Location as of Move	Proposed Rate Per Sq. Foot New Location	Tentative Move Date
Public Safety Capitol Security	\$26.67	\$26.67	4th Qtr 2000
Admin Plant Mgmt	\$26.67	\$26.67	4th Qtr 2000
Public Safety BCA	\$14.64	\$30.65	2nd Qtr 2002
Health (717)	\$15.41	\$15.41	3rd Qtr 2000
Admin – Technology Policy Bureau	\$16.00	\$18.75	3rd Qtr 2000

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	2,316	0	0	2,316	07/2000	06/2002
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$2,316	\$0	\$0	\$2,316		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
General Fund Projects	0	2,316	0	0	2,316
State Funds Subtotal	0	2,316	0	0	2,316
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	2,316	0	0	2,316

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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	0	0%
User Financing	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 (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:

12/7/99
NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

It should be noted that there will be an increase in rent costs for the BCA due to the move to a new facility. These costs and others related to the move should be discussed during consideration of the agency's next operating budget.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends a general fund appropriation of \$2.316 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	35
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	25
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	20
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	285

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$11,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 11 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex - St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Funding is needed to acquire properties that meet existing needs and/or that can be used for future state development and consolidation.

The land available for development in and surrounding the Capitol Area is limited. In addition, there is only a small window of opportunity to purchase a property once it becomes available in the market due to current market conditions.

Having available funds is the only way to take advantage of such opportunities as they arise in the market. With this funding, the state would be in a position to capitalize on opportunities adjacent to the Capitol complex and other state-owned properties. There is at least one property of some size adjacent to the Capitol Area that will be up for sale within the next 6 months to a year.

The funding would also allow the state to perform due diligence activities (i.e., appraisal, environmental, title, inspections) on potential sites and have the ability to purchase options to hold a property until the department received funding to complete the purchase.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Without property acquisition funds, the state is at a considerable disadvantage and in most situations unable to pursue any property that would be advantageous for the state to own.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Any property acquisition opportunities that may arise in or adjacent to the Capitol Area would provide sites for the development of state facilities and further help consolidate state government functions to the Capitol Area. In the interim, the state would use existing buildings where cost effective.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition						07/2000	07/2001
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$0	\$11,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$17,000		
Buildings and Land	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	11,000	3,000	3,000	17,000		
2. Predesign							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$11,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$17,000		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
General Fund Projects	0	11,000	3,000	3,000	17,000
State Funds Subtotal	0	11,000	3,000	3,000	17,000
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	0	11,000	3,000	3,000	17,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	0	0%
User Financing	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/No	Requirement
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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

The Department would have the flexibility to implement plans for siting state agency functions and to meet current market opportunities with this funding. \$1.8 million for this purpose is available from the 1998 property acquisition appropriation.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

The CAAPB supports request. While outside the current governmental campus, as outlined in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, the property owned by Saxon Ford was recently rezoned by the CAAPB as mixed-use, with governmental uses permitted. Thus, a state reuse of the site would be in compliance with the 1998 Comprehensive Plan for the Capitol Area and the recent rezoning of the properties.

Needless to say, any redevelopment of this property will need to be coordinated with the CAAPB and within the Comprehensive Plan for the area, and should be sensitive to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Governor's Recommendation:

This project is part of a larger initiative recommended by the Governor to address the critical need for land acquisition, design and development of important state buildings in or near the Capitol complex.

In this initiative, the Governor recommends \$100 thousand from the general fund for a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*, \$2 million in general obligation bonding for design funding for high priority facilities that will be identified through the strategic plan as needing immediate development, and \$5.7 million in g.o. bonding for property acquisition for such facilities. This is in addition to \$1.8 million for property acquisition that was made available in the 1998 bonding bill and is available for this purpose.

It is anticipated that the *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* will review state agency space needs, guide location issues, and determine the order of priority for development of facilities for the departments of Health, Human Services, Agriculture, and other state agencies.

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	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	105
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	50
Total	700 Maximum	300

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$500

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 12 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To design a new facility to house the Department of Administration's InterTechnologies Group (ITG), Office of Technology (OT), Communications.Media's Printcomm and Mail.com operations to meet their operational needs. The new facility would be located in the Capitol area.

Since 1995, Admin has discussed establishing a new facility for ITG to be located out of the Centennial Building. In 1999, a program was developed that not only would include both Communications.Media and ITG, but also include the Office of Technology for a complete "full service" operation under one roof, in a new "smart" facility. This building would integrate the latest technical networks and hardware for improved program operations and provide increased customer services.

Presently, ITG is located in portions of 5 of the 6 floors of the Centennial Building with key operational equipment located on the "top" floor of what is an office building, highly vulnerable to natural disasters, totally inefficient in operational infrastructure, and limited redundancy (backup). Since there is no expansion space for ITG within Centennial, operations have expanded into 3 other facilities within the Capitol area.

Admin's OT is presently located in leased space in downtown St. Paul. The complementary functions of OT, ITG and the technological operations center make these organizations the logical choices for co-location.

Communications.Media and Printcomm are both located in the Ford Building at 117 University Avenue. Printcomm is located in the basement and continues to experience problems with humidity control, which is critical to efficient printing press operations. Also, the printing operations are located separate from the supplies stored near the first floor loading dock where humidity and temperature levels are difficult to control. Although ventilation improvements have been made to the Ford Building, fumes from the printing operation continue to infiltrate the upper office floors and are problematic to the other tenants in the building. The bookstore operation will also move as the majority of the bookstore business is generated by mail and phone order versus walk-in business.

Placing the Mail.Com operation in this building would round out the facility and make it a "full service" technical center.

Other key factors in requesting a new ITG data center are as follows:

- The need to ensure all state agencies and their customers have the future capacity to meet "Connecting Minnesota" and global market needs.
- The need to provide "next generation" processing.
- The need to replace a marginal, low-end maintenance facility that does not provide a now required "grounded data center" to assure high operating efficiency.

The facility will be constructed in such a way that not only are materials important, but also access both vertically and horizontally, and the security of the facility.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Admin has placed a great deal of effort into this operation and feels it has the most effective long-range facility plan yet developed for a multitude of operations. This new facility would eliminate all of the ineffectiveness of 4 operations that need to be located together while retaining the ability to operate independently.

The budget for this project takes into account the modest "revolving" operating accounts for these operations while still maintaining a high degree of operational quality.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The Capitol area is located directly on the fiber optic network serving downtown St. Paul and Lafayette Park, where a large number of state agencies are located. There is the potential to readily expand the fiber optic network into the St. Paul central business district and near I-35 and the Connecting Minnesota program.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-300
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	100	0	0	100	07/2000	01/2001
Design Development	0	100	0	0	100	01/2001	07/2001
Contract Documents	0	200	2,000	0	2,200	07/2001	07/2002
Construction Administration	0	100	0	955	1,055	03/2002	09/2004
SUBTOTAL	0	500	2,000	955	3,455		
4. Project Management						03/2002	09/2004
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	0	400	1,015	1,415		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	400	1,015	1,415		
5. Construction Costs						03/2002	09/2004
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	1,143	0	1,143		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	57	0	57		
Construction	0	0	0	26,765	26,765		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	200	0	200		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	2,822	2,822		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	1,400	29,587	30,987		
6. Art						01/2004	09/2004
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	268	268		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	900	900	03/2004	09/2004
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	850	850	03/2004	09/2004
Security Equipment	0	0	0	285	285	03/2004	09/2004
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	2,035	2,035		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction				01/2006			
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	32.30%			
SUBTOTAL		0	0	10,937	10,937		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$500	\$3,800	\$44,797	\$49,097		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	500	3,800	44,797	49,097
State Funds Subtotal	0	500	3,800	44,797	49,097
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	500	3,800	44,797	49,097

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0.0	0.0	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	500	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 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:

12/7/99

The completed predesign document does not contain a cost plan. Please update. Please justify the \$500,000 in design funds requested.

Department of Finance Analysis:

Although this project may be a logical consolidation of the state's technology operations into one facility, the timing and space of the project would best be staged after a strategic plan for the siting of other agencies in the capitol area is completed.

Capital Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

If sited in the Capitol Area, design should be secured through a CAAPB Design Competition, in coordination with Administration and the client group, for which the CAAPB should be compensated. If a different process is used to secure the design, the CAAPB must likewise be involved and again compensated.

As for any specific site concerns, since none is listed, it is difficult at this time to evaluate the site and since the concept of such a facility was only "hinted at" in the Strategic Plan, the CAAPB must assume that it is logical to site the facility within the Capitol Area.

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	80
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	0
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	20
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25
Total	700 Maximum	175

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$10,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 13 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

To establish a statewide technology funding source for state agency infrastructure and components to expand, enhance or replace integrated systems as part of building an "Information Highway" for the State of Minnesota. It is Admin/OT's intent to have a source of funds requested on a regular basis, similar to the capital asset preservation accounts, administered by Admin/OT from a central prioritized data source.

Throughout the nation, much credit has been given to the use of advanced information technologies for the economic prosperity of the last several years due to increases in the speed of business and the rise in industrial productivity. The future economic vitality of this state hinges on the adaptation and direct use of electronic tools that allow economic development, established community networks and telework centers that promote and encourage electronic commerce. Access to intrastate, national and international markets are achievable and economically feasible through a visionary communications fabric that permits access to expanded opportunities in voice, data, and video information transmitted instantly over high-speed networks, telephone lines, and wireless web sites.

This global potential, through technology, has and will command how the state will conduct its business in the future. Beyond cost savings, analyzing the bastion of all tradition, the banking industry has progressed immeasurably in the past 3 decades through drive-through tellers, bank by phone, electronic transactions, and money machines to expand their business.

The state has the beginning legal framework to support commercial transactions dictated by our customers. With respect to electronic government services, a unified common registry for all citizens would create a one-stop form of service that must be implemented. Government purchasing, bidding, inventories, even sales from service goods to real estate must be transacted on a central file server while tax filing and payroll data could be conducted on line.

In order to support these long-range plans the state must have a resource that agencies can draw upon on an on-going basis for the electronic infrastructure vital to their operations. Before funds are allocated to a specific infrastructure project, the agency request for funds must be evaluated as to need and agency priority. The goal is to establish a logical, sequential indexed application prior to determining the most effective application of infrastructure funds.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

This program is untested statewide, however, it is clear that, without a consistent and dedicated source of funding for information technology infrastructure, agencies will soon be unable to meet the demand for their services by an increasingly "online" constituency. Ultimately, operating budgets will come up short in meeting program demands.

