



3/15/23- Jail Design and Operations Committee – Meeting Minutes

Project: Beltrami County Jail
Date: 03/15/23
Meeting Location: County Commission Work Room
Start Time: 1:30 PM

MEETING ATTENDEES: * (Indicates attended remotely via conference call)

<u>Present</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>
*	John Carlson	Beltrami County
X	Calandra Allen	Beltrami County
X	Steve Shadrick	Beltrami County
	Kevin Warne	Beltrami County
X	Tom Barry	Beltrami County
*	Justin Roberts	DOC
	Randy Perkins	Citizen
	Jim Boell	Consulting Engineer
X	Donny Wilcox	Construction Engineers
X	Ben Matson	Construction Engineers

1. Committee vacancy

- A. **2/15/23** – Ben M & Donny W reported that they had spoken to Steve Newby and he has indicated that he will not be able to be on the committee now due to other commitments that weren't there when he agreed to be on a couple of years ago. The Steering Committee was made aware of this earlier today and an advertisement to fill the vacant position will be posted at the typical county locations. As this is a Citizen position there are no special requirements to fill this position.
- B. **2/28/23** – The committee vacancy has been posted and applications are being accepted until 3/24/23.
- C. **3/15/23** – The vacancy remains open through 3/24. We are not aware of any applications being received yet.

2. Schedule Discussion

- A. **2/15/23** – Ben M highlighted upcoming tasks, he noted that priority is getting site selection wrapped up, followed by the Design Consultant RFQ then touring other facilities.
- B. **2/28/23** – No changes to schedule

- C. **3/15/23** – No changes to schedule. Ben M noted that he plans to update the Design Schedule and overall schedules this month.

3. Touring of other facilities

- A. **2/28/23** – *No change. Tours will take place once John C returns after the month of March.*
- B. **3/15/23** – The Committee discussed upcoming tours. It was decided to start by scheduling a tour of Wright and Chisago on April 5. Calandra will work out the details and will update committee members with specific details once they are determined. Assuming time allows at the next meeting the committee will review pictures that Calandra has taken on tours of other facilities.

4. Design Consultant RFQ

- A. **1/18/23** - *Ben M will begin working on some examples of RFQ's for the design consultant. This will be the next task for the committee to address.*
- B. **2/1/23** – *Ben M brought some examples of RFQ's from other MN jails to show the committee. These can be easily and quickly modified to include the content that we want in the RFQ, rather than starting from scratch. With the finalizing the site selection criteria being priority now, the committee did not dive deep into the details on the RFQ at this meeting.*
- C. **2/15/23** – *Not discussed. Need to complete site selection work before this is addressed.*
- D. **2/28/23** – *Discussions related to RFQ development commenced. The committee discussed whether this RFQ was going to be considering this selection to be tied to the final design/full design of the facility. After discussion it was decided that the RFQ should be written in a Phased approach with the assumption that we are looking at selecting the final design team with this document. Decisions are (as always) final with the Commission as to moving forward with any Phases proposed. It was decided that Tom B and Ben M should meet outside of the regular committee meeting to discuss and determine the bulk of the content of the RFQ before bringing it back to the full*

committee to review. Other documents to review include the Needs Assessment RFQ and the Project Manager RFQ that have already been issued by Beltrami County.

- E. **3/15/23** – Discussions related to the RFQ development continued. It was decided to make it a Request for Proposal and request fees associated with each phase of the design be included in the responses. Many other specifics related to the document were discussed. Ben M will incorporate the changes and distribute the document to the committee for any final comments prior to the next meeting. The Steering Committee will then review it at their 3/29/23 meeting. If they give the document their approval (with minor changes), it will be advertised starting April 5.

Discussions were held related to the selection committee. It was agreed that each of the sub-committees and the Steering Committee should be represented in the selection process, along with the entire Design & Operations Committee. Chairs from each of these committee will be asked to participate in the process.

