

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Call to Order: By CHAIR MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, on February 14, 1991, at 7 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Mary Ellen Connelly, Chair (D)
Sen. Bob Hockett, Vice Chairman (D)
Rep. Francis Bardanoue (D)
Sen. Ethel Harding (R)
Sen. J.D. Lynch (D)
Rep. Bob Thoft (D)

Staff Present: Jim Haubein, Principal Fiscal Analyst (LFA)
Jane Hamman, Senior Budget Analyst (OBPP)
Claudia Montagne, Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

HEARING ON THE DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS PROPOSAL FOR THE WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Curt Chisholm, Director, Department of Institutions, said they had not yet presented a demonstration of need for the Women's Correctional Facility, and would like to do so today along with the presentation on the results of the site selection process to place the facility in a community that can best support the program requirements.

Dan Russell, Division Administrator, Corrections, addressed the committee on need. He reviewed the report on the Proposed Women's Prison, including the narrative on the need and the Capital Construction Request. **EXHIBIT 1**

Mr. Chisholm reviewed the Request for Proposals and Results of Preliminary Screening. **EXHIBIT 1** He operated under the assumption that the need has been established. Issues remaining would be the size of the facility and the method of financing. Regarding the size, he claimed a facility of 200 beds was a responsible choice, and was intended to be over built initially to allow the Department to lease out excess cell space to other jurisdictions. Regarding the site selection process, of the eight formal proposals received, five are able to meet the Department criteria, based primarily on financial and management

capabilities. The Department's proposal was that the State lease back the facility from the community that would own it for the next twenty years, at the end of which time, the State would own the facility with the debt paid off.

Mr. Russell reviewed the 12 siting criteria and how well communities responded to them. They had looked at the Federal Bureau of Prisons guidelines, as well as those of other states, and applied them to Montana. In addition, they used information from SB 38 that set criteria, and from the Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory Council. **EXHIBIT 1**

REP. BARDANOUVE commented on one criteria, proximity to an airport, that would make a commercial venture of the prison. The criteria to be able to transport inmates should not be used. The primary purpose is to provide prisons for Montana women. **Mr. Chisholm** said that was a criteria essential to the transport of inmates in-state as well. The eight communities under consideration are Helena, Great Falls, Butte, Billings, Anaconda, Shelby, Sidney and Livingston.

1:B:000

Mr. Chisholm reviewed the financial and land proposals contained in the eight responses. All communities responded by offering land. Industrial revenue bonds or certificates of participation would be the primary funding source. No site could come in at this time with a firm package.

Keith Wolcott, Deputy Director, Department of Institutions, explained hypothetically how this would work. He reviewed the methods of financing, the lease option and the G.O. bond option. **EXHIBIT 2** The interest would be capitalized for the first two years while the project is being built; therefore, there would not be any payments until the building is occupied. There would be a difference in the two financing options of \$27,000 per year.

Mark Simmons, D.A. Davidson, addressed the issue of capitalized interest, and said it was used often in construction projects.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked how the interest rates on General Obligation bonds received by the State would compare with those received by the communities. **Mr. Simmons** said generally the State would receive a lower rate. However, the bond market in Montana is unique in that it is particularly strong and the rates would be comparable. **Mr. Wolcott** said the bond raters would look through the community to the state for ultimate payment.

SEN. LYNCH commented on the process, that it would pit community against community, and expressed unhappiness about it.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked to see the proposed costs per day for each method of financing. It is on the basis of operating costs that the decision would be made. **Mr. Russell** referred the committee to Part II, page 8, **EXHIBIT 1**, and said they would provide that in more detail through **Mr. Haubein**.

HEARING ON HB 528

Tape No. 1:B:650

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

REP. VIVIAN BROOKE, HD 56, Missoula, expressed hope that the best parts of HB 528 and the Department's proposal would be implemented to build the Women's Prison. That is her objective. She reviewed the bill, EXHIBIT 3, and asked the committee to look past their places of residence in this process and look for a fair and impartial process. Her primary concern is the woman inmate. Her profile is as follows: she has been physically and sexually abused, was probably an abandoned child, dropped out of school at age 16, has waitressed or bartended, has an average age of 34 years, is a mother, does not have a husband, her children are in foster care, and ended up in prison by writing bad checks and doing drugs while trying to help some guy, serving two to three years while in prison where she will try to get her G.E.D. She is a victim as well as a felon. HB 528 describes the need, sets the criteria, explains the selection process, and outlines the funding mechanism. Regarding funding mechanisms, she said debt is debt, and asked the committee to rely on the Legislative Fiscal Analyst for the appropriate cost comparisons. REP. BROOKE asked Mike Wingard to address the request for proposal and the criteria.

Mike Wingard, Legislative Council, reviewed the changes in the request for proposal and the criteria. EXHIBITS 4 & 5

Proponents' Testimony: None

2:A:000

Opponents' Testimony: Scott Crichton, American Civil Liberties Union, said he supported the facility but not the size. He addressed the inadequacy of the current facility not only in size but in the level of programming provided for women. He argued about the demonstrated commitment by the State to provide meaningful programming, an inequity based on gender relative to treatment of felons. He feared the State would build a 200 bed facility without the programming. Regarding costs, he claimed not enough attention has been given to the annual commitment the Legislature will be obligated to in terms of the operating and program costs of the larger facility. Mr. Crichton said in the hearings on the bill in the standing committee, proponents, including prosecutors and social workers, had testified against the size. The adage in corrections is "you will fill what you build".

Another issue which posed a major problem is the support services needed for the family. To alleviate the disruption of the family and the guilt experienced by mothers, some support mechanism would be needed for children's and spousal visitation. This

issue is being addressed by the site selection process, in which a city is being sought where there is support. However, he asked who is going to pay costs of families associated with out of state felons.

Mr. Crichton said the early recommendation from the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee was for a 100-120 bed facility, looking at the same population projections before the committee. He suggested the additional beds could be added in 1995 or 1997, should the population warrant it. He reminded the committee that the policies drive our populations. Until we realize that, we will continue to have the highest percentage of people within our population who are incarcerated and the longest sentences of any country in the western world. As long as mandatory sentencing is continued, and we close our eyes to community based corrections, we get the most costly, least effective mechanism for dealing with transgressors and reducing recidivism.

