

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CAPITAL OUTLAY
BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (COBCP)
COVER PAGE (REV 06/15)

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
915 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
IMS Mail Code: A15

BUDGET YEAR 2016-17

BUSINESS UNIT: 5225 COBCP NO: 3 PRIORITY: 1 PROJECT ID: 0000922

DEPARTMENT: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

PROJECT TITLE: Statewide: Master Plan for Renovation/Replacement of Original Prisons

TOTAL REQUEST (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS): \$5,406 MAJOR/MINOR: Major

PHASE(S) TO BE FUNDED: S PROJ CAT: CRI CCCI/EPI: N/A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL:

This proposal requests funding for consultant services to perform a study of the prisons constructed prior to 1980. The study will evaluate the existing housing, program, and services buildings and infrastructure systems and develop recommendations regarding renovations or replacements necessary to maintain the current level of operations. This study is necessary to ensure continued compliance with the Three Judge Panel occupancy benchmark.

HAS A BUDGET PACKAGE BEEN COMPLETED FOR THIS PROJECT? (E/U/N/?): N

REQUIRES LEGISLATION (Y/N): N IF YES, LIST CODE SECTIONS: _____

REQUIRES PROVISIONAL LANGUAGE (Y/N) N

IMPACT ON SUPPORT BUDGET: ONE-TIME COSTS (Y/N): N FUTURE COSTS (Y/N): N

FUTURE SAVINGS (Y/N): N REVENUE (Y/N): N

DOES THE PROPOSAL AFFECT ANOTHER DEPARTMENT (Y/N): N IF YES, ATTACH

COMMENTS OF AFFECTED DEPARTMENT SIGNED BY ITS DIRECTOR OR DESIGNEE.

SIGNATURE APPROVALS:

_____	DATE	<u>Dean Borg</u> Dean Borg, Deputy Director, FPCM	<u>12/31/15</u>
PREPARED BY	DATE	REVIEWED BY	DATE
_____	DATE	<u>Deborah Hysen</u> Deborah Hysen, Director, FPCM	<u>12/31/15</u>
DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR	DATE	AGENCY SECRETARY	DATE

DOF ANALYST USE

DOF ISSUE # _____ PROGRAM CAT: _____ PROJECT CAT: _____ BUDG PACK STATUS: _____
ADDED REVIEW: SUPPORT: _____ OCIO: _____ FSCU/ITCU: _____ OSAE: _____ CALSTARS: _____

PPBA: Original Signed by: _____ DATE SUBMITTED TO LEGISLATURE: January 7, 2016
Koreen Hansen

A. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

Introduction:

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) requests funding for consultant services to perform a study of the original prisons in the CDCR portfolio. The study will evaluate the existing housing, program, and services buildings and infrastructure systems and develop recommendations regarding renovations or replacements necessary to maintain the current level of operations. This study is necessary to ensure continued compliance with the Three Judge Panel occupancy benchmark.

Background/History:

Prior to the New Prison Construction Program of the 1980s and 1990s, CDCR consisted of twelve prisons. These prisons are listed below, along with the year they were opened and design capacity:

Prison	Year Opened	Design Capacity
San Quentin State Prison (SQ)	1852	3,082 beds
Folsom State Prison (FSP)	1880	2,469 beds
California Institution for Men (CIM)	1941	2,976 beds
Correctional Training Facility (CTF)	1946	3,312 beds
California Institution for Women (CIW)	1952	1,078 beds
Deuel Vocational Institution (DVI)	1953	1,681 beds
California Correctional Institution (CCI)	1954	2,783 beds
California Men's Colony (CMC)	1954	3,838 beds
California Medical Facility (CMF)	1955	2,361 beds
California Rehabilitation Center (CRC)	1962	2,491 beds
California Correctional Center (CCC)	1963	1,733 beds
Sierra Conservation Center (SCC)	1965	1,726 beds

In February 2014, CDCR was ordered by the Three Judge Panel to meet the 137.5 percent statewide occupancy percentage set by the Supreme Court no later than February 28, 2016. Through a combination of actions directly authorized by the Supreme Court, and the impact of Proposition 47 (approved by the voters in November 2014), this benchmark was achieved by CDCR in January 2015. Compliance with this occupancy standard is an ongoing requirement upon CDCR. Any reductions in prison capacity that may result from infrastructure or building failures would jeopardize CDCR's ongoing compliance with this standard.