5. Site Selection Discussion

A. 2/28/23

- 1. John C & Tom B had created two PowerPoint Presentations relating to the site selection. The first is to present to the Steering Committee with the background on the creation of the criteria and all data relating to the to names/descriptions of the sites deleted. The second is the same slides with specifics relating to each of the 15 sites shown and then scored, for review by the County Commission.*
- 2. After discussion it was decided to delete a couple of slides that will be presented to the Steering Committee tomorrow (3/1) and ask for their approval of the process related to the development of the criteria and scoring related to the criteria.*
- 3. Following the meeting this was presented to the Steering Committee on 3/1 and they approved things as presented. The second Presentation will now be brought to the Commission on 3/7 for their review and comments in a closed session.*

- B. **3/15/23** – Ben M updated the committee on the Closed Session meeting that was held with the County Commission and the action that they took related to the site selection. Tom B updated the Committee on items that have take place following their direction and the next steps related to the site. This committee may need to have some involvement in guidance related to Feasibility Studies and other site-specific guidance.

6. Open Discussions/New Business

- A. **2/28/23** – Tom B noted that this Committee should ultimately help the County to determine any use for the old jail building and/or property. - CLOSED

7. Items Closed this Meeting

- A. **12/14/22** – No change. The overall schedule will be updated after the first of the year.
- B. **1/4/23** – Ben M presented an updated overall schedule to the Committee. Ben M also noted that the process of hiring of a Conceptual Design consultant should begin in February in order to have enough time for them to get presentable items ready for the election campaign in the fall.
- C. **1/18/23** – Ben M highlighted upcoming tasks, he noted no planned changes to the schedule.
- D. **2/1/23** – No change to schedule.
- 11/10/22** -
1. A discussion was held on touring of other facilities. It was decided that committee members would like to tour Itasca, Clay, Becker, Wright, Sherburne, Carlton, Winona, and Chisago, if possible. Not all committee members would be required to be at each tour. The hope would be to see 2 facilities per trip, and to see the different types of supervision and types of specialty units.
 2. Calandra A can line up visits with each of the Jail Administrators. Chris T noted that each of the facilities on the list have been designed by Klein McCarthy and that he was meeting with their President soon and would mention our planned tours, so that additional insight could be provided on these designs and focuses.

3. *It was decided to wait until after the first of the year to line up these tours. There are other immediate focuses within the other committees and this committee, and the tours will be able to be completed after these items are addressed in a few months.*

12/1/22 – *The possibility of virtual tours of some of the facilities was discussed. Chris T cautioned that virtual walkthroughs would be best for just the facilities that are not yet completed. There are many nuances to operations that can only be grasped when they are fully occupied spaces.*

12/14/22 – *No Change. After the first of the year Calandra A will begin to schedule these walkthroughs with other Jail Administrators.*

1/4/23 – *Ben M reported that he had received information from Calandra A that she had contacted each of the Jail Administrators prior to leaving on her trip. These tours are being set up for February and March.*

1/18/23 – *No Change. Calandra should return by the next meeting and more specifics can be discussed at that time.*

2/1/23 - *Calandra has reached out to the planned facilities and most are open to tours at any time aside from some specific dates they have noted may not be available.*

2/15/23 – *John C noted that he will be out of the area in the month of March. He is available for virtual tours during the month, but otherwise would need to wait until April. As noted above this task is the committee's third priority.*

C. 11/10/22 -

1. *A number of different potential sites for a new facility have been suggested by County Staff, survey responses and others. This committee will be tasked with making a recommendation to the Steering Committee and the Commission.*
2. *Prior to evaluating any potential sites this committee needs to develop the criteria and which of them are most important in selecting the site. Between now and the next meeting all committee members should be creating a list of evaluation criteria that will then be put into a Location Impact Analysis. Once the criteria is established then any sites being considered can be analyzed accordingly.*
3. *Chris T was asked if there are any minimal standards for site size. Chris indicated that there isn't any, but that there can be no parking lots above or below a facility.*