Questions From Subcommittee Members:

SEN. LYNCH objected to the reference to gender balance on the selection committee, a clause he considered restrictive. **REP. BROOKE** said it was amended into the bill in State Administration Committee. She invited an amendment adding the words "when possible" to the phrase "the selection must provide for gender balance". **SEN. LYNCH** expressed concern about the wording "reasonably close to counties contributing the majority of the inmates". **REP. BROOKE** said it was one of the highest criteria in her mind. It is critical that women who are parents and felons do not create another generation of felons. Women need to be as close as possible to their children, families and legal counsel. **Ted Clack, Program Officer, Department of Institutions**, has figures over a five year period on counties who have contributed felons.

SEN. LYNCH objected to the language "as often as necessary" on page 8, line 12 of HB 528, referring to the committee meeting. This leaves the number of meetings open ended. **REP. BROOKE** said with the mandatory criteria being utilized, the eight sites could be reduced to four with one meeting. The next meetings would be site visits and public hearings. This would match the Department's schedule of meetings.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked about the limit for selection to the existing applicants. If the method of financing changes to General Obligation bonding by the State, he would oppose this limit because it excludes Lewistown, the geographic center of the state. **REP. BROOKE** said they had struggled with this, but in all fairness to communities who had applied under the guidelines, decided the limit should stand. **REP. THOFT** said if the communities build this and lease it back, we need to stay with these proposals. If it is GO bonds, that is no longer an issue.

REP. BARDANOUVE questioned the criteria locating the facility nearest to the area with the greatest number of criminals. He spoke of the shifts in the population of communities and criminals. **REP. BROOKE** said there is experience over the last 50 years indicating population centers and they contribute the most inmates.

SEN. LYNCH asked if the point system was absolute and how it worked. **REP. BROOKE** referred the committee to page 2 of the supplemental to the Request for Proposal exhibit. **EXHIBIT 5**

SEN. HOCKETT commented that it seems like we are more interested in the economics of the project than the welfare of the people who will be there and how to get them out again. He questioned the revenue projections for the out of state felons, and the support for their families. **Mr. Russell** said they were using projected figures for the year 2,000; in addition, the facility would not even be built until 1993. Within another seven years, they would need more than 120 beds. The State should build for more than three to four years at a time. If the State did build for the future and had extra space, these beds could be provided for inmates in other jurisdictions with needs, thus generating extra funds for the bond retirement and operating costs. In addition, he was not aware of many situations in which families of female inmates came in and required services. He also had not experienced such an inmate being paroled or discharged in the State.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if they had considered building 1/2 of the facility in one location, and 1/2 in another for access by families, or leaving a building out. **Mr. Russell** said the economics of scale drive the cost up for both construction and operation. They could scale back and add on later, but with the delays in construction, they would be coming in one biennium after completion for the addition, which they would not want to do.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked what was the nature of the crimes. **Mr. Russell** said he had information prepared by Ted Clack on this issue over a ten year period, but was not himself prepared to comment.

2:B:000

REP. BARDANOUVE asked why the rationale for over-building for the future holds for women and not for men. **Mr. Russell** said there was no question that they need more beds for the men, but there are limited dollars. **REP. BARDANOUVE** said more money was being spent in proportion to the potential population for women.

SEN. HOCKETT asked what was the percentage of the cost for training and rehabilitation. **Mr. Russell** said he did not have a break down of the operating costs for the program. Security and programming needs for the female inmates are the basis of the construction plan. He reviewed the staffing pattern which is based upon programming.

CHAIR CONNELLY asked if they were planning to test out-of-state inmates for AIDS or other drug related problems that the State could not afford to pay for. **REP. BROOKE** said her bill did not address programmatic or operational policies. In admitting federal prisoners to a state facility, the state has discretion as to the type of prisoner it would accept. **Mr. Russell** said that to date, they did not accept prisoners who have not been tested for HIV. They would screen potential inmates, and hopefully send someone out to screen out violent criminals. This cost is not reflected.

SEN. HARDING asked about the State's liability for out of state inmates. **Mr. Russell** said Montana was a member of the Interstate Compact on Corrections. Only in cases of gross negligence on the part of a staff member would the state be liable. The other jurisdiction is responsible for medical costs and other chargeable costs. There had not been any problems in this area.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if there were any multi-state facilities. **Mr. Russell** said it was hard enough to get one legislative body to approve such a project, let alone several.

Closing by Sponsor:

REP. BROOKE encouraged the committee to make their decision with the female inmate and her needs at the top of their priority list.

Jim Haubein provided a comparison of the two methods of financing the construction costs, assuming a 200 bed facility. **EXHIBIT 6** He also reviewed a comparison of operating costs for the facility, assuming three different capacities (200 bed with 50% out-of-state inmates, 200 bed with no out-of-state inmates, and 120 beds). **EXHIBIT 7**

REP. THOFT noted that the difference between the lease purchase agreement and the GO bonding is negligible. **Mr. Haubein** said GO bonding is .1 to .25% more. **REP. THOFT** commented that since this money is not in the bonding bill, HB 5, it could drive the bonding amount up too high and jeopardize the bond rating. At least there is an alternative to avoid this. **Mr. Haubein** said he had sought legal advice as to what would be needed if the committee were to choose the lease purchase method of financing. The lease purchase method would also require 2/3 vote of the Legislature, and would have to be done through the Department of Administration. Under the proposal by the Department, the lease purchase option would require language in the bill setting an upper limit to the cost.

REP. THOFT asked if the lease of the facility would be held against the bond rating as well. **Mr. Haubein** said the lease purchase option constitutes debt and would be no different than the GO bond. **Mr. Wolcott** was unsure about the lease purchase option's impact on the bond rating, and said he would check with

the Attorney General's office.

Mr. Haubein reviewed the comparison between the Department of Institutions proposal and the proposal contained within HB 528.
EXHIBIT 8

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. Haubein distributed information requested by the committee on the Department of Highways projected revenue. No Executive Action could be taken due to the absence of members. Mr. Haubein said the Executive revenue estimates are \$13 million higher than the LFA. That is the only difference. Both revenue estimators feel they are right. The decision is with the committee. Gas and diesel tax projections account for the difference. Ms. Hamman said the difference would impact the cash balance in the 1993 session, when some major decisions would have to be made in the planning for the 1995 biennium. The executive recommendation is to go ahead. **EXHIBIT 9**

Mr. Haubein distributed the committee's action to date on the Long Range Building Program, and the pending action. **EXHIBIT 10**

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11 a.m.



MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, Chair



CLAUDIA MONTAGNE, Secretary

MEC/cm

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
LONG-RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE 2-14-91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	✓		
SEN. ETHEL HARDING	✓		
SEN. BOB HOCKETT, VICE-CHAIRMAN	✓		
SEN. J.D. LYNCH	✓		
REP. BOB THOFT	✓		
REP. MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, CHAIR	✓		

HR:1991
CS10DLRLCALONGRP.MAN

EXHIBIT 1

DATE 2.14.91

HB Long Range Planning

**PROPOSED WOMEN'S
PRISON**

NARRATIVE

EX-100 - 1
2-14-91
HBLong Range Planning

Overview

The 51st Montana Legislature directed the Department, in conjunction with the Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory Council (CJAC), to develop a comprehensive plan to address the needs of female inmates. That plan was to be presented to the 52nd Legislature. The plan was to include:

1. consideration of the need to build a new correctional facility, as well as other incarceration alternatives;
2. provision for adequate educational, treatment, training and employment opportunities for female inmates;
3. compliance with standards published by the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, wherever feasible; and,
4. proposed legislation for implementing the plan, if appropriate.

The Department and the CJAC (recreated by Executive Order 17-89) jointly responded to the Legislature's directive. A subcommittee of the Council, served by Department staff, studied women's correctional issues for nearly a year. The committee heard testimony from two national experts on women's corrections issues, studied literature and toured the two newest women's prisons in the nation.

The present Women's Correctional Center was authorized by the Montana Legislature as a temporary facility and was intended to house a maximum of thirty female inmates. The facility was not designed for correctional use - it is a converted nurses' dormitory. Its design does not serve security or programming purposes well. Its location also is problematic in that it is an appreciable distance from sources of the special services female inmates require. The emergency operating capacity of the WCC now is 45 inmates; that of the expansion unit is 20, with double-bunking of five cells. The emergency operating capacity of the female institutional system is 77 inmates, including 12 beds at the WLSC.

Opened in late 1982, the WCC has experienced an average annual increase in inmate population of nearly 18 percent. The FYE 1990 population was nearly 3 times greater than that of 1983. This increase is substantially greater than that of the male inmate population. This phenomenon is not unique to Montana. Corrections literature indicates a persistent nationwide rapid growth of female inmate populations in the past decade, again at rates greater than those noted for males. Historical FYE total female inmate populations, admissions and average length of stay were:

	FISCAL YEAR END							
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>
Population	25	25	39	46	51	53	70	73

	FISCAL YEAR							
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>
Admissions	33	26	33	34	41	44	52	52

	FISCAL YEAR							
	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>
LOS (mos.)	11.0	11.3	11.3	11.2	10.6	11.2	12.6	13.3

Female inmate population projections were developed using the same technique used for males. The underlying assumptions were based on conservative interpretations of growth experienced in female prison admissions and length of stay. The FYE 1989 population was chosen as the base year for projections. Comparisons of emergency operating capacity and projected population are as follows:

	FISCAL YEAR END									
	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Projected Total Pop.	69	80	93	108	124	149	168	190	221	255
Existing Syst.Cap.	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
Proj.System Shortfall	(0)	(3)	(16)	(31)	(47)	(72)	(91)	(113)	(144)	(178)
Proj. Prison Pop.*	52	42	53	68	84	101	114	129	150	173
Existing Capacity	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
Proj.Prison Shortfall	0	0	0	(3)	(19)	(36)	(49)	(64)	(85)	(108)

* Although this projection indicates a 108 bed shortfall in 1995, in reality there will be a need for 173 beds in 2,000 as a result of closure of WCC. This need will be met if a 200-bed facility is built.

Projected Commun. Pop.	17	38	40	40	40	48	54	61	71	82
Existing Capacity	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Projected Shortfall	(5)	(26)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(36)	(42)	(49)	(59)	(70)
Proposed Community*	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
Revised Comm.Shortfall	(5)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(15)	(21)	(28)	(38)	(49)

* 1992-1993 community capacity additions (16-bed female pre-release center, 5 female "bed equivalents" in new ISP program).

It should be noted that the present female inmate population (88) is already greater than that predicted for FYE 1992. That level has been exceeded for months. Clearly, our projections are not excessive.

1
2-14-91
Long Range Planning

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST

The Department and the CJAC propose that the State construct a new, 200 bed women's prison on a new site which best suits the needs of our female inmates. The new facility should be built to Commission on Accreditation (ACA) standards and be based on a model similar to the Minnesota Correctional Facility at Shakopee, Minnesota. The host community for the new prison should be sufficiently urban that easy access to a full range of medical, mental health, social, counseling, educational/vocational, employment and transportation services is guaranteed. Further, the site should be reasonably close to the other offices and program of the correctional/justice system and to the source communities of most inmates.

If such a facility is constructed, the Montana female corrections system will have extra prison capacity through the year 2000. A Department survey of 18 states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons revealed that eight states and the federal government would favorably consider renting prison bed space from Montana, should such beds become available. Extra prison beds, if a 200-bed facility is built, would number as follows:

	FISCAL YEAR END						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Prison Beds	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Proj. Prison Pop.	<u>68</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>173</u>
Extra beds*	132	116	99	86	71	50	27

- * "Extra" prison beds presume expansions of community based correctional resources for women. We project a shortage of up to 49 community "beds" by the year 2000.

At \$65.00 per day (the present prevailing cell rental rate), a 200 bed facility would generate the following revenues by the year 2000 if extra beds were rented to out-of-state jurisdiction.

