



6/22/22- Jail Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes

Project: Beltrami County Jail
Date: 6/22/22
Meeting Location: County Commission Work Room
Start Time: 10:30 AM

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

Present	Name	Company
X	Tim Sumner	Beltrami County
X	Richard Anderson	Beltrami County
	Jorge Prince	City of Bemidji
	Ernie Beitel	Beltrami County
X	Calandra Allen	Beltrami County
X	Tom Barry	Beltrami County
	Jarrett Walton	Beltrami County
X	Trisha Hansen	DOC
	Daryl Seki	Red Lake Nation
	Faron Jackson	Leech Lake Nation
X	Wendy Spry	DOC Tribal Liaison
X	Joe Vene	Citizen
X	John Henningsgaard	Citizen
X	Donny Wilcox	Construction Engineers
X	Ben Matson	Construction Engineers
	Alan Richardson	Justice Planners
	Patrick Jablonski	Justice Planners

1. Advisory Committees

5/25/22 – Wendy Spry was introduced to the Committee as the new Tribal Liaison and will be joining the Steering Committee going forward. Sheriff Beitel will request her formal appointment with the Commission in an upcoming meeting.

Ben M reported that the Finance Committee had met on 5/18 and had reviewed updated finance scenarios based on the lower sales tax collection figures and higher interest rates. The Finance Committee tasked Ehlers with building a spreadsheet where the different inputs can be inserted to calculate out different finance options. Ben M also noted that there will be another Programming Committee meeting next week on 6/1.

6/22/22 – Ben M reported that the Programming Committee has completed their work related to creating a Wish List and the classifying each of the items placed on the list into categories of “Must Have, Should Have, and Likely Infeasible” This log will be presented to the Steering Committee in a future meeting and the Programming Committee will take a pause for a while until further direction (possibly related to

communications) is requested from the Steering Committee. Additionally, the Finance Committee is scheduled to meet again next week.

2. Project Schedule

- A. Ben M reviewed an update of the tasks occurring in the next 30-90 days and the overall project schedule
- B. Upcoming Tasks
 - i. Conduct Feasibility Study (ongoing)
 - a. Data requests/Analysis (ongoing)
 - b. Evaluate Incarceration Alternatives (ongoing)
 - c. Modeling Projection Scenarios (ongoing)
 - d. Future Infrastructure Modeling
 - e. Public Communication Meetings
 - ii. Sub Committee Meetings

3. Feasibility Study/Needs Assessment

5/25/22 – Alan & Patrick from Justice Planners attended the meeting remotely and they presented three additional population projections beyond what was presented on 5/11. These all ran figures out to the 40-year period indicated in their contract. After discussion the consensus of the committee is to change the models to be run to years 10, 20 & 30 years instead of what was indicated initially. The five projections that were forecasted varied in the Average Length of Stay (ALOS) and Booking projections staying steady or changing to numbers seen pre-pandemic. After much discussion and questions, the committee decided that the most accurate forecast would be what was called Forecast #3. In this forecast the ALOS remains at the current 18.8 days, bookings return to the pre-pandemic rate of 8.1 per day and current sentencing practices remain in place. Having agreed upon a population forecast Justice Planners can now begin running the models for the different scenarios in their contract.

6/22/22 – Ben M reported that he had spoken with Alan from JP earlier in the week and that they are currently working through the 18 different models required in their contract. Alan stated that they would be ready to present their preliminary results at a meeting in Mid-July. He also noted that they will be done with their full report by August 22. After a discussion with the committee about dates and how things will be presented the group decided to have JP present their models on 7/13 to the Steering Committee and the full report on August 24. Both can be presented remotely. Trish H recommend that the Judges, City & county Attorney's be invited to the initial full report presentation to the Steering Committee to hear the

information firsthand and get their input, before the general public gets the full presentation. The group also discussed inviting the full commission, but that would require it to be a public meeting. Once dates are confirmed with JP then invitations to the presentation can be sent out by CEI. The committee also decided to distribute to the Steering Committee the preliminary population presentation, as revised, so that they can review the data themselves ahead of future presentations. Ben M will request this information and forward to the committee as "Confidential" information at this time.

4. Tribal Involvement in Process

5/11/22 – Sheriff Beitel has followed up again with White Earth and is hoping to get a letter in support of the project from them and/or Mahnommen County. The Committee again discussed trying to set up meetings to get in front of the Tribal Councils for both Red Lake and Leech Lake, following their elections.

5/25/22 – Sheriff Beitel has received a letter of support from Cass County (Attached). He has also been in contact with Red Lake, and they may be open to providing a similar letter of support for the project.