Agencies are encountering infrastructure limitations that preclude moving ahead with desired technological upgrades needed to improve operating efficiency and provide leadership and services to customers. Without resources to remedy the infrastructure limitations when encountered, agencies end up placing plans on hold or delaying indefinitely. As a result government is often criticized for lack of leadership, failure to move ahead, or to keep pace with counterparts in other states or private business.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

In private business, technology is not regarded as a discretionary expense that can be eliminated or suspended. Instead, business regards information technology as a key means to assure rapid and competent decision-making, and breaking down bureaucracies. It is a key means of staying in touch. State government must continue to improve its use of technology to keep pace with changing business practices and to improve services to citizens.

Minnesota runs the danger today of being dropped from the upper rolls of states that use technology to the betterment of government services. Many other states have caught up and surpassed Minnesota as the Technology State.

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

David F. Fisher, Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.1424
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: david.fisher@state.mn.us

Kath Ouska, Assist. Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
Inflation Cost							
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	10,000	10,000	20,000	40,000	07/2000	07/2002
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$40,000		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
General Fund Projects	0	10,000	10,000	20,000	40,000
State Funds Subtotal	0	10,000	10,000	20,000	40,000
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	0	10,000	10,000	20,000	40,000

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

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

12/7/99
NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

There is a recognized need to provide a consistent and reliable funding stream to enable the state to keep pace with the technological demands of society. Additional discussions on how to best meet this demand, and appropriate funding sources, are needed.

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	80
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	20
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0
Total	700 Maximum	160

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$800

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 14 of 14

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Complex, St. Paul

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

To conduct a series of predesings by the Department of Administration (Admin) with other state agencies to improve overall state operational efficiencies, enhance customer service, and upgrade the infrastructures supporting those functions. The intent is to upgrade existing buildings within the Capitol area to provide "smart" facilities by integrating unlimited high-tech infrastructures and flexible space to meet the next century's customer needs.

- a. Ford Building and New Office Building
- b. Administration Parking Ramp Replacement and New Office Building
- c. Veterans Services Building
- d. Commerce, Labor & Industry, and Department of Trade & Economic – new facility
- e. Legislative Office/Meeting Facility and Parking Ramp
- f. Facility Security Predesign

a. Ford Building and New Office Building

Admin's original request was to propose a predesign study to renovate the entire Ford Building. However, during the summer of 1999, structural investigations have proven there is severe concrete deterioration to both concrete floor structures and exterior concrete walls.

Admin has placed temporary restraints on the facility, but these have a "sunset" in approximately 3 years. Regretfully, Admin will need to request funds to demolish the building.

The Department of Transportation will relocate back to its main headquarters and Communications. Media operations and Plant Management's administrative staff will need to be relocated to other locations.

b. Administration Parking Ramp Replacement and New Office Building

In 1999, Admin contracted to have structural repairs made to the Administration parking ramp. The structural engineers determined these renovations would be the last the parking ramp could sustain and we should consider the parking ramp as not usable in 5 years. At that point, the Admin ramp will be 37 years old and well past its design life. Therefore, an alternative for that structure by the year 2004 is needed.

The intent is to study the possibility of renovating and expanding the Administration building from its present size of 55,000 net square feet to an expanded and larger footprint. This predesign is also in parallel with the Legislative Office Facility (item e. this section).

c. Veterans Services Building

In 1998, the legislature appropriated asset preservation funds, and Admin chose to abate, renovate and re-roof the 5th floor of the 'tower' portion of the Veterans Services Building. However, this work only began to bring this facility up to present day life safety codes and 'smart' office standards.

The facility was constructed in 2 separate projects: the lower, 1-level building in 1952 and the middle, 5-story, 'tower' facility in 1972. The complete exterior granite envelope needs to be reinsulated, including a new vapor barrier to prevent condensation from collecting along the exterior walls in the winter months. The exterior teak wood windows were replaced on the 5th floor during the 1998 renovation, but the remaining windows throughout the facility do not meet present day energy or design standards. The mechanical systems are archaic, inefficient, inadequate, and need total replacement. Asbestos is paramount throughout the facility, negating even minor routine office renovations. Exiting requirements need to be brought up to today's code, and, other than the recently renovated 5th floor, the building must have a complete sprinkler system.

This pre-design will also address future uses, such as the inclusion of a military museum and auditorium, the future needs of all veterans organizations, and how to best 'house' the department of Military Affairs.

Admin conducted a cost comparison in 1998 to analyze renovating the facility or constructing a new facility and found it would be less costly to demolish the existing and build new. However, when relocation costs and collocating veterans service organizations enter the formula, it is more prudent to renovate the existing facility.

d. Commerce, Labor and Industry, Trade and Economic Development Building

The Capitol Square Building will be demolished during the year 2000 and converted to a temporary parking facility for state employees. However, it has always been the intent of Admin to plan for a combined facility on that site to house agencies that conduct their business on daily bases with key agencies and private sector firms in St. Paul's central business district.

A predesign would be conducted for a new office facility with a parking structure to house the departments of Commerce, Labor and Industry, and Trade and Economic Development operations at that site.

Their present spaces lack the environmental flexibility to readily house technology systems, have questionable indoor air quality standards, have drastic shortfalls on staff/visitor parking space, and the former Capitol Square site gives them a prime real estate location between the Capitol area and downtown St. Paul.

e. Legislative Office/Meeting Facility and Parking Ramp

To predesign a new legislative office and hearing room complex with parking facilities on the sites north of University Avenue, between Cedar Avenue and Park Street, with Sherburne Avenue the northern boundary.

This 'plaza' facility would combine legislative offices, have 'smart' design, conference rooms, staff areas, high-tech hearing rooms, integrated security, and, above all, incorporate information technology networks and capabilities to serve well into the next century.

Admin's 1993 long-range Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies proposed a joint office facility, underground parking ramp and a landscaped plaza north of the State Capitol. The purpose was to expand north of the Capitol versus earlier thoughts of expanding into the Mall, which has been determined to have a high water table and assorted aquifers. It would be timely and prudent to analyze the Administration facility's long-range potential. At present, the building only yields 55,000 usable square feet (USF) and has code, environmental and internal circulation problems. Additionally, the Admin ramp is 32 years old and structural engineers have gone on record that in another 5 years the ramp would require almost total structural replacement.

Elected officials, state staff members and Capitol Security have expressed an interest in improving the immediate area surrounding the Capitol by restricting parking, emphasizing key entries and introducing controlled security access drives adjacent to the Capitol.

A controlled access, underground parking facility located behind and below the north 'plaza' could replace all of the surface parking surrounding the Capitol, Lot 'B', Lot 'O', Lot 'N' and the Admin ramp.

The 'plaza' in turn would be an extension of the north portico of the Capitol building. The possibility of depressing University Avenue would allow this space to be readily accessible to the Capitol itself both above as well as below grade.

f. Facility Security Predesign

The Ventura Administration has formed a task force to study the Capitol Area security including the present Capitol Security force and the overall protection of state officials and employees. This predesign is to study the overall scope and impact of securing all state-owned facilities including major leased facilities housing state employees.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

All of the listed pre-designs would have a major long-range impact on both individual agency and Capitol area operating budgets. New or totally renovated facilities would replace the existing conditions not specifically designed for high-tech operations. Flexibility would greatly decrease the cost of on-going office remodeling (or churn) and increase the efficiency ratio for flexible office space by utilizing modular and demountable office systems.

A controlled access underground parking facility north of University Avenue would yield increased revenue for the parking fund that in affect could pay for the ramp. This capacity of this facility would be double the present space in Lots 'A', 'B', 'O', 'P' and Aurora Street.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The predesigns comply with Admin's Strategic Plan. The predesigns clearly outline increased overall office efficiency, flexibility, expand the 'IT' network, upgrade energy standards, replace older facilities and infrastructures, consolidate parking, and eliminate or modify those physical elements that no longer comply with or can be properly maintained to state operational standards.

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

Kath Ouska, Assistant Commissioner
200 Administration Building
St. Paul, MN 55155-3000
Phone: 651.296.6852
Fax: 651.297.7909
E-mail: kath.ouska@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	800	0	0	800	07/2000	03/2001
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	10,050	13,200	23,250	10/2000	12/2001
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$800	\$10,050	\$13,200	\$24,050		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	0	9,600	13,200	22,800
General Fund Projects	0	800	450	0	1,250
State Funds Subtotal	0	800	10,050	13,200	24,050
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	800	10,050	13,200	24,050

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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	0	0%
User Financing	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 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 term predesign should be reserved for building specific investigations rather than a general amount for a variety of studies.

Department of Finance Analysis:

Predesigns for these projects would be more meaningful once a new strategic plan for locating agencies has been completed.

Capitol Area Architectural and Planning Board Review:

A new Administration Parking Ramp and Office Building (Item B) incorporated into a new Legislative Office/Meeting Facility (Item E), is a critically important element found in the original 1993 Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies; and, coupled with recent findings on the structural integrity of the existing Administration ramp, this concept has also been captured in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan for the Capitol Area.

Likewise, replacement of the Ford Building was called for in both these documents, and that was before details on the structural integrity of the existing building were known.

The same goes for the new Commerce, Labor and Industry/Trade and Economic Development Building, which was described at length in the two aforementioned documents. However, while there was a call for reuse of the site with suggestions for one or several of these programs, it was never clear that all of them should be sited together, which might prove to be too much for this one block located on the key Capitol approach. If all these programs and parking were included, it is possible that predesign may force consideration of a second block or elimination of one or more of the parts of the proposed program. Since size of the building and associated parking is not stated, we raise this only as a concern at this time.

Lastly, while the CAAPB is fully supportive of the facility security predesign, it would be critically important to involve the CAAPB in this and any ensuing work, especially since there has been no coordination to date. This will assure that implementation will be sensitive to and informed by continuing redevelopment of the area as well as the public enjoyment of the area.

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	80
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	70
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	35
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	25
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	20
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	255

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Title	2000 Agency Priority Ranking	Agency Project Requests for State Funds (\$ by Session)				Statewide Strategic Score	Governor's Recommendation 2000	Governor's Planning Estimate	
		2000	2002	2004	Total			2002	2004
Statewide Facility Grant Program	1	\$8,650	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$28,650	325	\$2,000	\$0	\$0
National Sport Conference Center	2	4,000	0	0	4,000	185	0	0	0
Expansion of the National Volleyball Center	3	2,000	0	0	2,000	185	0	0	0
Northwest Sports Center	4	1,000	0	0	1,000	160	0	0	0
Renovation of the Giants Ridge Nordic Center	5	350	0	0	350	135	0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$16,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$36,000		\$2,000	\$0	\$0

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT:

The purpose of the Minnesota Amateur Sports commission (MASC) is to elevate the economic and social benefits of sport to enrich the lives of all Minnesotans.

