Military Affairs, Department of

Projects Summary (\$ in Thousands)

| Project Title | 2008 Agency Priority | Agency Project Request for State Funds (\$ by Session) | | Governor's Recommendations 2008 | Gover Planr Estin | ning | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Ranking | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | Total | | 2010 | 2012 |
| Asset Preservation | 1 | \$7,000 | \$8,000 | \$8,500 | \$23,500 | \$5,500 | \$5,500 | \$5,500 |
| Facility Life Safety | 2 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| ADA Alterations | 3 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 3,300 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 |
| Camp Ripley Billeting | | 0 | 5,400 | 0 | 5,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | \$9,500 | \$15,300 | \$10,400 | \$35,200 | \$8,000 | \$7,400 | \$7,400 |

Agency Profile At A Glance

- There are currently 13,293 military members of the Minnesota National Guard.
- ◆ The Department of Military Affairs manages 2.1 million square feet (SF) of facilities within 1,430 buildings on 54,496 acres at Camp Ripley and Arden Hills; 694,000 square feet (SF) within 46 logistical support buildings at nine locations; and 1.8 million SF in 62 National Guard Training and Community Centers (armories).
- ♦ The agency annually supports 2,500 National Guard men and women through its tuition reimbursement program.
- ◆ The department has overseen 64,721 National Guard "man-days" in response to state emergencies since 1998.

Agency Purpose

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

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

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

Core Functions

The MDMA provides the structure and resources to accomplish the four core programs that support the Minnesota National Guard:

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

Operations

The department's customer base is the 13,293 members of the Minnesota Army and Air National Guard, the directors and managers responsible for the execution of the federal-state cooperative agreements, and the citizens of the state and nation during emergencies. The Minnesota National Guard has never been more engaged in world-wide missions. The National Guard is no longer a cold-war era, strategic reserve force, but rather it is an operational force being utilized daily in the war on terrorism. Since 9/11 and as of August 2006, the Minnesota National Guard has deployed 14,662 Army and Air Guard members.

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

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

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

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

Budget

Of the department's total budget, 68 percent comes from the federal government through cooperative agreements for facilities maintenance, telecommunications, security, firefighting, and the STARBASE educational program serving inner city school students. The state general fund accounts for 30 percent, and approximately two percent comes from other sources (local government, facility sales, housing operations, etc.).

Additionally, the MDMA is also responsible for approximately \$310 million per year from the federal government. These funds come directly from the federal government, do not pass through the state treasury, and are paid to individuals and vendors for federal-related activities.

The department's staff includes 273 employees. Only 31 of these employees are 100 percent state-funded. The remainder are predominantly federally funded -- some at 100 percent and most others at 75 percent or 80 percent.

Contact

Department of Military Affairs Veterans Service Building 20 West 12th Street Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

World Wide Web Home Page: http://www.minnesotanationalguard.org

Major General Larry W. Shellito The Adjutant General Phone: (651) 268-8924

Fax: (651) 282-4541

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

At A Glance: Agency Long-Range Strategic Goals

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

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

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

The state of Minnesota has a significant inventory of facilities used by the Minnesota Army National Guard. These include armories, logistical facilities, and various other training facilities located throughout the state. Although state owned, most of these facilities were constructed with some level of federal support and many of them receive federal support for operations. The current inventory consists of over 1,550 facilities with more than 4.4 million square feet of space. The agency's asset preservation program has been developed as an ongoing, long-range program covering a certain number of facilities each capital bonding period. The Department of Military Affairs has increased its request for asset preservation funds to mitigate the impact of the reduction in the CAPRA funds available to agencies of state government.

Armories – The Department of Military Affairs' mission requires a significant investment in training and administrative facilities. The most recognizable of these facilities is the armory. Also known as National Guard Training and Community Centers, armories serve as the home station for the almost 11,000 members of the Army National Guard. These facilities, located in 62

communities around the state, are also made available to local government, community organizations, and individuals for a wide variety of activities. The armories provide the department with a total of almost 1.6 million square feet of space.

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

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

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

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

called to state service by the governor and to house citizens and emergency responders during emergencies.