6/22/22 – No Updates.

5. Public Communications

3/30/22 – Many thoughts and concerns regarding communications were covered. Although nothing was brought to the group as a consensus the following comments were made for future consideration in developing our communications:

- *Public needs to be informed about the Programming that is done in the Jail. Present the value of what they are doing ahead of the Feasibility Study, update what is happening with the Reset Coordinator and explain the partnership.*
- *Note that most Programming is volunteer and point out the value of this, noting that programming keeps the residents busy and helps reduce staff assaults.*
- *Finance Committee should be ready with information ahead of the Feasibility Study. Some property tax scenarios should be run by Jodi and Ehlers so that we know how much it could add to property tax bills.*
- *Be ready to explain property taxes vs. sale tax and the pros/cons of each. Note things like sales tax doesn't impact purchases like clothing and food.*
- *Lay out the problems/Lay out the solutions from Financial/Programming/Facility standpoint.*

- *Be ready to debate ourselves so that we are ready to answer the tough questions that will come up.*
- *Address the who, what, where, when why & how related to the project.*
- *Create a communications schedule with milestones*
- *Determine the audience (who) and how we are getting the message to the targeted audience.*
- *Get input/engagement from Brian Berg as part of the CE team.*
- *Do we need to get a communications specialist or is this a detrimental thing?*
- *Note that all information needs to be approved and come through the County Commissioners.*

4/13/22 – *Additional topics discussed:*

- *Ben M reported that he had discussed this topic with Brian Berg (who was unable to attend today) and that his first word of advice was to work with the Townships within the County to make sure that they are all aware of everything and are receiving good information about the project.*
- *Ben M had filtered the overall project schedule to show items related to communications and the milestones when those will be occurring and presented it to the Committee.*
- *John H questioned if the public can review the Jail Budget. It was confirmed that this is public information and that it can be added to the project website. However, it needs to be taken in context and key components need to be identified when presenting the budget and actual costs.*
- *It was noted that most young people don't get their information from newspapers or the radio. The approach to communicate with them needs to be addressed.*
- *There needs to be alignment between the sub-committees and the information we get from Justice Planners, leading to one single message. The discussion needs to be tabled until we have information back on the feasibility study to get sub-committee consensus.*
- *A simple communication plan needs to be drafted once we get the information from Justice Planners. At that time, we will determine how to convey the message from the information we are presented.*

5/11/22 – *Not Discussed*

5/25/22 – *Not Discussed*

6/22/22 – Ben M noted that with the upcoming report being issued by JP in late August that this topic needs to be revisited fairly soon and the communications plan laid out. After discussing upcoming meeting dates it was decided to discuss this topic again at the next meeting following the preliminary

models by JP, tentatively 7/27. CEI will plan to bring some staff from their marketing department to help in this discussion.

6. New Business/Open Discussions

5/25/22 – None Discussed

7. Items Closed prior to meeting

5/11/22 – Ben M reported that the Programming Committee had met again on 4/27 and have completed their “Wish List” spreadsheet. At their next meeting they will categorize the list into varying priorities. Ben M also noted that there will be Finance Committee meeting next week. Tom B indicated that the recent sales tax collections are less than what had been anticipated and that it would be beneficial to have Ehlers run some revised scenarios ahead of the meeting. Ben M to follow up with Bruce at Ehlers.

5/11/22 – The committee reviewed the slide deck that Justice Planners (JP) had presented on 4/29. The bulk of the discussion was centered on the time periods requested in the RFP. JP is contracted to run multiple alternatives for 10, 25 and 40 year time periods and they will do what was requested of them, but have noted that 40 year data becomes very broad and less useful. After considering requesting different options from them the committee decided to have them run the models based on the time periods described in their contract. Additional minor items were requested to be modified within the slides and Ben M will follow up with Alan R about these items.

Following the meeting Ben M called Alan R and discussed the items noted above. In this discussion Alan R noted that the Steering Committee needs to determine if JP is going to run the models going forward using current booking numbers or using numbers where sentencing and other practices return to the levels of 2012 to 2015. A poll of the committee was completed via e-mail following this discussion, and no clear consensus was reached by the committee. The committee will meet again on 5/25 to discuss more in depth with JP and come to a consensus.

Next Jail Steering Committee Meeting – Next Meeting is scheduled for 10:30 AM on 7/13/22. (County Work Room)

Prepared and reviewed by Construction Engineers – Please forward any comments or corrections to BenM@constructionengineers.com

Attachment: Updated overall schedule