The MASC contributes to the statewide system of amateur sports in Minnesota by:

- Creating economic benefits through sport events.
- Providing opportunity for healthy sport activities.
- Improving infrastructure through developing new sport facilities.

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

The following themes are shaping the development of MASC planning.

Increase in Amateur Sports Tourism – Since 1989 Minnesota has developed a proven record of hosting major amateur sporting events generating over \$270 million in tourism activity. Over this 10 year span MASC witnessed steady incremental growth in the amateur sport tourism industry. This trend can be sustained for the foreseeable future. The MASC intends to work with Minnesota organizations to sustain this economic activity. Amateur sporting events hosted by the MASC and MASC-affiliated sport facilities generate over \$50 million annually.

Rising Demand for Sport Gender Equity Programs – A 1988 MASC survey confirmed that sports participation in Minnesota is 70% male and 30% female. While the gap between the number of male and female participants in amateur sports has narrowed, there is still work to be done to achieve complete gender equity. The MASC has targeted specific sports to help increase female participation, i.e. All-American Girls' Soccer Tournament, All-American Girls' Hockey Tournament.

Increasing Opportunities for Underserved Youth – The MASC is planning programs that increase sport opportunities for underserved youth in urban and rural areas. In addition to programs, the MASC has rewarded organizations that serve underserved youth with fellowship money and continues to address the sport facility shortages in these areas.

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

The MASC will continue to oversee the master plan of the state's major amateur sport facility network: support the quality maintenance of current facilities; investigate and plan the development of new facilities.

Since 1987 the MASC has outlined improvements needed in our state's physical

plant for sport: a network of facilities to be used by Minnesotans to pursue their athletic dreams and as revenue-producing centers for major national events and on-going programs.

Today, Minnesota has one of the premier sport facility networks in the nation. We are now capable of accommodating virtually all of the 42 Olympic summer events and 11 of the 14 Winter Olympic sports. One essential aspect of the MASC facility infrastructure is that these public facilities are accessible to every Minnesotan.

None of the 12 MASC funded facilities require direct state operating dollars.

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

A MASC goal is to maintain and enhance our state's ability to host sport events and programs in most sport categories. The MASC agency plan is found in the MASC 1987-98 report (1998) and Blueprint III (1989). The MASC funding of sport facilities can be divided between major sport facility development with statewide significance and local sport facility development.

Major Sport Facility Development – The MASC believes that the following facilities will contribute to the state's tourism economy through hosting regional, state, national and international amateur sporting events:

- The Sport Conference Center, located on the campus of the National Sports Center, will provide the opportunity to host large sport conference events and meetings that tie into NSC sport events.
- Expansion of the National Volleyball Center will strengthen its tradition as the premier volleyball facility.
- The completion of phase 1 for the Northwest Sports Center in Thief River Falls and the renovation of the Giants Ridge Nordic Center will allow Minnesota communities access to premier sport facilities and generate economic impact through amateur sporting events.

These projects achieve the MASC's long-range strategic goals of positioning Minnesota as the national leader in providing its inhabitants with premiere sport facilities and bringing large-scale amateur sport events to Minnesota.

Local Sport Facility Development – The continuation of the statewide facility grant program will ensure the MASC goal of helping Minnesota communities answer their recreational facility needs. This project has evolved from the Mighty Ducks Ice Arena Grant program established by the 1995 legislature (M.S. 240A.09). The MASC intends to expand this program to other sport categories.

The MASC adopted in 1987 an application process similar to the DNRs outdoor recreational grant program. MASC staff provide assistance to applicants and present a list of applicants to the MASC Board for review. On an annual basis the

MASC Board makes formal agency recommendations to the Governor's office and legislature.

The facilities will generate economic impact and will increase the number of Minnesotans served again focusing on providing increased opportunities for females and underserved youth. Facility operators report economic impact numbers and participant totals directly to the MASC annually.

Virtually all facility applicants employ the services of engineering/architectural firms as part of their grant request.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1994-1999):

1994 – John Rose Oval, Roseville, \$.5 million
1995 – Mighty Ducks Community Ice Arenas, statewide, \$2.9 million
1996 – Mighty Ducks, statewide, \$7 million
1996 – National Volleyball Center, Rochester, \$2.3 million
1996 – Range Recreational Civic Center, Eveleth, \$1.25 million
1996 – Urban Sports Center, Minneapolis, \$3.4 million
1996 – Bush Lake Ski Jump, Bloomington, \$.5 million
1997 – St. Paul Tennis Center, St. Paul, \$.075 million
1997 – Mighty Ducks, statewide, \$5 million
1998 – NSC, Blaine, \$1.7 million
1999 – NSC golf course, Blaine, \$3.1 million
1999 – Ole Mangseth Ski Jump, Coleraine, \$.13 million
1999 – Urban Sports Center, Minneapolis, \$.6 million
1999 – St. Paul Tennis Center, St. Paul, \$.8 million
1999 – Mighty Ducks, statewide \$1.285 million

OTHER:

Our primary goal in building and improving facilities has been to serve the needs of Minnesota athletes. Our measurements indicated that the MASC affiliate sports facilities have brought amateur sports opportunities to more than 12 million visitors over the last 11 years. These facilities are also intended to bring economic benefits via amateur sport. After 11 years of operation, economic impact already totals an estimated \$270 million. This number continues to grow, measured against the original investment of \$49 million.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$8,650

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 5

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

This project would make grants to local governments and matching national or regional grants to help Minnesota communities and organizations address their amateur sport facility needs. The Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission (MASC) has a long-term commitment to making sports accessible to all Minnesotans. One of the most effective ways to insure the accessibility of amateur sport facilities is to strengthen the amateur sport facility network across Minnesota. The funding of athletic facilities is an essential aspect of the MASC.

In keeping with the agency's long-term goals the MASC will provide facility grants to projects that fit under target categories:

- Gender Equity
- Underserved Youth
- Matching Regional or National Facility Grants
- Regional Sports Facilities

Gender Equity: One of the challenges that have faced amateur sports in Minnesota is guaranteeing sport facility access to female athletes. The leading facility access issue concerns the availability of ice arenas statewide. The statewide ice arena shortage is the result of the recent explosion in the number of women hockey players.

A total of \$4 million of the statewide facility grants will be earmarked for the continuation of the Mighty Ducks Ice Arena Grant program established by the 1995 legislature (M.S. 240A.09). The current project calls for new facility grants of up to \$250 thousand per applicant and renovation grants of up to \$50 thousand per applicant. Applicants are required to match state dollars with local and/or private funding.

Since 1995 over \$16 million in facility grants have been awarded to Minnesota communities. The MASC is recommending that the 2002 capital budget request contain the final funding for the Mighty Ducks program. By continuing funding for this innovative project, the MASC will continue to provide Minnesota communities the opportunity to address their ice arena shortages, especially answering the demand for additional ice space created by the statewide growth of women's ice hockey.

Underserved Youth: In the future the Commission will look at limiting factors facing amateur sport participants in order to provide opportunities for the underserved youth population in Minnesota, including athletes from low economic backgrounds and multi-cultural communities. The MASC involvement in developing the Urban Sport Center is an example of our agency's commitment to serving under-served urban youth. The MASC also has a history of providing financial assistance to programs that promote amateur sports to underserved youth and multi-cultural communities. The MASC already has identified soccer as a priority project for the future. The project would develop soccer fields in urban and rural areas where the need is greatest.

Matching Regional or National Grants: This aspect of the facility grant program addresses the need of Minnesota communities statewide to match regional and national grant money for the funding of sport facilities. It is in the interest of Minnesota communities and the MASC that local communities utilize the millions of dollars in non-state grant money available. For example, national organizations like the US Soccer Foundation are providing grants for the development of soccer fields in urban areas, and the PGA is providing \$100 thousand per site for golf learning centers. Funding of these types of projects will allow communities statewide to continue to look to the MASC for assistance in matching these facility grants to bring out of state dollars to Minnesota.

Regional Sport Facilities: The MASC believes that each of the 8 congressional districts in Minnesota should benefit from the economic impact and sport opportunity of facility development. Large regional sport facilities, like the National Volleyball Center and the Giants Ridge ski area, generate significant tourism revenue for their communities and provide their residents access to premier athletic facilities. While a significant number of sport facilities are located in the metropolitan area, the MASC is dedicated to bringing amateur sports to every Minnesota region.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

An additional \$40 thousand will be needed to handle the application and selection process for the grants.

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

Paul D. Erickson, Executive Director
Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission
1700 - 105th Avenue Northeast
Blaine, MN 55449
Phone: (612) 785-5632

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	17,900	8,650	10,000	10,000	46,550	07/2000	06/2002
GRAND TOTAL	\$17,900	\$8,650	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$46,550		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	15,900	8,650	10,000	10,000	44,550
General Fund Projects	2,000	0	0	0	2,000
State Funds Subtotal	17,900	8,650	10,000	10,000	46,550
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	17,900	8,650	10,000	10,000	46,550

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	8,650	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 (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)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
Yes	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
Compensation -- Program and Building Operation	0	0	0	0	0
Other Program Related Expenses	0	40	40	40	40
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	40	40	40	40
Revenue Offsets	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	40	40	40	40
Change from Current FY 2000-01		40	40	40	40
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 96, Ch 463, Sec 14, Subd. 2	8,000
Laws of 97, Ch 202, Art 1, Sec 26	5,000
Laws of 95, Ch 254, Art 1, Sec 18, Subd. 1	2,900
Laws of 98, Ch 404, Sec 15, Subd. 6	2,000

Department of Administration Analysis:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

This project would provide grants to local entities to help address their amateur sport facility needs. Part of the original mission of Amateur Sports was to develop a network of sport facilities that would make Minnesota a model in amateur and Olympic sports. The idea was that the Commission would help develop these one-of-a-kind sites throughout the state. That mission still left the funding of most amateur sport facilities as the responsibility of local governments. The state took a step away from that tradition when it began making the Mighty Ducks grants. This request would complete the Mighty Ducks Program, but would also begin to fund other sports in the same manner.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends a partial appropriation of \$2 million for grants to local entities to complete the Mighty Ducks Program and to help address other amateur sport facility needs. The Governor's planning estimates for 2002-05 contain no funding for continuation of this grant program. This appropriation is from the general fund.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC SCORE		
Criteria	Values	Points
Critical Life Safety Emergency - Existing Hazards	0/700	0
Critical Legal Liability - Existing Liability	0/700	0
Prior Binding Commitment	0/700	0
Strategic Linkage - Agency Six Year Plan	0/40/80/120	80
Safety/Code Concerns	0/35/70/105	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	50
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	325

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 5

PROJECT LOCATION: Blaine, Anoka

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

The project calls for the construction of a sport conference center on the campus of the National Sports Center (NSC) and the related development costs of landscaping, parking, road access, and code requirements. The estimated cost of this project is \$5 million, of which \$1 million will be raised through private partners and sponsors. The purpose of the project is to enable the NSC to host large sports conference events that both increase tourism and participation levels. This new facility addresses the long-range strategic plan for MASC facilities to generate tourism activity.