Problem:

Twelve of CDCR's 34 prisons were constructed between the mid/late 1800's and the 1960's. These prisons contain more than one-third of the total design capacity within CDCR. Most of the housing units at these prisons are between 50 and 75 years old, along with most of the program and support buildings. The security systems and physical plant layouts reflect the evolution of both national and state correctional policies. While CDCR has adjusted operations to reflect the older styles of these buildings (for example, downgrading security levels from III to II at specified

celled prisons), these facilities are more difficult to maintain and more likely to suffer catastrophic building or system failures than prisons constructed during the last 30 years.

CDCR utilizes an annual call letter process to have each prison identify and prioritize both special repair and deferred maintenance requirements, along with capital outlay requests for new or expanded facilities. Through this process, CDCR has identified that many of the housing units at the original prisons are in need of significant renovations or replacements. The reasons for these needs include housing areas that compromise direct supervision by custody staff; fire/life/safety improvements; and building-wide infrastructure replacement needs. These prisons also suffer from shortages of program space available to meet modern rehabilitative program requirements due to reasons such as leaking roofs, inadequate mechanical systems, and limited electrical and telecommunications capabilities. Many prisons have augmented their space through the purchase/rental of modular spaces, but these spaces have a limited useful life and are becoming severely dilapidated over time. A downside of utilizing the call letter process is that it does not provide a comprehensive review of the prison and all renovation/replacement needs.

There is little uniformity in the types of physical plants in the prisons to be studied. Because of this, every prison must be studied rather than performing a study of just a few prisons and applying the results to all of the original prisons. The types of housing units include four- to five-tier housing units at SQ and FSP, three-tier housing units at prisons built during the 1940s and 1950s, and dormitory housing units at CCC and SCC. Dormitory housing units at two locations were not originally designed for use in a correctional setting, but were repurposed as prisons. Water lines in the celled housing units have significant leakage due to their age and mechanical systems are no longer adequate due to new code requirements. Academic and vocational program buildings reflect the program modalities of the period in which they were constructed, often requiring renovation/repair and upgrades (especially of electrical and telecommunications systems) to provide current program models.

The responsibility to maintain compliance with the 137.5 percent occupancy rate places a high priority on maintaining operations at these original prisons. Because of the age and condition of these prisons, CDCR needs to perform a comprehensive analysis of these facilities.

B. RELATIONSHIP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN

This project is consistent with Goal 3 of the 2010/2015 Strategic Plan:

Goal 3: Employ Best Practices In Correctional Custody, Care, and Rehabilitation

Outcome: Superior prisons and youth facilities

Key Performance Indicator: National Correctional Standards

Objective 3.2: By June 30, 2015, 70 percent of offenders are housed in a prison commensurate with their custody, health care and rehabilitative needs.

CDCR has faced challenges in our ability to appropriately house inmate and youth populations in beds commensurate with their housing needs. Efforts towards accommodating housing needs have been challenged by competing interests that include court mandates and physical plant design. CDCR will increase bed capacity and program space, which will provide us with the ability to house offenders consistent with their needs and enhance our ability to respond to the changing demographics of the inmate and youth populations. CDCR will also make the nature of

our classification process more dynamic to improve our ability to respond to the changing demographics of the offender population and implement national best practices.

C. ALTERNATIVES

Alternative #1: Provide funding for a consultant to prepare a Master Plan for Renovation/Replacement of the original prisons.

Scope of work includes an evaluation of whether housing units and support and program buildings can be renovated or should they be replaced with new construction and whether the buildings are adequate for the population and mission of the prison. The study will also evaluate the potential operational cost savings due to a prison being closed or from efficiencies gained from infrastructure improvements, and detail which improvements are capital outlay, special repair, or deferred maintenance. The infrastructure and utilities servicing these buildings will also be reviewed, and a phasing plan for performing construction while the prison maintains operations will be developed. Finally, the analysis will prioritize the renovation/replacement efforts among the original prisons.

Project Advantages:

- Will provide detailed information necessary to prioritize and develop future capital outlay and special repair/deferred maintenance requests.
- Will provide the information necessary for CDCR to develop a long-term plan for maintaining existing prison capacity and ensuring ongoing compliance with Three Judge Panel occupancy benchmark.

Project Disadvantages:

- None.

Estimated Project Cost:

- \$5,406,000.

Funding Source:

- General Fund

Alternative #2: Do Nothing.

Project Advantages:

- None.

Project Disadvantages:

- CDCR will continue to use existing information to make capital outlay and special repair/deferred maintenance funding decisions at the original prisons, rather than utilizing a comprehensive review of the overall needs at the prison.
- Funding will be requested and expended for short-term needs at these prisons without a long-term plan that indicates whether renovation or replacement is appropriate for the facility as a whole.

Estimated Project Cost:

- None.