<u>Occupancy Rate</u>	<u>Revenue Generated</u>
50%	\$ 6,844,644
75%	\$ 10,266,994

1
2-14-91
Long Range Plan

WOMEN'S PRISON CONSTRUCTION

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

- 200-BED MINIMUM-MEDIUM-MAXIMUM SECURITY PRISON
- ESTIMATED COST \$11,967,000
- NEW CONSTRUCTION
- MEETS ACA ACCREDITATION STANDARDS
- FREE STANDING
- CAMPUS STYLE CONSTRUCTION WITH INDIVIDUAL HOUSING UNITS/MODULAR
 - MCF SHAKOPEE MODEL
- DESIGN DICTATED BY NEEDS OF FEMALE OFFENDERS

WOMEN'S PRISON CONSTRUCTION COMPONENTS

- **PERIMETER**
 - **PATROLLED PERIMETER ROAD**
 - **NO PERIMETER SECURITY FENCE OR BARBED TAPE**
 - **PERIMETER FENCE TO BE 6' TO SERVE AS A PROPERTY BOUNDARY**
 - **INTERNAL SECURITY FENCING ERECTED AROUND EXERCISE YARD IN HIGH SECURITY HOUSING AREA**
- **CORE BUILDINGS/STRUCTURES**
 - **ADMINISTRATION**
 - **RECEPTION/INTAKE**
 - **VISITATION**
 - **CHAPEL**
 - **MEDICAL SERVICES**
 - **GYMNASIUM/RECREATION**
 - **FOOD SERVICE**
 - **EDUCATION/LIBRARY**
 - **VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**
 - **PRISON INDUSTRIES**
 - **MAINTENANCE**
 - **INMATE PROGRAMMING**

WOMEN'S PRISON CONSTRUCTION COMPONENTS

- **HOUSING UNITS**
 - **HIGH SECURITY UNIT**
 - › **RECEPTION UNIT**
 - › **POPULATION CELLS**
 - › **DISCIPLINARY CELLS**
 - › **PROTECTIVE CUSTODY/ADMIN. SEG.**
 - **GENERAL POPULATION HOUSING**
 - › **INDIVIDUAL UNITS**
 - › **MINIMUM/MEDIUM SECURITY**
 - › **24-36 BEDS EACH**
 - › **80-100 SQUARE FEET PER CELL**
 - › **TOILET/SINK**
 - › **BED/CLOSET/DESK**
 - › **STAINLESS STEEL SECURITY WINDOW SCREENS**
 - › **DAY ROOM**
 - › **SHOWERS/BATHS**
 - **PRE-PLACEMENT HOUSING**
 - › **INDEPENDENT LIVING CONCEPT**
 - › **APARTMENT STYLE HOUSING WITH 2-3 INMATES**
 - › **THREE UNITS**
 - › **COMMUNITY PRIVILEGES (EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, APPROVED ACTIVITIES)**

WOMEN'S PRISON OPERATIONS

- **UP TO 200 INMATES**
 - MONTANA INMATES
 - INMATES FROM ADJACENT STATES
 - FEDERAL INMATES
- **110 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES - 200 BEDS**
80-90 CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES - 120 BEDS
- **ANNUAL PERSONAL SERVICES BUDGET**
ESTIMATED AT \$2,400,000 FOR 200 BEDS,
2,000,000 FOR 120 BEDS
- **ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS**
ESTIMATED AT \$1,095,770 FOR 200 BEDS,
\$650,000 FOR 120 BEDS
- **REVENUES GENERATED FROM BOARDERS TO**
RANGE FROM AS MUCH AS \$2,348,775 IN
1994 TO \$272,838 IN 2000. ALL
GENERATED REVENUES REVERTED TO
GENERAL FUND TO RETIRE PROJECT DEBT

2-14-91
Long Range Planning

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST

PROJECT PRIORITY TABLE

DEPARTMENT/AGENCY		BIENNIIUM	
PRIORITY	PROJECT TITLE	RATIONALE FOR PRIORITY RANKING	SOURCE OF FUNDS
	Construct a New Women's Prison	The need for adequate prison housing for female offenders is evident. We can no longer exist in the temporary facilities we now occupy nor can these buildings be renovated to accommodate current and future inmate populations	General Obligation Bonds

**LONG RANGE BUILDING PROGRAM
CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST**

Project Title	<u>Women's Prison Construction</u>	Department	<u>Institutions</u>
Project Priority	<u>2</u>	Agency/Program	<u>Corrections</u>
Biennium	<u>92/93</u>		

A. THIS PROJECT: [Check One]

☒ Original Facility ☐ Renovates an Existing Facility
☐ Add'n to Existing Facility ☐ Replaces an Existing Facility
☐ Other _____

B. LOCATION: To Be Determined

(check where appropriate)

☐ Site on Currently Owned Property ☐ Utilities Already Available
☒ Site to be Selected ☐ Access Already Available
☐ Site Already Selected

C. DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY:

General Description:

Construct a new, free-standing Women's prison to house female offenders in from minimum to maximum security. Anticipated bed space will accommodate 200 inmates. An alternative plan is available to only construct 120 beds with support services to expand to 200 inmates.

Impact on Existing Facilities:

Existing facilities were only occupied on a temporary basis and will be abandoned or returned to the Montana State Hospital for their use.

Number to be served by Facility: 200

D. EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM BEING ADDRESSED:

The Women's Correctional Center occupies temporary quarters on the MSH campus that are not suitable for prison housing nor the facilities capable of being expanded for increasing populations of female offenders.

SB38 was passed in the 1989 Legislative session directing the Department to develop a comprehensive plan for housing female inmates. The Criminal Justice & Corrections Advisory Council and the Department have completed that study and concluded that a new women's prison must be constructed.

E. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No alternatives are available. Continued occupancy of the existing facilities can not be considered because the capacity is not available to handle more female inmates. There is also no practical way to expand existing facilities to meet the program & housing needs of our female offenders.

Rationale for Selection of a Particular Alternative:

This alternative is the only viable way to address the problem. Renovation of the existing facility is not possible. Renovation of building at another site would be as costly as new construction and would not be able to be designed for the needs of a women's prison.

LONG RANGE BUILDING PROGRAM

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST

F. ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT:

Source of Estimate:	A & E Division
1. Lane Acquisition:	\$ -0-
2. Preliminary Expenses	\$
Site Survey:	\$
Soil Testing:	\$
Other:	\$
3. Construction Cost:	\$ 11,807,000
(Includes all costs except equipment)	
4. Architectural/Eng.Fees:	\$
5. Utilities:	\$
6. Landscaping & Site Development	\$
7. Equipment:	\$ 160,000
8. Contingencies:	\$
9. Other	\$
TOTAL COST	\$ 11,967,000
Less Other Fund Available Source	\$
STATE FUNDS REQUIRED	\$ 11,967,000

G. ESTIMATED OPERATIONAL COST AT COMPLETION:

Expected Completion Date: July, 1993

Number of Additional Personnel Required: 56

Additional Funds Required when Project is in Full Operation

1st BIENNIUM (94)

Personal Services \$ 2,022,771

Operating Expenses \$ 657,462

Maintenance Expenses \$ -0-

2nd BIENNIUM (95)

Personal Services \$ 2,022,771

Operating Expenses \$ 657,462

Maintenance Expenses \$ -0-

3rd BIENNIUM ()

Personal Services \$

Operating Expenses \$

Maintenance Expenses \$

EXHIBIT

2-14-91

Long Range Planning

**LONG RANGE BUILDING PROGRAM
CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST**

GENERAL NARRATIVE MATERIAL

The 1989 Legislature directed the Department of Institutions to develop a comprehensive plan for housing adult female inmates (SB 38, Ch. 581, L. 1989), for presentation to the 52nd Legislature. The Department was directed to:

1. consider the need for building a new correctional facility, as well as other incarceration alternatives;
2. provide for adequate educational, treatment, training, and employment opportunities for female inmates;
3. comply with the standards published by the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, wherever feasible; and,
4. contain proposed legislation for implementing the plan, if appropriate.

