



## 02/01/23- Jail Design and Operations Committee – Meeting Minutes

**Project:** Beltrami County Jail  
**Date:** 02/01/23  
**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>
X	John Carlson	Beltrami County
X*	Calandra Allen	Beltrami County
X	Steve Shadrick	Beltrami County
X	Kevin Warne	Beltrami County
X	Tom Barry	Beltrami County
*	Justin Roberts	DOC
	Steve Newby	Citizen
	Randy Perkins	Citizen
*	Jim Boell	Consulting Engineer
X	Donny Wilcox	Construction Engineers
X	Ben Matson	Construction Engineers

### 1. Schedule Discussion

- 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.

### 2. Touring of other facilities

- A. **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.*
- B. 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.*
- C. 12/14/22 – No Change. After the first of the year Calandra A will begin to schedule these walkthroughs with other Jail Administrators.*
- D. 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.*
- E. 1/18/23 – No Change. Calandra should return by the next meeting and more specifics can be discussed at that time.*
- F. 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.*

### **3. 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.

#### **4. Site Selection Discussion**

##### **A. 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.*

##### **B. 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.*

##### **C. 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.*

**D. 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 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.*

**E. 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.*

**F. 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.

**5. Open Discussions/New Business**

- None

**6. Items Closed this Meeting  
Committee vacancy**

- A. **11/10/22** - *Steve S reported that he had spoken to Mike M about filling the vacancy. Later in the meeting Steve S reported that Mike had just responded indicating that he had a conflict of interest. Tom B noted that the vacancy should be advertised in the County Newsletter and Website and see if there is any response.*
- B. **12/1/22** – *The County has begun advertising for the committee vacancy. A couple of committee members have noted some individuals that might be interested since the last meeting, however since it has been advertised those individuals should follow the same protocols as others and apply for the position as required in the advertisement. These are due by 12/23/22.*
- C. **12/14/22** – *The committee vacancy continues to be advertised through 12/23/22. Once the advertisement is closed the applications can be reviewed and the position will be approved by the County Commission. Additionally, Justin Roberts introduced himself to the Committee. Chris T will be taking a new position before the end of the year and Justin will be replacing Chris in his role at the DOC.*
- D. **1/4/23** – *Ben M reported that the only response to the advertisement came from Jim Boell, who works in Civil Engineering. The committee felt that he would be a good fit and would recommend that we move forward with putting him on the committee.*

- E. **1/18/23** – Jim Boell was added to the committee at the commission meeting last evening and he introduced himself to the committee. Justin Roberts was also officially appointed by the commission at their meeting. Item CLOSED.

**Next Jail Design & Operations Committee Meeting – Next Meeting is scheduled for 2/15/23 @ 1:30 PM. (County Work Room)**

Attachment: None