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

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

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

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

Some of these facilities have outlived their useful lives. Structural, electrical, plumbing, roof, window, and heating plant repairs are becoming prohibitively expensive and more frequently required. The department has a maintenance backlog estimated at over \$28 million. The operating budget continues to be inadequate to make an appreciable reduction in this maintenance backlog,

although we have reduced the backlog over the last year utilizing the capital appropriations given to out department in prior years. Upgrading facilities to meet current code requirements becomes impractical as repairs become more extensive and expensive. For example, many of these facilities were constructed before indoor air quality was recognized as a work-place issue, and consequently they have poor air circulation and aging heating plants. Moreover, expansion to accommodate modern needs is often impractical in older facilities because they are now land-locked.

Agency Process Used to Arrive at These Capital Requests

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

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

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

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

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

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

Major Capital Projects Authorized in 2002 through 2006

| 2002: | Asset Preservation statewide | \$2.5 million |
|-------|--|-----------------|
| | ADA Improvements statewide | \$357,000 |
| | Facility Life-Safety statewide | \$1 million |
| | Capital Asset Preservation and Replacement Account (CAPRA) Roof and Boiler | \$1.005 million |
| | CAPRA Emergency Lead Abatement | \$150,000 |
| 2005 | Asset Preservation statewide | \$4 million |
| 2006 | Asset Preservation statewide | \$4 million |
| | Facility Life-Safety statewide | \$1 million |
| | Lead abatement/indoor range conversion | \$1.029 million |
| | ADA Compliance Improvements | \$1.4 million |

Asset Preservation

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

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

Project Description

This request addresses 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 2.6 million square feet of training and housing buildings at Camp Ripley. The department uses asset preservation funding to 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 indepth facilities audits with our facility managers to identify deferred maintenance needs. This process helped the department determine how large its portion of the "Capital Iceberg" had become. The current operating budget has, at best, been able to keep up with necessary priority repairs, leaving a growing backlog of projects.

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

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

Some examples of safety/liability issues that are included within the scope of this project are: repairs to curbs, sidewalks and building entrances; and updating electrical service and 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
- Other projects which extend the life of the facility

Asset Preservation Programming:

2008 2010 2012 \$7 million \$8 million \$8.5 million

Priority projects include:

- ♦ Hutchinson, Fairmont, St. James, Morris, East St. Paul Boiler;
- ◆ St. Cloud, Bemidji Roof;
- ♦ Moorhead, Crookston Batched
- ◆ Sauk Centre, Morris Batched;
- Hutchinson, St James Batched;
- ◆ St James, Fairmont Batched

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

Asset Preservation

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 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 Notes)

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

Previous Appropriations for this Project

Bonding Bill year:

2006 \$4 million 2005 \$4 million 2002 \$2.5 million

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer, Comptroller Department of Military Affairs Veterans Service Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098

Phone: (651) 268-8948 Fax: (651) 282-4541

Email: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Colonel Bruce Jensen
Facilities Management Officer
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2602 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: bruce.jensen@mn.ngb.army.mil

Thomas Vesely
Facilities Management Office - Design and Construction
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2614 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: tom.veselv@mn.ngb.armv.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$5.5 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$5.5 million in 2010 and \$5.5 million in 2012.

Asset Preservation

Project Detail (\$ in Thousands)

| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|---|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Property Acquisition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Predesign Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Design Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Project Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Construction Costs | 10,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 8,500 | 34,000 |
| 6. One Percent for Art | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Relocation Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Occupancy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Inflation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 10,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 8,500 | 34,000 |

| CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--------|
| State Funds : | | | | | |
| G.O Bonds/State Bldgs | 10,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 8,500 | 34,000 |
| State Funds Subtotal | 10,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 8,500 | 34,000 |
| 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 | 10,500 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 8,500 | 34,000 |

| CHANGES IN STATE | Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation) | | | |
|---|--|------------|------------|-------|
| OPERATING COSTS | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
| Compensation Program and Building Operation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Program Related Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Operating Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Repair and Replacement Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expenditure Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Revenue Offsets | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change in F.T.E. Personnel | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects) | Amount | Percent of Total |
|--|--------|---------------------|
| General Fund | 7,000 | 100.0% |
| User Financing | 0 | 0.0% |

| ОТ | ATUTODY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS | | | | | |
| | roject applicants should be aware that the | | | | | |
| follo | wing requirements will apply to their projects | | | | | |
| | after adoption of the bonding bill. | | | | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major | | | | | |
| INO | Remodeling Review (by Legislature) | | | | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review | | | | | |
| INO | Required (by Administration Dept) | | | | | |
| Yes | MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy | | | | | |
| 165 | Conservation Requirements | | | | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology | | | | | |
| INO | Review (by Office of Technology) | | | | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required | | | | | |
| No | MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required | | | | | |
| No | MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review | | | | | |
| INO | Required (by granting agency) | | | | | |
| No | Matching Funds Required (as per agency | | | | | |
| 110 | request) | | | | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2013 | | | | | |