Toward this end, the Criminal Justice & Corrections Advisory Council was appointed by the Governor and began work in September, 1989, to complete work begun by a previous council. This council addressed problems outlined by Governor Stephens in Executive Order 17-89, which directed the council to focus its' efforts on the following areas:

1. to address the needs of Montana's female offenders.
2. to develop statistical data on Montana's sentencing statutes & practices & to review sentencing & release practices, and,
3. to further examine ways to address the crowding problems...and provide viable alternatives for addressing both male and female population problems.

The Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory Council, after examining projected female inmate population trends; review of NIC funded evaluation findings; consideration of public testimony, and tours of WCC and two out-of-state facilities, prepared a comprehensive list of recommendations. In addition to expansion of pre-release beds and alternative sanction options, the recommendations included construction of a new woman's prison.

The Council placed construction of a new woman's facility as the number one building priority (size to be determined by the Department).

Anticipated female inmate housing requirements for the proposed facility include Montana inmates and, as a source of revenue until Montana needs all available beds, contracting with out-of-state and/or Federal agencies. Montana anticipates a population of 124 female inmates by 1995. Of these, 84 would be housed at WCC. Current female population projections indicate Montana inmates would nearly fill (87.5%) a 200 bed facility by the year 2000.

The Department recommends construction of a 200 bed female inmate facility. This size will provide housing for Montana inmates through 2000, and permit limited contracting with non-Montana agencies until Montana inmates need all available beds.

1
2-14-91
Long Range Planning

CONSTRUCT WOMEN'S PRISON
COST PROJECTIONS

OCTOBER 23, 1990

CONSTRUCT INFRASTRUCTURE TO SERVE
200 INMATES, AND PROVIDE HOUSING FOR
120 INMATES (5 RECEPTION, 10 DETENTION,
3 INFIRMARY 9 PRE-PER RELEASE, 24
MEDIUM, AND 72 MINIMUM)\$10,075,600

CONSTRUCTION COST PER INMATE \$83,963

CONSTRUCT 2 ADDITIONAL MINIMUM
SECURITY HOUSING UNITS AND 1
MEDIUM SECURITY UNIT (CAPACITY
OF 192 INMATES).....\$11,807,400

CONSTRUCTION COST PER INMATE \$61,497

WOMEN'S PRISON
CORRECTIONS DIVISION
PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE
OCTOBER 1990

DESCRIPTION	SF AREA
-------------	---------

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

GENERAL:

VISITOR VESTIBULE, DETECTION	160
LOBBY, LOCKERS, INMATE SALES, WAITING	320
VISITOR SEARCH	120
SECURITY/CONTROL	120
VISITOR TOILETS (2 @ 70)	140
CONTACT VISITING ROOM	640
RELIGIOUS OFFICE	120
CHAPEL (ADJOIN VISITING, EXPANDS)	160
CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA	280
ATTORNEY CONFERENCE	140
NON-CONTACT VISITING (2)	120
INMATE SEARCH w/ TOILET	100
VENDING	60
OUTDOOR YARD 1,200	

ADMINISTRATION:

WARDEN OFFICE	180
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT/PERSONNEL	140
SECURITY MANAGE	140
CONFERENCE/PAROLE BOARD ROOM (20)	400
TRAINING ROOM	250
LIBRARY/SMALL CONFERENCE	170
CLERICAL SUPPORT (5)	400
BUSINESS MANAGER	140
ACCOUNTANT	140
FILE STORAGE	140
COMMUNICATIONS/SWITCHBOARD	120
MAIL ROOM/WORK AREA	140
PHOTO COPY/SUPPLIES	90
RECORD STORAGE, SEMI-SECURE	120
SECURE STORAGE, VAULT	80
MUSTER ROOM/ STAFF LOUNGE, LOCKERS	380
JANITOR CLOSETS (2 @ 60)	120
MALE STAFF LOCKERS/TOILETS	200
FEMALE STAFF LOCKERS/TOILETS	260
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA	6,090

54% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA	9,380
-----------------------------	-------

2-14-91

Long Range Planning

SECURE AREA:

VEHICLE SALLY PORT	300 SF	
ENTRY VESTIBULE		40
INMATE RECEIVING/PHOTO/FINGERPRINT		160
DRESSING ROOM/SHOWER		70
PROPERTY ISSUE/STORAGE		300
INTERVIEW ROOM		120

5 CELL RECEPTION AREA:

LIVING UNITS (4 @ 80)		400
W/ STAINLESS TOILET/LAV FIXTURES		
SHOWER ROOM W/ TOILET		50
DAY ROOM		175
COUNSELING ROOM		100
COUNSELOR OFFICE		120
FENCED OUTDOOR YARD	400 SF	
GENERAL STORAGE/LINEN		30
JANITOR CLOSET		20

10 CELL LOCK DOWN (CLOSE SECURITY):

VESTIBULE		20
LIVING UNITS (10 @ 80)		800
W/ STAINLESS TOILET/LAV FIXTURES		
INCLUDES 1 INJURY PROOF ROOM		
SHOWER ROOM W/ TOILET		60
DAY ROOM		325
FENCED OUTDOOR YARD	600 SF	
SUPERVISOR OFFICE		120
SECURITY CONTROL CENTER		130
STAFF TOILET		30
GENERAL STORAGE/LINEN		30
LAUNDRY		50
JANITOR CLOSET		20
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA		3,170

88% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA		5,960
-----------------------------	--	-------

INMATE SUPPORT SERVICES

EDUCATION:

