

Prison Relocation Committee – DRAFT

Committee	Prison Relocation Committee
Date	Wednesday, June 12, 2012
Time	2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location	Capitol Board Room, State Capitol
Members Present	Lane Summerhays – Chairman, , Rep. Brad Wilson – Kaysville, Camille Anthony – Citizen, Darrell Smith – Mayor of Draper City, David Luna – Citizen, Judy Atherton – Judge, Ben McAdams – Salt Lake County Mayor, Leland Pollock - Garfield County Commissioner, Sen. Jerry Stevenson
Members Excused	
Staff	Dave Walsh – Staff of Original PRADA Board, Alan Bachman – Assistant Attorney General, Shannon Simonsen – Staff Member
Visitors	
Agenda Item	Welcome and Introductions
Notes	Mike Mower called the meeting to order. An attendance roll was passed around to gather updated email and phone numbers.
Agenda Item	Review Statutory Charge and Overview of Assignments – Rep. Greg Hughes, Alan Bachman
Notes	<p>Senate Bill 72 is well written and fairly short.</p> <p>Line 44 - Is a series of definitions they are intuitive. Describes current prison land and describes where prison may be relocated.</p> <p>Line 73 - Creates Prison Relocation and Development Authority</p> <p>Line 76 - Consists of 11 members, 6 members are considered a quorum</p> <p>Line 96 – Explains authority duties and responsibilities.</p> <p>Lines 100-103 – The request for proposal is in line with Utah procurement code which will be sent to the committee shortly.</p> <p>Lines 109-113 - Public hearings will be held in the current location and new location.</p> <p>Lines 115 – 118: RFP's are flexible number of them and how they are selected. They will be discussed in later meetings.</p> <p>Line 124: – Authority to appoint sub-committees</p> <p>Line 128 - Dictated request for proposal process</p> <p>Line 169 - Governor and Legislature must approve any relocation of the prison</p> <p>Line 176 - Current prison land may not be sold/leased unless approved by Governor or Legislature</p> <p>Line 179 - Funds have been provided along with legislation for this board</p> <p>Line 187- Compensation explanations</p> <p>Line 200 - Conflicts of interest are prohibited, members were screened. Any conflict must be reported.</p> <p>Line 216 - Gifts/Employment must not be accepted from anyone with an interest in prison location.</p> <p>Open and public meetings act has multiple requirements that must be met. A meeting is a quorum when 6 people get together so avoid the appearance. If a quorum meets, it must be</p>

announced publicly and minutes must be taken. Members need to be cautious about the appearance of meetings. The procurement code will be distributed at a later date.

Rep. Hughes:

Draper has regional benefit for Utah. Previous review of the prison location by a past administration looked at the land, looked at the pros and cons but there was much left out. Draper has 700 acres, 25 miles from metropolitan Salt Lake City, and is central to two research universities. The procurements at the time would allow the state to surplus the acreage as they saw fit. With the first PRADA bill, we wanted the process to be open and had transparency and create a discussion among all stakeholders. Because it is a large task with so many parts, it deserves to have an exhaustive review. After 8 drafts we came up with the bill you have in front of you today. You have a city, a county, and a state that will be highly impacted by what is decided here. It is a once in a lifetime process. This process is integral to the integrity of this and how we move forward.

Agenda Item Review findings from earlier PRADA group – Rep. Brad Wilson/Dave Walsh

Notes

Rep. Brad Wilson:

This is a complicated process with many moving parts. The first PRADA did not have the ability to go out and get RFP's and come to a singular recommendation on which path to follow. We didn't have the financial and staff resources to come to a conclusion. The first PRADA board came to the conclusion that we thought this was feasible and makes sense.

There are many interests involved in the relocation of the prison. PRADA 1.0 issued a RFI- Request for Information: we received 6 different responses. Some were simple 5 page replies and some were in depth binders. This information provided helped us to conclude that we should move forward.

Although the information from PRADA 1.0 is available, at this point it would not be wise to make that information available to PRADA 2.0

Personnel costs are the biggest line item for running the state prison. The majority of the people that we send to Draper will be released from prison and go back into society. The Draper prison is not ideally suited to do all the programming that we would like to do. There are numerous sites where a prison could be relocated. And if the prison is moved, what should be done with 690 acres? I believe that it would be best used by industry.

Some RFIs only dealt with one of the three key issues, some dealt with all of them. There is no singular path to follow. There are many different ways to do this.