This additional facility also addresses one of the NSC's challenges of limited meeting space due to the growing success of programs and events. Currently the NSC does not have the facilities to host large sport-related conferences. Completion of the Sports Conference Center will allow the NSC to host a wide variety of sport related events:

- Referee clinics and certification programs
- Conferences in sport medicine, clinics and practicums
- Conferences for sport trainers
- Conferences and seminars for sport administrators
- Coaches conferences and seminars
- National and state sport associations conferences
- Non-sport events, sport business seminars, sport retail fairs, community organization meetings, etc.

In addition to the conference capabilities, the Sport Conference Center will host sports medicine and sports training conferences. The sports medicine center will assist athletes in their recovery of prevention of sport injuries. The sport-training component will instruct and aid athletes in their athletic training. These additions will allow the NSC to serve and nurture every facet of amateur sports in Minnesota.

The completion of this project would strengthen the NSC's standing as one of the premier sports centers in the country, and the leading generator of sport tourism dollars in Minnesota. The creation of the Sports Conference Center would allow the NSC to host large conferences and training sessions for amateur sports and provide Minnesota athletes access to a premier sports medicine and training facility. The ability to host a large sporting event with an onsite conference event concurrently will give the NSC a marketing advantage over the rest of the country. The centrally

located Sport Conference Center would also provide the optimum meeting area for the various statewide amateur sport associations.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

There is no impact on MASC operating budget. All owner and operating responsibilities would continue to rest exclusively with the NSCF.

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

Paul D. Erickson, Executive Director
Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission
1700 – 105th Avenue Northeast
Blaine, MN 55449
Phone: (612) 785-5632

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	300	0	0	300	07/2000	06/2002
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0	07/2000	06/2002
Construction Management	0	150	0	0	150		
SUBTOTAL	0	150	0	0	150		
5. Construction Costs							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0	07/2000	06/2002
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	4,050	0	0	4,050		
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	4,050	0	0	4,050		
6. Art							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	500	0	0	500	07/2000	06/2002
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	500	0	0	500		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	4,000	0	0	4,000
State Funds Subtotal	0	4,000	0	0	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	1,000	0	0	1,000
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	5,000	0	0	5,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	4,000	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 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)
Yes	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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

The predesign fee is above the expected range for a 4 million dollar project, the range should be .05-1.0%.

There are still no design fees indicated.

There is still no construction contingency indicated.

The construction cost section is not thoroughly completed.

FF&E is 12.3% which is above the expected range of 5-7%, please justify.

Missing the inflation factor.

Department of Finance Analysis:

This project would allow the National Sports Center to add the new dimension of sport conferencing to its event hosting. At this time the Department of Tourism is conducting a study to determine what the economic impact of this project would be for the state if the center were built. It is anticipated that this report will be available to the legislature by the start of the next legislative 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	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	70
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	0
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	0
Total	700 Maximum	185

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 5

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Rochester - Olmstead Recreation Center

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

The National Volleyball Center (NVC) expansion project calls for the addition of 4 volleyball courts, restrooms and locker rooms for players and officials. The project includes additional restrooms because the current number has proven to be inadequate during large tournaments. These improvements would allow the NVC to continue its standing as a major regional event and training center for USA Volleyball, as well as positioning itself as a potential host for national volleyball events.

Expansion to 15 on-site volleyball courts would allow the NVC to host larger volleyball tournaments. Large tournaments such as the AAU Championships and USA Volleyball Tournaments require the use of at least 14 courts. These tournaments bring in significant tourism dollars to the state.

Expansion of the NVC answers MASC goals of creating and assisting the development of major regional sport facilities. The city of Rochester has consistently met the demands of amateur athletes in southern Minnesota, providing quality programs and premier facilities.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

There is no impact on MASC operating budget. All owner and operating responsibilities would rest exclusively with the city of Rochester.

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

Paul Erickson, Executive Director
Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission
1700 – 105th Avenue Northeast
Blaine, MN 55449
Phone: (612) 785-5632

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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		
Construction	2,300	2,000	0	0	4,300		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	2,300	2,000	0	0	4,300		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,300	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,300		

Amateur Sports Commission
Expansion of the National Volleyball Center

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Detail

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	2,300	2,000	0	0	4,300
State Funds Subtotal	2,300	2,000	0	0	4,300
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	2,300	2,000	0	0	4,300

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	2,000	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 (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)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 96, Ch 463, Sec 14, Subd 6	2,300

Department of Administration Analysis:

There is no project cost detail to evaluate.

Department of Finance Analysis:

More courts will not significantly increase the number of bookings. According to the NVC management, the facility is already booked weekends, weeknights, and most weekdays. To accommodate large national tournaments the NVC already has access to other space throughout the city of Rochester.

This one-year old facility has only one men's and one women's restroom and one small dressing room to support up to 32 teams, officials and visitors.

No local match is proposed.

According to the city of Rochester, this request is the third of their three requests. Mitigation grant funding for the DM&E railroad is their number 1 priority, followed by a Public Safety Training Facility at number 2, and expansion of the National Volleyball Center at number 3.

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	70
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	185

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 4 of 5

PROJECT LOCATION: Thief River Falls, Northwest Minnesota

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

The project calls for the funding of phase 2 of the Northwest Sports Center (NSC) in the city of Thief River Falls. This project addresses the Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission (MASC) agency goal of fostering the economic and social benefits of sports for communities across Minnesota. This Multi-Events Community Center (MECC) would provide the residents of Northwest Minnesota access to a premier indoor athletic facility. The \$6 million Sports Center would include a 120,000 square foot facility and would hold a large multi-sport sports hall including a 200-meter indoor track.

The state funding of \$1 million would allow this project to be ready should they receive a donation by completing Phase I and setting up the infrastructure for a Multi-Events Center indoor facility.

The completion of the NSC will improve the quality of sport opportunities for northwest Minnesotans. A completed regional sports center, with the ability to host large amateur sports events, would strengthen the statewide amateur sport facility infrastructure. The ability to host large multi-sport events would also allow the MECC to generate revenue for northwest Minnesota. These large events would draw tourism dollars into the area from North Dakota and Canada.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

There would be no direct impact on MASC agency operating budget. The center would be owned and operated by Thief River Falls School District #564, City of Thief River Falls, Pennington County and Northland Community & Technical College. The Joint Powers Board, consisting of members of the 4 involved agencies, will oversee the operational and management aspects of the Multi-Events Center.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

In 1994 the legislature appropriated \$3 million to MnSCU (Higher Education) and required a \$1 million match. The original request for \$5 million was a cooperative effort between the city of Thief River Falls, Pennington County, and School District 564.

The local governmental units have met the in-kind requirement of over \$1 million and have raised almost another half million from private sources as of 9/7/99 to help complete Phase I of the project.

The Joint Powers Board received the 1997 Partnership Minnesota Cooperative Public Service Award from the Governor and the state of Minnesota, in recognition of the efforts of the four government agencies to eliminate duplication and allow taxpayer dollars to go further.

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

Paul Erickson, Executive Director
Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission
1700 – 105th Avenue Northeast
Blaine, MN 55449
Phone: (612) 785-5632

Rick Nelson, Project Manager
Northwest Regional Amateur Sports Commission

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition							
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$10	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10		
Buildings and Land	124	0	0	0	124		
SUBTOTAL	134	0	0	0	134		
2. Predesign							
SUBTOTAL	60	0	0	0	60		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	55	0	0	0	55		
Design Development	65	0	0	0	65		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	120	0	0	0	120		
4. Project Management							
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	189	0	0	0	189		
SUBTOTAL	189	0	0	0	189		
5. Construction Costs							
Site & Building Preparation	600	0	0	0	600		
Demolition/Decommissioning	10	0	0	0	10		
Construction	1,445	0	0	0	1,445		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	420	0	0	0	420		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	2,475	0	0	0	2,475		
6. Art							
SUBTOTAL	22	0	0	0	22		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	1,000	0	0	1,000	07/2000	06/2002
GRAND TOTAL	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,000		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	3,000	1,000	0	0	4,000
State Funds Subtotal	3,000	1,000	0	0	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	3,000	1,000	0	0	4,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,000	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	Requirement
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)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Use Agreement Required (Finance Dept)
Yes	MS 16A.695: Program Funding Review Required (Agency)
No	Matching Funds Required (as per agency request)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 96, Ch 643, Sec 11, Subd. 11 (b)	3,000

Department of Administration Analysis:

The detail provided does not allow an analysis to be performed.

Department of Finance Analysis:

It is unclear exactly what part of the indoor event center this million-dollar request would buy. The narrative states that the \$1 million would allow the Northwest Sports Center to be prepared for a donation if other events take place. Based on discussions it remains unclear whether this million dollars is required to obtain a private donation of \$5 million. This project does not require any local or private match.

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	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	160

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$350

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 5 of 5

PROJECT LOCATION: Biwabik

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE:

This request is for an upgrade of the basic facilities of the Giants Ridge Nordic Center. The renovation request consists of 3 specific projects:

- Construction of a new facility roof
- Upgrading of the facility's plumbing system
- Renovation of common spaces

Since the creation of the Giants Ridge Nordic Center in 1984 this facility has been one of the premier cross-country skiing training facilities in the country. This facility provides over 60 kilometers of international caliber nordic trails in addition to a downhill skiing area, 18 hole golf course and training center. In keeping with the goals of the MASC the Giants Ridge Nordic Center has provided Minnesota and national amateur athletes and inexpensive and quality training facility. Due to heavy use and age many of the facility's essential services are in need of repair.

Replacement of the complex's original roof is the facility's number one priority. In addition, the complex needs to upgrade its plumbing system and dormitory amenities. Since assuming the operational responsibilities of this complex, the IRRRB has continued its commitment to the development and upkeep of Giants Ridge, expending over \$25 million of IRRRB monies for this facility. The modernization of this facility will continue to allow amateur athletes access to an inexpensive and Olympic caliber training facility in northern Minnesota.

IMPACT ON STATE AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

There is no impact on the MASC operating budget. All owner and operating responsibilities would rest exclusively with the Center.