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION	140
TEACHERS WORK AREA	160
LIBRARY	540
STANDARD CLASSROOMS	780
SMALL CLASSROOM	460
EQUIPMENT/GENERAL STORAGE	160
CLERICAL TRAINING	390
LIFE SKILLS TRAINING	580
STAFF TOILET	30
INMATE TOILET	90
JANITOR CLOSET	<u>20</u>
SUBTOTAL	3,350

52% GROSS AREA INCREASE 5,090

MEDICAL:

WAITING AREA	100
OFFICE	120
DRUG & RECORD STORAGE	180
DENTAL OPERATORIE	120
MEDICAL EXAM ROOM 2 @ 120	240
GENERAL STORAGE	90
INMATE TOILET	30
STAFF TOILET	30
JANITOR CLOSET	20
INFIRMARY BEDROOMS (3 @ 110)	330
SHARED BATHROOM/TUB	70
STAFF DUTY OFFICE	<u>90</u>
SUBTOTAL	1,420

60% GROSS AREA INCREASE 2,270

MENTAL HEALTH AND TREATMENT:

SUPERVISOR OFFICE	140
TREATMENT SPECIALIST OFFICES (3 @ 120)	360
CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY COUNSELOR OFFICE	120
PSYCHOLOGIST INTERVIEW ROOM	160
GROUP MEETING ROOMS (2 @ 190)	380
BOARD OF PARDONS INTERVIEW ROOM	<u>120</u>
SUBTOTAL	1,280

35% GROSS AREA INCREASE 1,730

EXHIBIT 1
 2-14-91
 Long Range Planning

RECREATION:

BASKET BALL COURT/AEROBICS	
EQUIPMENT, A.V., CHAIR STORAGE	240
WEIGHT ROOM	600
INMATE LOCKERS/SHOWERS	240
PUBLIC LOCKER FACILITIES	180
SMALL CANTEEN	160
CANTEEN OFFICE/STORAGE	60
HAIR SHOP	120
GAME ROOM	180
STAFF OFFICE/LOCKER RM	160
JANITOR CLOSET	40
SUBTOTAL	8,940

 40% GROSS AREA INCREASE 12,520

FOOD SERVICES:

INMATE DINING (100 AT ONE TIME)	1400
STAFF DINING	200
SERVING LINE	200
INMATE TOILET	100
STAFF TOILET	30
BAKERY	400
SALAD/DESERT PREP	200
HOT FOOD PREP	450
DISH WASHING/POT WASHING	340
GARBAGE	140
RECEIVING DOCK	160
DRY FOOD STORAGE	600
FREEZER	200
COOLER	200
SUPERVISOR/DIETITIAN OFFICE	120
JANITOR CLOSET	40
SUBTOTAL	4,780

 45% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA 6,930

INDUSTRIES & VOCATIONAL TRAINING:

INDUSTRIES DIRECTOR	140
BUSINESS OFFICE	240
SEWING AREA	1400
MATERIAL STORAGE	400
DATA ENTRY	800
CRAFTS/GENERAL USE	1200
LAUNDRY	1000
SOILED, WASHING, DRYING, CLEAN	
BREAK AREA/TOILETS/VENDING	200
JANITOR CLOSET	40
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA	5,420

 35% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA 7,320

INMATE HOUSING

24 BED MEDIUM SECURITY UNIT:

ENTRY VESTIBULE	60
SUPERVISOR OFFICE	120
SINGLE ROOMS W/ TOILET/LAV FIXTURE	
24 @ 80	1920
DAY ACTIVITIES SPACE	1200
SHOWER ROOM	120
LINEN STORAGE/DISTRIBUTION	60
PERSONAL LAUNDRY	40
CONTROL ROOM/TOILET	120
INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING	100
JANITOR CLOSET	40
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA	3,780

88% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA 7,110

24 BED MINIMUM SECURITY UNITS (2):

ENTRY VESTIBULE	60
SUPERVISOR OFFICE	120
SINGLE ROOMS W/ TOILET AND LAV.	
24 @ 80	1920
DAY ACTIVITIES SPACE	400
SHOWER ROOM	100
LINEN STORAGE/DISTRIBUTION	60
PERSONAL LAUNDRY	40
SECURITY STATION/TOILET	120
COUNSELING	100
JANITOR CLOSET	40
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA	2,960

80% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA 5,330

9 BED PRE PRE-RELEASE: (OUTSIDE COMPOUND)

INDEPENDENT LIVING OUTSIDE COMPOUND

3 3 PERSON APARTMENTS

FOYER/ ENTRY CLOSET	60	180
LIVING ROOM	160	480
DINING ROOM	100	300
KITCHEN/PANTRY	90	270
LAUNDRY	40	120
BEDROOMS @ 100 EA	300	900
BATHROOM/LINEN CLOSET	70	210
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA		2,460

56% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA 3,840

EXHIBIT 1
2-14-91
Shang Rany P.

FACILITY MAINTENANCE

MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR OFFICE	120
LOCK SHOP	60
CARPENTER SHOP	400
PLUMBING SHOP	200
ELECTRICAL SHOP	200
TOOL STORAGE	120
PAINT STORAGE	100
BREAK/LOCKER ROOM	160
MEN'S & WOMEN'S TOILETS	80
GENERAL WAREHOUSE	1500
RECEIVING DOCK	140
VEHICLE STORAGE (MINIMAL MAINTENANCE)	1200
FUEL STORAGE TANKS	
EMERGENCY GENERATOR ROOM	160
HEATING PLANT INCLUDED IN GROSS AREA	
TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA	4,440

18% INCREASE FOR GROSS AREA	5,240

SITE DEVELOPMENT

CIRCULATION:

ACCESS DRIVE	2,000
15 VISITOR PARKING SPACES	9,000
45 STAFF PARKING SPACES	
SERVICE DRIVES AND LOADING AREAS	
PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION	

RECREATION:

BASE BALL FIELD	
MULTI USE COURT	16,200
RUNNING PATH	
GENERAL ACTIVITY AREA (GRASS)	
EQUIPMENT STORAGE/TOILET	160

SECURITY:

6 FOOT CHAIN LINK FENCE AROUND PERIMETER	
EXTERIOR LIGHTS	
OBSERVATION MOUND FOR PERIMETER PATROL	
PERIMETER PATROL ROAD	

UTILITIES: (DEPENDANT ON SITE)