Funding Source:

- N/A

D. RECOMMENDED SOLUTION

1. Which alternative and why?

Alternative #1 is the recommended solution. Alternative #1 provides a comprehensive study of the original prisons and will allow for the development and prioritization of funding requests necessary to maintain long-term capacity at these prisons.

2. Detail scope description.

Scope of work includes an evaluation on whether housing units and support and program buildings can be renovated or should they be replaced with new construction and whether the buildings are adequate for the population and mission of the prison. The study will also evaluate the potential operational cost savings due to a prison being closed or from efficiencies gained from infrastructure improvements, and detail which improvements are capital outlay, special repair, or deferred maintenance. The infrastructure and utilities servicing these buildings will also be reviewed, and a phasing plan for performing construction while the prison maintains operations will be developed. Finally, the analysis will prioritize the renovation/replacement improvements among the original prisons.

3. Basis for cost information.

A conceptual cost estimate was developed by CDCR staff and CDCR's program management consultant.

4. Factors/benefits for recommended solution other than the least expensive alternative.

Alternative #1 is the only solution that provides a proactive plan for maintaining existing CDCR capacity necessary to ensure continued compliance with the Three Judge Panel occupancy benchmark.

5. Complete description of impact on support budget.

None.

6. Identify and explain any project risks.

None.

7. List requested interdepartmental coordination and/or special project approval.

CDCR and the consultant performing the study will consult with the State Fire Marshal in evaluating existing buildings and identifying recommendations for renovation or replacement.

8. Project schedule.

Study: Start 10/16 Complete 04/18

E. CONSISTENCY WITH GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65041.1:

1. Does the recommended solution (project) promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure and how? Explain.

Yes, this study will be completed at existing CDCR facilities.

2. Does the project improve the protection of environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources? Explain.

Yes, this study will be completed at existing CDCR facilities.

3. Does the project encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that infrastructure associated with development, other than infill, support efficient use of land and is appropriately planned for growth? Explain.

Yes, this study will be completed at existing CDCR facilities.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA		Budget Year 2016-17	
CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (COBCP)		Proj ID:	0000922
FISCAL DETAIL WORKSHEET		BU/Entity:	5225
Department Title:	California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation	Program ID	4615
Project Title:	Statewide: Master Plan for Renovation/Replacement of Original Prisons	COBCP #:	3
Program Category:	Other - Critical Infrastructure	Priority:	1
Program Subcategory:		MAMI:	MA

Identify all items which fit into the categories listed below. Attach a detailed list if funding is included in this request. Provide descriptions and summary estimates for items for which you plan to request funding in the future. When possible, identify funding needs by fiscal year (BY+1 through BY+4).

PROJECT RELATED COSTS	COST	TOTAL
AGENCY RETAINED:		
TOTAL AGENCY RETAINED		0

GROUP 2 EQUIPMENT		
TOTAL GROUP2 EQUIPMENT		0

IMPACT ON SUPPORT BUDGET	COST	TOTAL
ONE-TIME COSTS		
TOTAL SUPPORT ONE-TIME COSTS		0

ANNUAL ONGOING FUTURE COSTS		
TOTAL SUPPORT ANNUAL COSTS		0

ANNUAL ONGOING FUTURE SAVINGS		
TOTAL SUPPORT ANNUAL SAVINGS		0

ANNUAL ONGOING FUTURE REVENUE		
TOTAL SUPPORT ANNUAL REVENUE		0

STATE OF CALIFORNIA		Budget Year 2016-17	
CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL (COBCP)		Proj ID:	0000922
SCOPE/ASSUMPTIONS WORKSHEET		BU/Entity:	5225
Department Title:	California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation	Program ID:	4615
Project Title:	Statewide: Master Plan for Renovation/Replacement of Original Prisons	COBCP #:	3
Program Category:	Other - Critical Infrastructure	Priority:	1
Program Subcategory:		MA/MI:	MA

Project Specific Proposals: For new projects provide proposed Scope language. For continuing projects provide the latest approved Scope language. Enter Scope language in cell A110.

Conceptual Proposals: Provide a brief discussion of proposal defining assumptions supporting the level of funding proposed by fiscal year in relation to outstanding need identified for that fiscal year. (Also include scope descriptions for BY+1 through BY+4 in cell A110).

This proposal requests funding for consultant services to perform a study of the prisons constructed prior to 1980. The study will evaluate the existing housing, program, and services buildings and infrastructure systems and develop recommendations regarding renovations or replacements necessary to maintain the current level of operations. This study is necessary to ensure continued compliance with the Three Judge Panel occupancy benchmark.