Facility Life Safety

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 2 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

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

Project Description

This request seeks funding to address required Life/Safety alterations to existing National Guard Training/Community Centers (Armories) throughout the state. Requested project funding would greatly enhance personnel safety.

These projects are considered significant, permanent and major improvements to our armory facilities. Many of the armories have been used for emergency shelters. Some facilities do not meet current building code standards and personnel are working in potentially dangerous/unsafe buildings, where there might be mold, no egress in case of fire, poor ventilation, asbestos, etc. Projects to be funded by this request will provide needed improvements in the facilities that will make their use much safer. Specific projects could include installing fire and/or smoke alarm systems, emergency egress lighting, ventilation system improvements, etc.

Life/safety upgrades and repairs are generally matched with three federal for each state dollar.

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

| FY 2008-09 (\$1,000,000) | FY 2010-2011 (\$1,000,000) | FY 2011-12 (\$1,000,000) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| St. James | Willmar | Rochester |
| Crookston | St. Cloud | Winona |
| Hutchinson | Pipestone | Hastings |
| Sauk Centre | Detroit Lakes | Pine City |
| East St. Paul | Litchfield | Anoka |
| Morris | Fergus Falls | St. Peter |
| Fairmont | Roseville | |
| Moorhead | | |

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$1 million in 2006 bonding bill \$1 million in 2002 bonding bill

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer Comptroller Department of Military Affairs Veterans Service Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098

Phone: (651) 282-8948 Fax: (651) 282-4493

Email: terry.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Colonel Bruce Jensen
Facilities Management Officer
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4

Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2602 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: bruce.jensen@mn.ngb.army.mil

Military Affairs, Department of

Project Narrative

Facility Life Safety

Thomas Vesely
Facilities Management Office-Design and Construction
Camp Ripley
15000 Highway 115
Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2614 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: tom.vesely@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$1 million in 2010 and \$1 million in 2012.

| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|---|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Property Acquisition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Predesign Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Design Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Project Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Construction Costs | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| 6. One Percent for Art | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Relocation Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Occupancy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Inflation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |

| CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|
| State Funds : | | | | | |
| G.O Bonds/State Bldgs | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| State Funds Subtotal | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| 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 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |

| CHANGES IN STATE | Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation) | | | |
|---|--|------------|------------|-------|
| OPERATING COSTS | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
| Compensation Program and Building Operation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Program Related Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Operating Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Repair and Replacement Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expenditure Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Revenue Offsets | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change in F.T.E. Personnel | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects) | Amount | Percent of Total |
|--|--------|---------------------|
| General Fund | 1000 | 100.0% |
| User Financing | 0 | 0.0% |

| ST | ATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Project applicants should be aware that the | | | | |
| follo | following requirements will apply to their projects | | | |
| | after adoption of the bonding bill. | | | |
| NI- | MS 16B 335 (1a): Construction/Major | | | |
| No | Remodeling Review (by Legislature) | | | |
| Na | MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review | | | |
| No | Required (by Administration Dept) | | | |
| Yes | MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy | | | |
| 165 | Conservation Requirements | | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology | | | |
| INO | Review (by Office of Technology) | | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required | | | |
| No | MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required | | | |
| NIa | MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review | | | |
| No | Required (by granting agency) | | | |
| NI- | Matching Funds Required (as per agency | | | |
| No | request) | | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2013 | | | |

ADA Alterations

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 3 of 3

PROJECT LOCATION: Statewide

Project At A Glance

- ♦ Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) alterations to existing National Guard Training/Community Centers throughout the state.
- ♦ Will match \$1.2 million of federal funds to this \$1.5 million state request (Shared 50/50 for most projects).