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

Paul Erickson, Executive Director
Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission
1700 – 105th Avenue Northeast
Blaine, MN 55449
Phone: (612) 785-5632

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	2,890	350	0	0	3,240	07/2000	09/2002
GRAND TOTAL	\$2,890	\$350	\$0	\$0	\$3,240		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	2,890	350	0	0	3,240
State Funds Subtotal	2,890	350	0	0	3,240
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	2,890	350	0	0	3,240

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	350	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 (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)
Yes	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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 87, Ch 400, Sec 9	2,200
Laws of 98, Ch 404, Sec 15	690

Department of Administration Analysis:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

There was no mention of the need for these improvements in this site's 1998 bonding request. The Center should explore opportunities for a local match or IRRRB funding.

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	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	0
Total	700 Maximum	135

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Title	2000 Agency Priority Ranking	Agency Project Requests for State Funds (\$ by Session)				Statewide Strategic Score	Governor's Recommendation 2000	Governor's Planning Estimate	
		2000	2002	2004	Total			2002	2004
Capitol Building: Interior Restoration Predesign	1	\$318	\$24,220	\$20,049	\$44,587	435	\$318	\$0	\$0
Capitol Building: Lighting for Security and Access	2	545	2,612	0	3,157	295	0	0	0
Capitol Complex: Comprehensive Sign Program		0	824	0	824		0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$863	\$27,656	\$20,049	\$48,568		\$318	\$0	\$0

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT:

The Capitol Area Architectural Planning Board's (CAAPB) primary mission is to preserve and enhance, for the people of Minnesota, the Capitol area's unique aesthetic and historic character, and to plan and guide its future by developing a framework for its physical growth. This framework is the new *Comprehensive Plan for the Minnesota State Capitol Area*.

The CAAPB's statutory charge is to:

1. preserve and enhance the dignity, beauty, and architectural integrity of the Capitol, the buildings immediately adjacent to it, the Capitol grounds, and the Capitol area;
2. protect, enhance, and increase the open spaces within the Capitol area when deemed necessary and desirable for the improvement of the public enjoyment thereof;
3. develop proper approaches to the Capitol area for pedestrian movement, the highway system, and mass transit system so that the area achieves maximum accessibility; and
4. establish a flexible framework for growth of the Capitol buildings in keeping with the spirit of the original design by the Capitol's architect, Cass Gilbert.

As the planning and regulatory agency responsible for architectural design and long-range planning for the Capitol area, the CAAPB has exclusive zoning jurisdiction and design review over both the state government complex and the surrounding commercial and residential neighborhoods. In overseeing and coordinating development in the Capitol area, the CAAPB is in a unique position to work closely with many state agencies, especially the Administration Department, the city of Saint Paul, planning districts and neighborhood development groups, and with architects and developers from the private sector.

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

The Capitol Area Board begins its fourth decade of service with 2 major planning frameworks to guide its work into the next century: *The Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies* (1993, rev. 1995) by the Administration Department, and its own newly revised *Comprehensive Plan for the Minnesota State Capitol Area*.

Much has been accomplished by the CAAPB since its establishment by the legislature in 1967. Its first Comprehensive Plan (1970) and the second (1982) focused primarily on improvements within the Capitol area itself.

The new 1998 Comprehensive Plan focuses on the Capitol area in its larger context as part of the Capitol city, as well as continued development, both public and private, in the Capitol area. The plan incorporates development frameworks completed in the mid-1980s for 3 Capitol area subdistricts: the East Capitol, Rice-University, and Summit Park areas. It also includes a policy framework for initiation, evaluation, and implementation of commemorative works in the Capitol area, adopted by the Board in 1993.

In 1998, the CAAPB adopted a *Policy for Works of Art in the Minnesota State Capitol*, as developed by the Minnesota Historical Society, the Department of Administration, and the CAAPB. The policy establishes standards and design guidelines, along with a process for reviewing new and existing art in the Capitol Building.

The new Comprehensive Plan also reexamines the viability and redevelopment potential for the residential section of the Capitol area, as well as development of new areas added in recent years by expansion of the boundaries.

The 1993 Strategic Plan, a collaborative effort of the Department of Administration and the CAAPB, incorporated much of the original Comprehensive Plan's urban design framework. It has projected development of 4 or 5 new state buildings to be sited within the Capitol area over the next 2 decades.

The CAAPB's responsibility for public projects begins with site selection and sponsorship of architectural design competitions and continues its review through all phases of design and construction.

Besides proposals for new buildings, the CAAPB's recent planning efforts have included commemorative works, public safety and accessibility improvements, redesigned state parking lots, a much needed Capitol complex comprehensive sign program, and a lighting master plan for both the Capitol area and the Capitol Building itself.

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

CAAPB's overall responsibility for the Capitol and its grounds, as well as the buildings in the Capitol complex, is primarily to protect existing assets and to plan for future investments. Campus development, in response to both state government needs and those of the public, has required broad flexibility in the CAAPB's overall planning.

Increasing use of the Capitol Mall for public events and proposals for memorials require the Board to refine long-range plans for Mall development. With these uses has come a growing concern for improved personal safety and access for both the

general public and the disabled, and the need to balance open green space with that of future memorials.

Preserving the Capitol Building has been a high priority for the CAAPB for the past 30 years, but only since the mid-1980s has the legislature become fully involved in the effort. Maintenance of the building was deferred, for the most part, until a structural emergency required action.

Now approaching the Capitol's Centennial, the CAAPB and Administration have adopted the Capitol 2005 Strategic Plan to complete restoration/renovation of the building and environs with requests for accelerated legislative appropriations over the 2000-2005 period.

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

The Capitol 2005 plan, noted above, is the CAAPB's major long-range capital budget priority, embodying the Board's statutory charge to "preserve and enhance the dignity, beauty, and architectural integrity of the Capitol," and acknowledge that after nearly 100 years, building systems and equipment have outlived their advancement into the 21st Century.

The Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies and the Board's new Comprehensive Plan for the Capitol area, along with the area's Zoning Design Ordinance, provide the basis for the CAAPB's work of preserving and enhancing the Capitol area's unique aesthetic and historic character.

With these tools, the CAAPB's 2000 capital budget plan will include Capitol Building renovation projects and Capitol Building security improvements. Longer-range, the Board expects to be involved with the Administration Department in siting new buildings, renovating existing buildings, a comprehensive Capitol complex sign program, completion of lighting for the Capitol Building and all its entrances, and possible development of new commemorative works on the Mall.

AGENCY PROCESS USED TO ARRIVE AT THESE CAPITAL REQUESTS:

An initial capital project list was developed by examining unfunded requests from previous years and assessing their viability and compatibility with the Capitol Area Comprehensive Plan and other long-range goals, including findings of the 1993 Strategic Plan and its supplement in 1995. CAAPB staff then consulted and met with several other departments to discuss related projects and to sequence and/or rank funding requests. In the case of the Capitol Building, this process included the Historical Society, Capitol Security, and Administration Department, as well as the CAAPB's consulting architect for the Capitol Building restoration. Throughout the entire process, CAAPB staff worked closely with the Administration Department to assure that proposals for the next 6 years are coordinated.

Once the information had been incorporated into the preliminary list of capital budget requests, staff reviewed the requests with the Capitol Area Board and its Architectural Advisory Committee.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1994-1999):

The CAAPB has continued to focus on restoration of the Capitol Building. Since 1994, capital budget appropriations totaling \$25.6 million have been dedicated to Capitol Building projects, ranging from fire management systems updates, reroofing, repair of the lantern above the dome, and restoration/renovation of the Quadriga to reconstruction of all terraces and restoration of the Capitol Building Cafeteria.

Capital projects financed by general fund appropriations to the CAAPB have increased during the past 6 years. These have included several memorials on the grounds, including the Roy Wilkins Memorial, the Hubert Humphrey Memorial (planning), the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the Minnesota Women Suffrage Memorial Garden.

OTHER:

The Board, mindful of the Capitol Building's Centennial in the year 2005, would like to complete all major renovation/restoration projects by that time. Preliminary estimates for this critical work are forecast to be \$40 million in addition to the 2000 requests.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$318

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 2

PROJECT LOCATION: State Capitol, Saint Paul, MN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request would fund a predesign study for phased restoration of the Capitol's interior (east wing, basement, public and ceremonial areas). *The request is extremely critical to the Capitol Building being fully restored and updated by its centennial in the year 2005.* It would provide an updated, detailed analysis of remaining areas to be renovated/restored, a phased project schedule, and cost estimates. The study would also consider the impact of the phased restoration plan on current building occupants, and relocation needs.

Capital budget reform requires predesign for all construction projects. The Capitol consulting architect---using experience-based cost/square foot figures based on previous work in the Capitol---has estimated predesign costs at 0.6% of the cost for completion of the restoration program.

To date, projects totaling roughly \$22 million have followed closely the "1988 Comprehensive Preservation Plan and Implementation Strategy for the Minnesota State Capitol Building," prepared for the CAAPB by Miller-Dunwiddie Associates. Over the past dozen years, projects have regularly been completed within projected budgets, and projections in this current request narrative are based on careful review and updates of that 1988 document adjusted to factor inflation over the years.

This predesign study would be the basis for capital budget requests by CAAPB in the years 2002 and 2004. It follows scheduling for Capitol 2005, intended to complete all major renovation/restoration projects by the Capitol's centennial in 2005.

Restoration of the Capitol has been a top priority of the Capitol Area Board since the mid-1980s, but funding has been sporadic. Much of the exterior work has been necessary because of deferred maintenance over the decades and emergency structural failures.

Interior spaces completed during the 1980s include the House and Senate Chambers, Room G-15, and the west ground floor Great Hall. While most office spaces have been renovated, public and ceremonial areas remain to be done, with the exception of hearing rooms 107, 112, and 118.

The CAAPB will work with the Department of Administration to coordinate this project with the update of the "Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies".

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Previous Project Funding: The CAAPB unsuccessfully requested funds for the Capitol Building interior restoration predesign in 1998. No existing agency funds were used to initiate this predesign request.

Recently, states such as Wisconsin, Texas, and Ohio have taken a comprehensive approach to their Capitol's restorations by closing down entire wings or even the buildings themselves. Occupants were relocated for short periods of time to allow for concentrated, efficient, and economical efforts on the needs of these buildings being restored. Once predesign and strategic planning is complete, this may prove to be the wisest path for the great amount of work that still lies ahead as we approach the centennial for the Minnesota State Capitol in 2005.