Tools:

Operational Savings with staff efficiency – more advanced technology of the new prison
Property and Sales Tax

The Sale of The Prison Land Itself - Entitlement and master planning the ground with Draper City: process would increase its value.

Savings From The Deferred Maintenance Plan at the Draper Prison

County Jails/Contracting: there is a potential benefit

There is very little federal money that is provided for the operational costs of the prison. Cost of a new prison could vary from \$550-\$600 million. It is believed that it could be built on around 300 acres.

The appropriations subcommittee for the Department of Corrections is very capable and does

an excellent job. Things that are considered by the appropriations subcommittee include programming, access to the courts, and availability of medical care.

The legislature must weigh in and appropriate the funds for any relocation of the prison. Interest rates and construction costs are starting to creep back up. The quicker that we can move, the better it will be for tax payers and all parties involved.

Rep. Greg Hughes:

We must be sensitive to time constraints. Interest rates and construction costs could be prohibitive. The sooner that we can complete the PRADA process, the better off the state will be.

A phased approach to move the prison is definitely an option and should be considered.

Asking for an RFP:

We shouldn't ask for an RFP that we aren't going to support. We need to understand the prison, its mission, and how it functions. We need to determine what the problems are and what are the future demands? How does the current location meet those demands and how may they be met somewhere else?

What is the next step?

Job Creation needs to part of the understanding the big picture

RFI is only a request for information and is short.

RFP is a request for proposal meaning they are more extensive.

If 6 requests for information have already been made, we should be examining each existing one individually. However, an actual request for proposals will most likely be much different than the requests for information that were received for PRADA 1.0. However, before an actual RFP is issued by the committee, the information from the RFI's from PRADA 1.0 should be made available for the PRADA 2.0 board. Alan Bachman would like time to consider releasing PRADA 1.0 information before any information is released.

How do we as PRADA 2.0 get to the point to where we believe we should or should not relocate the prison? Is there an executive summary from PRADA 1.0? All that we really need is a summary of the ideas from PRADA 1.0? If there is one available, the board would like to see it.

Financing:

There are different financing options. One of which would be private financing. It is believed that interest rates will continue to rise through 2014.

Ben McAdams suggested that an executive summary should be released, and any proprietary information be redacted before its release. All 11 members of the original PRADA 1.0 board saw the original RFI's. However, two providers of the RFI's redacted their proposals because they were concerned that their private information and plans would go forward. The current legislation calls on the board to issue RFP's. The prison doesn't need to be moved just because we issue RFP's.

Ben McAdams makes a motion that the committee prepares to approve an RFI, Camille Anthony seconds the motion. All approve. As part of the next meeting, there could be a possible executive meeting with all responders of the RFI's including the two parties that redacted their RFI's.

	<p><u>Dave Walsh:</u> We will send out to the members of the committee all the info that was submitted and is now posted online. The information will include all notes, agenda and handouts including 2005, 2009, and 2011 Wikstrom Studies.</p>
Next Meeting	Establish PRADA Director Recruitment Process – DHRM/Mike Mower
Notes:	<p>Director and Administrative Assistant Hiring Committee: David Luna Lane Summerhays S. Camille Anthony</p> <p>The recruitment committee must be cautious of conflicts of interest, should tailor to same specifications as the MITA Board Qualifications, economic development background, construction management background, organizational, possible advance degree, knowledge of the State of Utah, prison/jail contracting, strong communication skills, public and private experience.</p> <p>Camille Anthony nominated Lane Summerhays as the spokesman for the board. It was seconded and all approved.</p>
Agenda Item	Discuss Plan of Action and Future Meeting Schedule – Lane Summerhays
Notes	<p><u>Leland Pollock:</u> Zions Bank conducted a study regarding jail/prison cost. The board will look to have a presentation in a future meeting.</p> <p>The board will meet together every two weeks. The next meeting will be held June 26th 9:00 am – There will be an open meeting and then an executive closed session. The meeting will be held in Legislative Room 445.</p> <p>Prison Tour: June 20th 9:00 am</p> <p>Leland Pollock Judy Atherton Darrell Smith Dave Walsh Jerry Stephenson</p>
Agenda Item	Adjourn
Notes	Motion made by Sen. Stevenson to adjourn. David Luna seconded the motion, all approved.

Minutes prepared by Shannon Simonsen – Administrative Assistant, GOPB