3 PHASE POWER	
WATER	
SEWER	
NATURAL GAS	
TELEPHONE	

COST SUMMARY

DESCRIPTION	AREA	SF COST	TOTAL
BUILDING COSTS:			
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	9,380	\$65	\$609,700
SECURE ADMINISTRATION	5,960	80	476,800
EDUCATION	5,090	62	315,580
MEDICAL	2,270	78.50	178,195
MENTAL HEALTH & TREATMENT	1,730	68.50	118,505
RECREATION	12,520	73.50	920,220
FOOD SERVICE	6,930	88.50	613,305
INDUSTRIES	7,320	65	475,800
MEDIUM SECURITY HOUSING	7,110	80	568,800
3 MIN. SECURITY HOUSING	15,990	71.50	1,143,285
PRE PRE-RELEASE	3,840	71.50	274,560
FACILITY MAINTENANCE	5,240	58	<u>303,920</u>
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION			\$5,998,670

COST INCLUDES CONTRACTOR OH & P @ 15 % AND ARCHITECT FEES OF 8%.
POPULATION CAPACITY OF 120 INMATES.

FOR A POPULATION CAPACITY OF 192 INMATES
CONSTRUCT THE ABOVE PLUS 1 MED. SECURITY HOUSING UNIT &
ADD 2 MIN. SECURITY HOUSING UNITS \$7,329,660

CONSTRUCTION COST IS BASED ON TEXTURED PRECAST CONCRETE OR CONCRETE
BLOCK/ FACE BRICK WALLS, STRUCTURAL STEEL FRAME WITH SLAB ON GRADE
FLOORS, SINGLE PLY MEMBRANE OR SLOPED METAL ROOF, STEEL STUDS AND
GYPSUM BOARD PARTITIONS, COMPLETE MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS
INCLUDING A LIGHT HAZARD FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM.

SITE DEVELOPMENT:			
CONCRETE SURFACING	5,620	2.50	\$14,050
PAVERS	33,610	4.25	142,845
ASPHALT PAVING	172,505	2.50	431,265
CURBS GUTTERS ETC.	LS		36,000
PERIMETER PATH	26,036	1.25	32,545
SOFT BALL FIELD	57,600	2.48	142,800
MULTI-USE COURT	16,200	10.00	162,000
IMPROVEMENTS/UTILITIES	LS		88,080
LANDSCAPING/SPRINKLER	325,000	.91	295,605
SECURITY FENCE/LIGHTS	LS		<u>114,840</u>
SITE COSTS			\$1,460,030

1
2-14-91
Long Range Plan.

PROJECT COST FOR 192 INMATE WOMEN'S PRISON BUILT TO 120 BED CAPACITY.

BUILDINGS	\$5,998,670
SITE DEVELOPMENT	\$1,460,030
SUBTOTAL	\$7,458,700
FURNISHINGS/EQUIPMENT ESTIMATE	\$ 285,000
10% CONTINGENCY	\$ 774,370
INFLATION (BASED ON 1992 CONST. START):	
'90-4%, '91-4.7%, '92-6.5%, '93-2%	<u>\$1,557,530</u>
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$10,075,600

PROJECT COST FOR 192 INMATE WOMEN'S PRISON BUILT TO FULL CAPACITY.

BUILDINGS	\$7,329,660
SITE DEVELOPMENT	\$1,460,030
SUBTOTAL	\$8,789,690
FURNISHINGS/EQUIPMENT ESTIMATE	\$ 285,000
10% CONTINGENCY	\$ 907,469
INFLATION (BASED ON 1992 CONST. START):	
'90-4%, '91-4.7%, '92-6.5%, '93-2%	<u>\$1,825,241</u>
TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$11,807,400

**REQUEST FOR COMMUNITY PROPOSALS
AND RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY
SCREENING**

1
2-14-91
Seeking Range Plan

HISTORY OF ACTIVITY/WOMEN'S PRISON

- November 21, 1990 - Request for Letters of Intent.

- December 9, 1990 - Deadline for communities to submit Letters of Intent to construct the Women's Facility. Received 20 Letters of Intent.

- December 10, 1990 - All communities having submitted a Letter of Intent are invited to informational meeting at SRS Auditorium of December 14, 1990.

- December 14, 1990 - Informational meeting with representatives of communities intending to submit proposals. Distribution of general requirements for proposals.

- December 18, 1990 - Letter sent to 20 communities asking for clarification of intent to submit proposals. Only 13 of the original 20 interested communities were present at the December 14 meeting. All communities were asked to notify the Department, in writing, by December 31, 1990 if planning to submit a proposal.

- December 31, 1990 - Absolute deadline for informing the Department if a proposal is going to be submitted.

- January 30, 1991 - Deadline for submission of proposals, as announced at December 14 meeting and the document outlining general requirements. Eight proposals received.

- February 4, 1991 - Letters sent to all competing communities acknowledging receipt of proposals.

- February 4, 1991 - Corrections staff opens and begins preliminary assessment of proposals.

- February 7, 1991 - Results of preliminary assessment provided Division Administrator

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
COMMUNITY SITE SELECTION FOR A
WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Prepared by the
Department of Institutions

December 14, 1990

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

FOR

COMMUNITY SITE SELECTION FOR A
WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

General requirements for the proposals concerning
a site selection for a women's correctional facility.

1
2-14-91
HB Long Range Planning

A. Project Description

The Department of Institutions, hereinafter called the Department, has proposed that a 200-bed minimum, medium, and maximum security prison for women be built. The Department requests proposals from communities wishing to finance, locate and construct a new women's prison to be built to Department specifications for lease by the State of Montana. The Montana Legislature will be asked to approve that process. The host community and prison site will be chosen by a site selection committee using specific, scored site criteria developed by the Department.

B. Proposal

The Respondent shall present a proposal which outlines the community's ability to best provide the site and services required for the placement of the proposed 200-bed, minimum, medium, and maximum security women's correctional facility. The proposal must include:

1. Demonstration of the extent to which a sponsoring community complies with the Department's program and construction site criteria;
2. Demonstration of the sponsoring community's ability to obtain financing, the conditions under which that financing will be obtained and the extent of community contributions to the project (e.g. land, land access, SID, etc.);
3. Demonstration that the sponsoring community has successfully completed a major construction project and can complete the proposed prison project for occupancy by the Department of Institutions, no later than July 1, 1993.