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

Paul Mandell, Principal Planner, CAAPB
204 Administration Building
Phone: (296)-6719
Fax: (296)-6718
Email: Paul.Mandell@state.mn.us

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	300	0	0	300	06/2000	02/2001
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	385	0	300	255	940		
Design Development	513	0	400	340	1,253		
Contract Documents	1,026	0	800	680	2,506		
Construction Administration	642	0	500	425	1,567		
SUBTOTAL	2,566	0	2,000	1,700	6,266		
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							
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	500	0	500		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	3,500	1,200	4,700		
Construction	20,347	0	12,500	11,000	43,847		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	2,000	0	1,500	1,300	4,800		
SUBTOTAL	22,347	0	18,000	13,500	53,847		
6. Art							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	750	0	0	0	750		
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	0	0		
Security Equipment	0	0	0	0	0		
Commissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	750	0	0	0	750		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		10/2000	10/2003	12/2005			
Inflation Multiplier		6.10%	21.10%	31.90%			
Inflation Cost		18	4,220	4,849	9,087		
SUBTOTAL							
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$25,663	\$318	\$24,220	\$20,049	\$70,250		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	25,663	318	24,220	20,049	70,250
State Funds Subtotal	25,663	318	24,220	20,049	70,250
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	25,663	318	24,220	20,049	70,250

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	318	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 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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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	
1998, Ch 404, Sec 14, Subd 2 & 3	7,950
1997, Ch 246, Sec 29 and 1996, Ch 463, Sec 13, Subd 4 & 6	9,935
1995 Spec Ses, Ch 2, Subd 3 and 1994 Ch 643, Sec 3, Subd 2 & 4	7,778

Department of Administration Analysis:

12/7/99

It would be important for the ultimate uses of the spaces within the capital (master plan) be agreed to by all parties in order for an accurate predesign to be prepared. These agreements may have major ramifications on future capital requests needed to house components currently within the capital. The strategic plan funds in the Admin request should be coordinated with this activity. A maintenance manual as traditionally defined should be part of a commissioning cost and not associated with predesign.

Department of Finance Analysis:

The funding of the predesign is essential for determining the scope of work needed inside the capitol building and the needed commitment of funding in future years.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$318 thousand 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	0
Customer Service/Statewide Significance	0/35/70/105	105
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	60
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	50
Total	700 Maximum	435

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$545

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 2

PROJECT LOCATION: Capitol Area, Saint Paul, MN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request is for design and completion of the first phase of construction leading to a comprehensive system of exterior lighting of the Capitol Building and its grounds, resulting in secure entrances, energy efficiency and historical and architectural accent lighting.

This project is part of the Capitol 2005 Strategic Plan, and meets its objectives of Capitol restoration with emphasis on preservation of the building envelope and improving accessibility and security by upgrading lighting at all building entrances and passage ways.

It is important to note that Phase I is architectural lighting of the facades of the Capitol, and that this is totally independent from any strategic plan or predesign for the interior of the building. The building needs to be lit, and by moving forward with Phase I, we can be assured that the building will be ready for its Centennial celebration in 2005. In addition, it is anticipated that new systems will achieve energy and cost savings, while delivering a more effective, pleasing, and efficient lighting to the most important public building in the State.

A previous appropriation for lighting (1998, Chapter 404) was for pedestrian lighting of pathways and plazas on the grounds and north of the Capitol Building. This new request is for the architectural façade lighting of this Phase I, intended to replace a variety of systems installed in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Special lighting for the building's entrances and key exterior spaces will be requested separately under Phase II.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

Energy savings resulting in lower operating costs are expected if 1970s technology is replaced by more energy-efficient lighting. As has happened with the 1994 retrofit of Capitol complex building interiors (e.g., the Centennial Building and the Department of Transportation Building), exterior lighting replacement could save 10-20% per year. New security measures will improve personal safety as well as building efficiency.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The CAAPB requested funds for a comprehensive lighting system for the Capitol

Building and adjacent grounds in 1998. The request was in response to the need to upgrade the level of lighting for security measures, personal safety, and enhance accessibility. In addition, replacement of older fixtures would provide life cycle, energy efficient savings, and integrate the Capitol area lighting standards with that of the city of Saint Paul. There was no funding of this request in 1998.

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

Paul Mandell, Principal Planner, CAAPB
204 Administration Building
Phone: 296-6719
Fax: 296-6718
Email: Paul.Mandell@state.mn.usp

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	15	25	0	0	40	04/1999	09/1999
SUBTOTAL							
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	7	30	0	37	06/2000	08/2000
Design Development	0	10	40	0	50	09/2000	12/2000
Contract Documents	0	20	80	0	100	01/2001	06/2001
Construction Administration	0	13	50	0	63	06/2001	02/2003
SUBTOTAL	0	50	200	0	250		
4. Project Management						02/2001	10/2001
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	10	50	0	60		
SUBTOTAL	0	10	50	0	60		
5. Construction Costs						02/2001	10/2001
Site & Building Preparation	0	10	50	0	60		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	10	25	0	35		
Construction	0	375	1,800	0	2,175		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	20	125	0	145		
SUBTOTAL	0	415	2,000	0	2,415		
6. Art	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL							
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		05/2001	10/2002				
Inflation Multiplier		9.00%	16.10%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		45	362	0	407		
SUBTOTAL							
9. Other	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL							
GRAND TOTAL	\$15	\$545	\$2,612	\$0	\$3,172		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	15	545	2,612	0	3,172
State Funds Subtotal	15	545	2,612	0	3,172
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	15	545	2,612	0	3,172

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	545	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	Requirement
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)
Yes	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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 MN 1998, Ch 404, Sec 14, Subd 4	15

Department of Administration Analysis:

12/7/99

It is difficult to fathom how the incremental components of requests for work on the capital are coordinated without agreement on and development of a predesign for the entire facility.

Department of Finance Analysis:

This project is in keeping with the CAAPB's mission and directive to enhance the dignity of the Capitol and its grounds.

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	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	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	295

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

Project Title	2000 Agency Priority Ranking	Agency Project Requests for State Funds (\$ by Session)				Statewide Strategic Score	Governor's Recommendation 2000	Governor's Planning Estimate	
		2000	2002	2004	Total			2002	2004
Kitchen Renovation	1	\$1,265	\$300	\$0	\$1,565	435	\$1,265	\$300	\$0
Asset Preservation	2	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500	410	1,500	1,500	1,500
Military Affairs/Emergency Mgmt Facility	3	202	2,885	32,857	35,944	305	0	0	0
Stillwater Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	5,195	0	5,195		0	0	0
Blaine Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	5,458	0	5,458		0	0	0
Anoka Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	0	5,720	5,720		0	0	0
Alexandria Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	0	4,434	4,434		0	0	0
Mankato Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	0	5,919	5,919		0	0	0
Cambridge Training/Comm Center (Armory)		0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Total Project Requests		\$2,967	\$15,338	\$50,430	\$68,735		\$2,765	\$1,800	\$1,500

This page intentionally left blank.

AGENCY MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of the Department of Military Affairs is to provide and manage the state resources necessary to "recruit and train a military force capable of accomplishing the federal, state, and community missions." The department leads and manages both federal and state programs.

Federal Mission: As a federal entity, the 11,600 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. Authority for the establishment of the National Guard is contained in Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

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. Other state missions include protecting the state's investment in facilities through a facilities maintenance program and supporting the recruiting efforts of the National Guard through incentive programs.

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" and become role models within their communities.

TRENDS, POLICIES AND OTHERS 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 and maintenance. The current inventory consists of over 1,400 facilities with more than of 3.6 million square feet.

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 stations for the almost 9,000 members of the Army National Guard. These facilities, located in 60 communities around the state, are also made available to local government, community organizations, and individuals for a wide variety of activities. The state currently has 61 armories with a total of almost 1.8 million square feet of space.

Over the last several years, there have been no 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 12 1/2%) 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 bonds. Without additional funding for replacement of aging facilities, the ability of the National Guard to train and house military units will continue to be severely impacted.

This lack of federal funding also impacts the ability to acquire additional units for the Minnesota National Guard. Because of the state's success in recruiting and retaining soldiers, the Army National Guard has acquired authorization for over 550 additional soldiers over the last 2 years. These authorizations bring federal funds for full-time employees and traditional soldier salaries into the state. However, without permanent facilities for the units and their equipment, we will no longer be able to attract additional force structure.

The federal government will generally not provide funds for maintenance and repair of current armory facilities. The state must pay all costs of operation and 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 snow emergency and flood disaster of 1996-1997, 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) continues to decline. 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 are supported 75% federally and 25% state. The federal money appropriated for this purpose has decreased significantly nationwide. We anticipate continued reductions in this funding over the next several federal fiscal years, with no return to prior funding levels.

The Air National Guard will continue to be a major part of overall Air Force mission support. As the size of the active Air Force continues to be reduced, indications are that the missions of the Air National Guard will increase 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 26 (43%) of department's 61 armory facilities are over 40 years old; 13 (21%) 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 estimated the current backlog of maintenance and repair at over \$21 million. The operating budget continues to be inadequate to reduce this backlog. Upgrading facilities to meet current code requirements becomes impractical as repairs become more extensive. For example, many of these facilities were constructed before air quality was an issue and consequently have poor air circulation and aging heating plants. Moreover, expansion to accommodate modern needs is often impractical in older facilities because they are built in areas that are now landlocked.

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

In 1987 the Department of Military Affairs began a program using any monies available from the operating budget to repair and maintain the exterior building envelope (roofs, walls and windows) of our armory buildings. Although the amount of money available has varied during these years, progress has been made. When all building envelopes are in sound watertight condition, repair and preventative maintenance work can be started on the interior of the buildings. However, it is costly to keep the envelopes in sound condition. For example, the roof systems of our 61 armories have a life expectancy of 15 to 20 years. That means we need to replace 3 to 4 roof systems per year, perpetually.

Since most new building facilities for the National Guard were funded primarily by federal grants in the past, the Department of Military Affairs had focused its capital budget requests on maintaining and upgrading of our existing buildings. With further reductions in federal funding for new and replacement facilities, it is imperative that we properly take care of our existing facilities and attempt to replace those facilities that become obsolete or prohibitively expensive to operate or maintain. The department also seeks to provide permanent facilities for newly acquired units so that we can avoid excessive lease costs.

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

- Maintain the health safety of the users of our facilities by upgrading and renovating the kitchens in all of our 25 year old or older buildings.
- Through an asset preservation program, upgrade or replace building components not covered under the CAPRA program. This is seen as an ongoing long-range need covering a certain number of buildings each 2-year period.
- Continue our program of repairing the exterior building envelope at all of the armory buildings. This will be accomplished primarily through CAPRA.
- 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. The department's goal is to replace at least 1 armory each year to avoid having an inventory of facilities that are seriously outdated and structurally unsound.
- Dispose of any unneeded facilities through sale to local governments or organizations or, if no buyer is found, to demolish the building and sell the land.