Project Description

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

This program makes significant, permanent and major improvements to our armory and training facilities. Conversion and improvement of space allows unrestricted entry/egress by disabled persons. Many of our facilities are used as emergency shelters and for community events. Unfortunately, many are not handicap accessible. Accessibility is becoming even more important to National Guard operations as the facilities are used for meetings and support events for families of deployed service members. Some current facilities may also not be accessible by returning, injured/disabled service members.

In the request for 2008-09, all the buildings would have building access, toilet room and doorway upgrades to meet the Minnesota Accessibility Code. In addition, the Madison facility would require an elevator be installed due to its downtown location, which lacks the onsite property necessary to build an access ramp. Federal match is not available for this purpose.

Projects are programmed as indicated in the following table (programmed locations may vary within the three biennia):

| FY 2008-09 (\$1,500,000) | FY 2010-2011 (\$900,000) | FY 2012-2013 (\$900,000) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| St. James | Willmar | Rochester |
| Crookston | St. Cloud | Winona |
| Hutchinson | Pipestone | Pine City |
| Sauk Centre | Detroit Lakes | Hastings |
| East St. Paul | Litchfield | Anoka |
| Morris | Fergus Falls | St. Peter |
| Fairmont | Roseville | |
| Moorhead | | |
| Madison | | |

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$1.4 million in 2006 bonding bill \$357,000 in 2002 bonding bill

Project Contact Person

Terrence J. Palmer, Comptroller Department of Military Affairs Veterans Service Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-2098

Phone: (651) 282-8948 Fax: (651) 282-4493

Email: terrence.palmer@mn.ngb.army.mil

Colonel Bruce Jensen, Facilities Management Officer Camp Ripley 15000 Highway 115

Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2602 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: bruce.jensen@mn.ngb.army.mil

Military Affairs, Department of

Project Narrative

ADA Alterations

Thomas Vesely, Facilities Management Office – Design and Construction Camp Ripley 15000 Highway 115 Little Falls, Minnesota 56345-4173

Phone: (320) 616-2614 Fax: (320) 632-7473

Email: tom.vesely@mn.ngb.army.mil

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$1.5 million for this project. Also included are budget planning estimates of \$900,000 in 2010 and \$900,000 in 2012.

| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS All Years and Funding Sources | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|---|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| Property Acquisition | 1 Hor rears | 112000-09 | 1 1 2010-11 | 1 1 2012-13 | TOTAL |
| | U | U | U | U | U |
| 2. Predesign Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3. Design Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Project Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Construction Costs | 1,757 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 5,057 |
| 6. One Percent for Art | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Relocation Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Occupancy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Inflation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1,757 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 5,057 |

| CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES | Prior Years | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|
| State Funds : | | | | | |
| G.O Bonds/State Bldgs | 1,757 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 5,057 |
| State Funds Subtotal | 1,757 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 5,057 |
| 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 | 1,757 | 1,500 | 900 | 900 | 5,057 |

| CHANGES IN STATE | Changes in State Operating Costs (Without Inflation) | | | |
|---|--|------------|------------|-------|
| OPERATING COSTS | FY 2008-09 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2012-13 | TOTAL |
| Compensation Program and Building Operation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Program Related Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Operating Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Building Repair and Replacement Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nonstate-Owned Lease Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expenditure Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Revenue Offsets | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Change in F.T.E. Personnel | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS (for bond-financed projects) | Amount | Percent of Total |
|--|--------|---------------------|
| General Fund | 1,500 | 100.0% |
| User Financing | 0 | 0.0% |

| | ATUTODY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| STATUTORY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS | | | |
| Project applicants should be aware that the | | | |
| follo | following requirements will apply to their projects | | |
| | after adoption of the bonding bill. | | |
| No MS 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major | | | |
| INO | Remodeling Review (by Legislature) | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (3): Predesign Review | | |
| INO | Required (by Administration Dept) | | |
| Yes | MS 16B.335 and MS 16B.325 (4): Energy | | |
| 165 | Conservation Requirements | | |
| No | MS 16B.335 (5): Information Technology | | |
| INO | Review (by Office of Technology) | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.695: Public Ownership Required | | |
| No | MS 16A.695 (2): Use Agreement Required | | |
| NI- | MS 16A.695 (4): Program Funding Review | | |
| No | Required (by granting agency) | | |
| No | Matching Funds Required (as per agency | | |
| | request) | | |
| Yes | MS 16A.642: Project Cancellation in 2013 | | |