D. 12/1/22 –

- 1. The committee spent the bulk of the meeting reviewing the lists of evaluation criteria developed by the committee members.*
- 2. The criteria itself was then evaluated to determine the importance of that specific criteria. Objective Criteria were evaluated as High, Medium-High, Medium, or Low and Subjective Criteria were evaluated as Positive, Negative or Neutral.*
- 3. Criteria will be given an available number range based on how it is rated and then each site can be scored in the number range for each criteria.*

E. 12/14/22 –

- 1. Following the last meeting an additional site to evaluate was added to the list by a County Commissioner. John C had compiled data on this site and second one nearby. After quickly reviewing the other nearby site it was determined that a pipeline runs underneath the bulk of the site making it unusable. The site suggested will be evaluated along with the other ones being considered earlier.*
- 2. The committee continued to evaluate the criteria for the sites and enter data into the spreadsheet.*
- 3. Throughout the review process a few questions came up that might be addressed by reaching out to other parties to help clarify things such as zoning and acquisition. Ben M indicated that he would reach out to Tom Barry prior to anyone contacting others outside of this committee, to be sure that things are communicated correctly and that those questions are alright to be asked.*
- 4. Scoring of the criteria in the method that was being planned came into question. It was decided to send out the active spreadsheet to the committee members as currently entered and let them work within the document (attached) to see if there might be a better approach ahead of the next meeting.*

F. 1/4/23 –

- 1. During the site selection discussion, the Committee questioned if there were any other properties that need to be considered. Steve S and John C will reach out to a couple of people to see the best way to search out any potential other properties.*

The good news is that that once the criteria and scoring are finalized any additional sites can be quickly scored using the established criteria.

- 2. In classifying the data many felt that the criteria needs to be sure to include the Highest and Best Use of the property to be sure that just because a property meets certain criteria that it is scored appropriately to be the best use of the property in the end.*
- 3. Further discussion on getting objective criteria included in the calculations needs to take place and needs to be discussed further.*

G. 1/18/23

- 1. John C noted that he had spoken with Jamin and 2 additional sites were added to be reviewed by the committee. Steve S has also spoken with Kevin from GIS and he will follow up with any additional sites to be reviewed.*
- 2. Following the last meeting Steve S, Kevin W and Tom B met and developed a process to define the scoring within the criteria. The bulk of the meeting was spent then defining each score for the different criteria. Additional time will need to be spent on this at the next meeting, then sites should be able to be scored.*

H. 2/1/23

- 1. The committee spent the bulk of the meeting continuing to work on defining the scores for the different criteria.*
- 2. This process is not yet complete and will need to be worked on at the next meeting too.*

I. 2/15/23

- 1. Kevin Trappe GIS Director attended the meeting and presented 5 potential new sites to consider. He had found these utilizing filtered GIS information and his local knowledge of potential sites.*
- 2. The Committee worked through the remaining defining of the scores for the criteria and completed this task.*
- 3. John C will update the spreadsheet to include the additional sites the Kevin T showed the committee and it will be automated to calculate scores for the new and prior sites and will rank them in order. Once John is done, he will forward it to Ben M for CE to*

audit it and confirm that all formulas are working correctly. Ben M will then forward it to the full Committee (attached).

4. *Steps going forward are anticipated to be as follows:*

- i. Meet again on 2/28 to finalize/discuss results.*
- ii. Present to the Steering Committee on 3/1 with sites blanked out (Tom B to confirm this approach with Commission Members on the Steering Committee prior to the Steering meeting on 3/1).*
- iii. Commission discusses in closed session on 3/7 and provides any feedback or requests of this Committee.*

Next Jail Design & Operations Committee Meeting – Next Meeting is scheduled for 3/29/23 @ 1:30 PM. (County Work Room)

Attachment: None