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 architectural and design specialists, environmental specialists, physical plant management staff, building maintenance coordinators, and other support staff. General maintenance workers assigned to the various facilities complete the routine janitorial and small repairs.

The asset preservation and facility improvement portions of the capital budget request are based on our ongoing facility inspections by our facilities management staff and input from National Guard unit administrators and general maintenance workers located in those facilities. 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 usable by tenant organizations.

The plan for new construction is based on ongoing evaluations of the facility inventory with respect to the 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, opportunities for joint construction projects that meet the needs of the department and local communities, and the need to replace 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 and stationing committee. This committee meets bi-monthly to review military force structure changes and determines how the facilities management staff must respond to accommodate anticipated changes. Additional information is provided by various National Guard directorates and through ad-hoc and standing committees using total quality principals. Demographics studies are also considered when making new siting decisions and when replacing existing facilities. All major projects are reviewed and approved by the facilities and stationing committee that makes recommendations to the Adjutant General for final approval.

Members of our Design and Construction Section staff estimated the project costs that were then reviewed by our staff architect.

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS (1994-1999):

1994: Kitchen renovations - \$366 thousand

1996: Kitchens renovated in Cloquet, Grand Rapids, Hibbing, Chisholm, & St. James, Red Wing, Hastings, Pipestone, and Willmar - \$400 thousand

Numerous asset preservation projects (e.g., new roof at Hibbing Maintenance Shop; roof repairs at Faribault, Owatonna, Appleton Maintenance Shop, and Redwood Falls) - \$500 thousand

1998: Kitchen renovations in Marshall, Litchfield, Anoka, Fergus Falls, Pine City, Thief River Falls, Bemidji, and Detroit Lakes - \$880 thousand (Should be completed by the end of calendar year 1999.)

Asset Preservation projects at St. Paul, Mankato, and New Ulm - \$250 thousand

This page intentionally left blank.

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,265

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: 10 Locations, Statewide

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This request is for funding to renovate 10 armory kitchens that are between 30 and 71 years old and do not meet modern health or building codes. For example, the counter tops are either damaged vinyl or laminated; the wood cabinets are broken; and dishwashing sinks are inadequate and unsanitary. The renovations include new code compliant stainless steel cabinets, sinks and counter tops; and Ansul Fire Suppression Systems for the cooking range. The improvements involve all installed equipment requiring significant changes to electrical, plumbing and drainage systems as well as improvements to food preparation and service areas. If properly maintained, these kitchens should have a useful life of over 25 years.

The original Capital Budget request for 30 kitchens was submitted in F.Y. 1994. Funding for 10 of the 30 kitchens was provided in the F.Y. 1994-1995 Capital Budget. Of the 10 kitchens funded, 9 were designed and bid in February 1996. Of these 9 kitchen projects bid, only 5 could be completed within the funds appropriated. The remaining kitchens were rescheduled.

In F.Y. 1996, \$400 thousand was provided for the next 10 kitchens. To help control costs, neighboring kitchens were paired so that bids covered the cost of 2 kitchens. Of this second group, the funding was adequate to complete 4 more kitchen projects. Of the remaining kitchens 4 were rescheduled and 2 were cancelled (one due to availability of other facilities and the other due to unit restructuring).

The 8 kitchens scheduled for F.Y. 1998-99 are under construction and should be completed within the \$800 thousand budget by the end of the calendar year.

Remodeling of the 11 remaining kitchens is as follows:

F.Y. 2000-01 (\$1,265 thousand)		F.Y. 2002-03 (\$300 thousand)
Sauk Centre	Mankato	Redwood Falls
Alexandria	Madison	
Morris	Wadena	
Ortonville	Olivia	
Fairmont	Winona	

The costs shown for F.Y. 2002-03 are higher because the Redwood Falls site requires an addition to the building to meet the code requirements of remodeling the

kitchen.

This project is a significant, permanent and long overdue major improvement to our armory facilities. It is critical that these kitchens be renovated in a timely fashion to avoid potential health hazards to National Guard members and community members using the facilities. The need for kitchen facilities to support long-term disaster housing and facility use of the armories was demonstrated during the spring floods of 1997.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET (FACILITIES NOTE):

No impact.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

In-house architects will design these renovations with outside consultants performing the mechanical and electrical engineering design.

While working with the state Department of Health to conduct the design review on the first set of kitchens, it was learned that the existing galvanized steel range hoods would also need to be replaced as they do meet current health codes. Additionally, according to the latest edition of the State Building Code, range hoods must now have makeup ventilation air systems. These items along with design fees were not anticipated when the original budget estimates were prepared.

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

Mr. Thomas Vesely, Architectural Supervisor
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, MN 56345
Phone: (320) 632-7570
Fax: (320)-632-7473
Email: veselyt@mn-arng.ngb.army.mil

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development	0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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	06/2003
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	1,646	1,265	300	0	3,211		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	1,646	1,265	300	0	3,211		
6. Art	0	0	0	0	0		
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							
Inflation Multiplier		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%			
Inflation Cost		0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,646	\$1,265	\$300	\$0	\$3,211		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	1,646	1,265	300	0	3,211
State Funds Subtotal	1,646	1,265	300	0	3,211
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	1,646	1,265	300	0	3,211

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,265	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 (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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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	
FY98 Chapter 404, Section 16, Subdivision 2	880
FY96, Chapter 463, Section 15, Subdivision 3	400
FY94, Chapter 643, Section 12	366

Department of Administration Analysis:

NA

Department of Finance Analysis:

This request is to rehabilitate 10 armory kitchens located throughout the state. It is the fourth phase of a multi-phase project, to renovate 30 kitchens that are between 30 and 71 years old. Previously the department has been appropriated:

<u>F.Y.</u>	<u>\$ in thousands</u>	<u># of Kitchens</u>	<u>Cost Per Kitchen</u>
94	\$336	5	\$67.2
96	\$400	4	\$100
98	\$880	8	\$110

This request averages \$126.5 thousand per kitchen. Increased costs are due to inflation and increased Department of Health and State Building Code Standards. The fifth and final phase is expected in F.Y.2002.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.265 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$300 thousand in 2002.

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	35
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	100
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	60
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	0
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	50
Total	700 Maximum	435

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,500

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: Various, Statewide Locations

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 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 non-CAPRA projects.

Detailed facility audits have revealed a growing backlog of maintenance and renovation requests in excess of \$19 million. Facility aging creates additional maintenance and repair problems. Currently, the average age of the department's armory facilities is 37 years. Phasing of asset preservation projects is (in priority order):

- 1) Safety/liability related projects,
- 2) Sanitary issues (e.g., toilet facilities, vehicle garages),
- 3) Functionality projects (e.g., rehabilitation of training rooms, lighting), and
- 4) Aesthetics/comfort projects if funding remains.

Some examples of safety/liability issues that are included within the scope of this project are: National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) violations, exit/egress lighting upgrades, repairs to curbs, sidewalks and building entrances, updating of electrical service, renovating vehicle garages 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.

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 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 CAPRA/Asset Preservation list, while at the same time methodically eliminating the existing "iceberg" of projects. Funding at the levels requested can be efficiently managed by the department personnel and parallels backlog reduction goals identified in the agency performance report.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGETS (FACILITIES NOTE):

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.

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

Mr. Richard Post, Director of Public Works
Camp Ripley, ATTN: MNAG-DPW
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls MN 56345-4173
Phone: (320) 632-7341
Fax: (320) 632-7710

Terrence J. Palmer
Comptroller, Dept of Military Affairs
Veterans Service Building
St. Paul MN 55155-2098
Phone: (651) 282-4678
Fax: (651) 282-4493
Email: palmert@mn-arng.ngb.army.mil

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources		Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	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	0	0	0	0		
3. Design Fees								
Schematic		0	0	0	0	0		
Design Development		0	0	0	0	0		
Contract Documents		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Administration		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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								
Site & Building Preparation		0	0	0	0	0		
Demolition/Decommissioning		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction		0	0	0	0	0		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities		0	0	0	0	0		
Hazardous Material Abatement		0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency		0	0	0	0	0		
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
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			07/2000	07/2002	07/2004			
Inflation Multiplier			4.80%	14.80%	24.80%			
Inflation Cost	SUBTOTAL		0	0	0	0		
9. Other								
	SUBTOTAL	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500	07/2000	06/2002
	GRAND TOTAL	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$4,500		

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
Fiscal Years 2000-2005
Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500
State Funds Subtotal	0	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500
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	1,500	1,500	1,500	4,500

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	1,500	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 (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)

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		0	0	0	0
Change in F.T.E. Personnel		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Department of Administration Analysis:

Admin supports Asset Preservation requests.

Department of Finance Analysis:

This project seeks to protect the state's investment in the buildings operated by Military Affairs. To help properly manage these assets the department produces an annual report listing repairs needed at each site and its cost. That list, as it has for the recent appropriations, details projects to be funded by this request.

Over the past several years the department has received general fund appropriations to help ease its backlog:

<u>Legal Citation</u>	<u>Amount Appropriated</u>
Laws of 1999, Ch 250, Art 1, Sec 17, Subd. 2	\$2 million
Laws of 1998, Ch 404, Sec 16	\$250 thousand
Laws of 1997, Ch 202, Art 1, Sec 18, Subd. 2	\$950 thousand

A sizable amount of work remains unfunded and exceeds the department's ability to accomplish within their operating budget. The department believes that they can successfully make needed repairs totaling their current funding as well as the \$1.5 million requested here.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.5 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$1.5 million in 2002 and \$1.5 million in 2004.

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	35
Agency Priority	0/25/50/75/100	75
User and Non-State Financing	0-100	0
State Asset Management	0/20/40/60	40
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	410

2000 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$202

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: St Paul MN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project funds the planning and predesign of a new joint facility to house the Department of Military Affairs Training and Community Center (TACC) and the Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety. This project includes parking and would be located in St. Paul on property to be acquired by the state of Minnesota.

This proposed facility would house administrative, training, and educational activities of the Minnesota National Guard and would provide space for storage, emergency operations, and to reconstitute agencies of state government in a disaster. This project envisions the construction of a specially designed (estimated 189 thousand square foot) facility of permanent, masonry type construction and concrete slab floor. Included will be all utilities, pre-wired workstations, military vehicle parking, required testing, privately owned vehicle parking, mechanical and electrical equipment, security fencing, flagpole, sidewalks, and security lighting. The facility will utilize the most economical energy sources available at the proposed location and provide infrastructure that would allow for maintaining technologically modern equipment over the life of the facility.

The department is currently housed in the Veterans Service Building and in the Armory on Cedar Street. Both of these buildings are fully occupied and have no room left for growth. Neither building has enough space to adequately house current staff or the anticipated additional required staff. Some agency staff, who should be at the headquarters, are housed throughout the metro area. There is also a severe lack of storage space. Both buildings are woefully inadequate for the department's technology needs. Temperature, air quality, and humidity control in both these facilities are inadequate. Although, most agree that the Department of Military Affairs and the Division of Emergency Management could best serve the citizens of the state if they were co-located, there is not sufficient space to accommodate this.

Staff Operating Space Requirements. The department has outgrown its current space. The staff located in the Veterans Services building has grown from 52 in 1975 to over 131 today. Additional staff, that could better serve the Adjutant General if co-located with the headquarters, are currently housed throughout the metro area. Staff consolidation would increase operating efficiencies and save travel expenses and fax line use charges.

The federally mandated electronic records storage project requires consolidation and

electronic storage of all Army National Guard personnel files at this office. This will require space for an additional 25 staff members and an increase in the demands on the electrical wiring and data cabling. The state has also received authorization for an additional 22 person Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) element designed to enhance the local, state, and federal agency response in case of a weapons of mass destruction incident. There is not enough space available at the Veterans Service Building to accommodate these operations.

The information management section, which provides communications and computer networking services to all our facilities throughout the state, has grown from a one-person operation in 1985 to a 16-person shop. The section has completely outgrown the space currently occupied and has had to move the growing array of the computer server and networking systems into the back office, sharing office space with employees.

Military Affairs Staff and Activity Consolidation. Activities currently located at the Cedar Street Armory, the Veterans Service Building, and the Roseville Armory would be consolidated at this facility. Some of this staff should be co-located with the Adjutant General but has not been possible to due to lack of space at the Veterans Service Building. This consolidation would allow:

- More efficient operations and more effective communication.
- Better sharing of all resources – space and equipment.
- More rapid response to citizens of the state in times of emergencies.

Storage Space Requirements. The electronic records storage project will eventually provide on-line access to personnel records of all MN Army National Guard soldiers. Electronic records storage systems must be in place by the end of 1999. This electronic storage will at some point alleviate the hard copy storage space requirements. However, until the system's stability and reliability are assessed, hard copy records for each soldier, accession records for each new member, and discharge records for those leaving the MN Army National Guard must be maintained. Storage space for all hard copy will also be required until the MN State Historical Society grants permission to transfer or dispose of these records. There is no more storage space available in the Veterans Service Building, and records are now being stored at the Cedar Street Armory under less than ideal conditions.

Veterans Service Building Obsolescence. The current leased space in the Veterans Service Building has become grossly inadequate for support of Minnesota National Guard missions. The facility is technologically obsolete and further communications and data cabling has become impossible due to asbestos ceiling tiles. The electrical wiring was not designed to handle the current loads imposed by

modern office equipment and computers. The building does not allow the technical needs of the department to be met.

Cedar St. Armory Obsolescence. The existing St. Paul (Cedar Street) Armory was constructed in 1962 and is no longer a viable facility. The building is beyond its useful life: it is no longer suitable to support required training and it requires extensive life/safety updating to be in compliance with present-day codes and standards. The building has progressed to the point of obsolescence where any further investment is not economically prudent. It has become increasingly difficult for the units housed there to operate efficiently due to critical space shortages. More modern space allowances provide for computer, communications, and office machinery that were not provided for in this facility. As of the submission of this budget, deferred maintenance on this facility is estimated at over \$80 thousand.

Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC). Temperature, air quality, and humidity control in both these facilities is inadequate causing un-healthy work conditions for our employees and the potential for equipment failures from heat stress. Employees are currently subjected to widely varying temperatures throughout the day.

State Function Consolidation. This facility would also provide 25 thousand square feet for the Division of Emergency Management (DEM), Department of Public Safety. This division is the state entity responsible for the coordination of emergency services during a natural or man made disaster. The state mission of the National Guard and the emergency response mission of DEM are very closely related. Indeed, it was discovered during the flood crisis of the spring of 1997, that interagency coordination, planning, and statewide responses were clearly enhanced by co-location of DEM and Military Affairs.

DEM's conventional office space is dedicated to daily activities; it is reasonable to share its operations center and business recovery center with other similarly directed agencies, such as Military Affairs. A National Guard TACC would include many similar spaces, which could be jointly shared with DEM. Shower rooms, locker rooms, kitchen space, and communication area are several areas that should be explored for joint use. Additionally, it may be practical to configure, equip, and construct the National Guard's assembly hall space in such a manner that would enable it to be used for a business recovery center. Wiring, cable trays, and conduit could be installed in the floor which would make it simple to bring in voice and data lines for government agency re-constitution.

State Must Support the National Guard. The National Guard is a unique organization. While the federal government provides the vast majority (95%) of funding, the National Guard remains, first and foremost, a state program under the control of the governor until mobilized for federal duty. Over the last 10 years, the National Guard has been mobilized for 37,307 state active duty days, and mobilized

for federal duty for a total of 55,922 days.

IMPACT ON AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET (FACILITIES NOTE):

The majority of the department staff, now located in the Veterans Service Building, will move to the new facility, lowering the cost of leasing this space in the Veterans Service Building and freeing it up for its intended purpose - supporting and housing veterans' groups. Currently, DMA leases approximately 26 thousand square feet in the Veterans Service Building (VSB). This leased space requirement would be reduced to less than 3 thousand square feet at the VSB.

The existing Cedar Street facility is also extremely expensive to operate and maintain. Numerous window air conditioners are currently used to maintain reasonable operating temperature during warm weather. The department expects that a new facility, with more efficient HVAC systems, will be less costly to operate.

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

Terrence J. Palmer
Comptroller, Dept of Military Affairs
Veterans Service Building
St. Paul MN 55155-2098
Phone: (651) 282-4678
Fax: (651) 282-4493
E-mail: palmert@mn-arng.ngb.army.mil

Mr. Ron Feia, Facilities Planner
Camp Ripley, ATTN: MNAG-FMO-O
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls MN 56345-4173
Phone: (320) 632-7485
Fax: (320) 632-7473
Email: feiar@mn-arng.ngb.army.mil

Kevin Leuer
Director of Emergency Management
444 Cedar Street, Suite 223
Saint Paul, MN 55101-6223
Phone: (651) 296-0459
Fax: (651) 296-0459
Email: kevin.leuer@state.mn.us

AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST
 Fiscal Years 2000-2005
 Dollars in Thousands (\$137,500 = \$138)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and All Funding Sources	Project Costs All Prior Years	Project Costs FY 2000-01	Project Costs FY 2002-03	Project Costs FY 2004-05	Project Costs All Years	Project Start (Month/Year)	Project Finish (Month/Year)
1. Property Acquisition							
Land, Land and Easements, Options	\$220	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$220		
Buildings and Land	0	0	0	0	0		
SUBTOTAL	220	0	0	0	220		
2. Predesign	400	198	0	0	598	07/1998	07/2002
SUBTOTAL	400	198	0	0	598		
3. Design Fees							
Schematic	0	0	240	0	240	07/2002	04/2003
Design Development	0	0	1,200	0	1,200	07/2002	07/2003
Contract Documents	0	0	720	0	720	07/2002	07/2003
Construction Administration	0	0	240	0	240	07/2002	06/2005
SUBTOTAL	0	0	2,400	0	2,400		
4. Project Management						08/2003	06/2005
State Staff Project Management	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Management	0	0	0	460	460		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	460	460		
5. Construction Costs						08/2003	06/2005
Site & Building Preparation	0	0	0	100	100		
Demolition/Decommissioning	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction	0	0	0	23,000	23,000		
Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities	0	0	0	200	200		
Hazardous Material Abatement	0	0	0	0	0		
Construction Contingency	0	0	0	1,100	1,100		
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	24,400	24,400		
6. Art	0	0	0	200	200	04/2005	06/2005
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	200	200		
7. Occupancy							
Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0	0	0	200	200	08/2003	05/2005
Telecommunications (voice & data)	0	0	0	400	400	08/2003	05/2005
Security Equipment	0	0	0	300	300	08/2003	05/2005
Commissioning	0	0	0	200	200	08/2003	05/2005
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	1,100	1,100		
8. Inflation							
Midpoint of Construction		12/1999	08/2003	09/2004			
Inflation Multiplier		1.90%	20.20%	25.60%			
SUBTOTAL		4	485	6,697	7,186		
Inflation Cost							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
9. Other							
SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0		
GRAND TOTAL	\$620	\$202	\$2,885	\$32,857	\$36,564		

CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES	Prior Years	FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	TOTAL
State Funds :					
G.O Bonds/State Bldgs	620	202	2,885	32,857	36,564
State Funds Subtotal	620	202	2,885	32,857	36,564
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	620	202	2,885	32,857	36,564

IMPACT ON STATE OPERATING COSTS	Current FY 2000-01	Projected Costs (Without Inflation)			
		FY 2000-01	FY 2002-03	FY 2004-05	FY 2006-07
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 2000-01		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 1998, Chapter 404, Section 16, Subdivision 4	100
Laws of 1996, Chapter 463, Section 15, Subdivision 4	220
Laws of 1994, Chapter 643, Section 2, Subdivision 7	100
Laws of 1991, Chapter 345, Article 1, Section 108 to use unencumbered balances from Laws 1984, Chapter 597, Section 9(d)	0
	200

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects)	Amount	Percent of Total
General Fund	202	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 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:

This request follows the preferred sequence of funding for capital projects being, predesign, design, and construction. There does appear to be a number of questions regarding the responsibility for providing such a facility that should be determined prior to the initiation of predesign so that funding this request proves fruitful.

The predesign amount is 2.5% instead of the range of .05-1.0%, please justify.

Department of Finance Analysis:

The Department of Military Affairs has genuine concerns regarding space issues. These problems include over-crowding, inadequate technological capacity and limited storage requirements. Until a statewide plan to house state agencies is completed it is impossible to determine the "best" solution to solve these problems.

Governor's Recommendation:

The Governor does not recommend capital funds directly for this project, but does recommend funding to the Department of Administration for development of a new *Strategic Plan for Locating State Agencies*. This strategic plan would examine the space needs of a variety of state agencies and set funding priorities accordingly.

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	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	20
State Operating Savings or Operating Efficiencies	0/20/40/60	20
Contained in State Six-Year Planning Estimates	0/25/50	25
Total	700 Maximum	305

HJ 11 .M6425c 2000/2005 Stat
Minnesota. Governor.
Minnesota strategic capital
budget plan

HJ 11 .M6425c 2000/2005 Stat
Minnesota. Governor.
Minnesota strategic capital
budget plan

DATE	ISSUED TO
MAR 03 '03	

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
645 State Office Building
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

DEMCO