C. Program Site Criteria

The proposal must contain:

1. Demonstration from the governing authorities and local residents that the proposal has been endorsed and will be pursued by those authorities. A public hearing must be held to determine the level of support by the community prior to final selection.

2. A 24-hour emergency medical service vehicle must be available with a 10-minute or less response time upon notification of an emergency. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of a 24-hour emergency medical service vehicle to the proposed site upon notification of an emergency.
3. A 24-hour active fire protection service must be available with a 15-minute or less response time upon notification of an emergency. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of a 24-hour active fire protection service to the proposed site upon notification of an emergency.
4. Public water supply and sewage disposal facilities must be available on site. The Respondent will demonstrate the availability of these services on the proposed site.
5. An interstate or highway exit must be available within 10 road miles of the site. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity of an interstate or major highway exit to the proposed site.
6. The site shall be reasonably close to a certified local law enforcement agency capable of emergency response. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity of a certified local law enforcement agency to the proposed site, and the level of capability of emergency response.
7. The Respondent will demonstrate the compatibility of the proposed site with local zoning ordinances.
8. The site must be reasonably close to certified and/or licensed sources of the following services:
 - a. Medical Services The site shall be within fifteen road miles of a referral hospital with 24-hour emergency room service and an attending physician. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and current availability of a full range of medical care for the routine and emergency medical care of the inmates on a 24-hour basis including, but not limited to, a referral hospital, a 24-hour emergency room service and an attending physician, and medical specialties needed by female inmates (i.e. obstetrical and gynecology, family practice, internal medicine, etc.). The Respondent will also demonstrate the willingness of medical providers to deliver these services to inmates of the proposed prison.
 - b. Chemical Dependency The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, current levels of service, and willingness to contract with the state to deliver chemical dependency services.
 - c. Mental Health Services The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, current levels of service, and

1
2-14-91
Belong Range Plan.

willingness to contract with the state to deliver mental health services. These services must include all levels of mental health services including, but not limited to, psychiatric care, clinical services, inpatient and outpatient treatment, and programs appropriate to women's needs.

- d. Vocational education center and programmatic equivalent and Unit of Higher Education (public or private) The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, and types of training available in post-secondary institutions such as units of Higher Education (public or private) and vocational education centers, or the programmatic equivalents. The Respondent will demonstrate the extent to which the available programs present basic skill development opportunities and should demonstrate a willingness to allow selected inmates to attend the programs; a willingness to meet inmates' special needs; and, the willingness to allow their staff to contract with the prison to provide these services on site to educate those unable to leave the facility. The institutions should show a willingness to place interns in appropriate fields of study in programs at the prison.
 - e. Child care and foster care The Respondent must demonstrate the quantity and availability of licensed foster care and all levels of child care including, but not limited to, registered day care, licensed group care and out-of-home care. A Respondent may do this by contacting the Department of Family Services Regional Administrator for their region.
 - f. Organizational support The Respondent will demonstrate the existence of established organizations which relate to women's needs, i.e. battered spouse, parenting, self-esteem, employment, displaced homemaker programs, etc. The Respondent will also demonstrate the existence of established organizations which relate to Native American issues.
- 10. The site community must be served by interstate transportation services (examples are air, bus, or train services). The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of these services.
 - 11. The site must be located in a community reasonably close to counties contributing the majority of female offenders. The Respondent will demonstrate their proximity to these counties. Proximity to the committing counties is particularly important in terms of transportation of inmates to and from the counties and for the benefit of inmate visitors and legal counsel.

D. Construction Site Criteria

The proposal must contain:

1. Demonstration that the site has direct access to paved public streets, reliable utilities such as water, sewer system, natural gas, electricity, and telephone services. These services must be readily available and capable of supporting the additional load. The proposed site must be 15-20 acres. The water system must be able to provide a minimum of 1500 GPM with 20 PSI residual pressure and meet EPA primary drinking water regulations;
2. Documentation that the property does not lie within a 100 year flood plain identified in FEMA Flood Hazard Boundary Maps, Soil Conservation Service Flood Hazard Studies, or Corps of Engineers Flood Information Reports;
3. Documentation that the water table will allow the facility a basement structure; and must include subsurface soils and water table analyses based on actual site investigation or general description based on soils in the immediate area. (Final selection will require an actual soil investigation.); and,
4. Climatic information including but not limited to average monthly temperature, average monthly precipitation, monthly solar days, and monthly average wind speed and direction.

E. Special Instruction to Respondents

1. Authorization

This request for proposal (RFP) is issued in accordance with 18-4-304, Montana Code Annotated and 2.5.602, Administrative Rules of Montana. The RFP process is a procurement option allowing the award to be based upon stated criteria or evaluation factors.

2. Financial Information

The communities must demonstrate that adequate financial resources are available to design and construct a 200-bed minimum, medium and maximum security facility at an estimated cost of \$11,967,000. The state will lease the facility over a period of 20 years, with an option of clear ownership of any real property at the end of the period. Financial options include Industrial Revenue Bonds, Certificate of Participation or other acceptable financial mechanisms. This estimated cost does not include the land acquisition of 15 to 20 acres. The Department will require new construction of a free-standing facility, to American Correctional Association standards, in a modular, campus design similar to that of the Minnesota Correctional Facility at Shakopee. The facility will be built in or near an established municipality able to provide the necessary services as stated in the site criteria.

3. RFP Information

- a. Proposals must be signed, sealed, and delivered to the:

DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS
1539 11TH AVENUE
HELENA, MT 59620

no later than 5:00 p.m. January 30, 1990. The proposal should contain an original document and four copies. The proposals will remain sealed and unopened until the closing date and time.

- b. Proposals must provide all data required herein. Failure to submit all such data will be deemed sufficient cause for rejection of a proposal.
- c. If it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, revisions will be provided to all Respondents who receive the initial RFP at least one week (seven calendar days) before the close of the response period.
- d. The Respondent must assume sole responsibility for the complete efforts as required by this RFP and will be considered the sole point of contact with regard to contractual matters.
- e. The Department of Institutions assumes no responsibility or liability for costs incurred by communities prior to issuance of a Contract.
- f. The Respondent shall be responsible for any and all injury or damage as a result of the research and preparation of the proposal.
- g. A contract may be awarded in response to a proposal considered to be in the best interest of the Department contingent upon project approval by the Legislature.
- h. A list of construction management firms and architects known to have experience in design and construction of correctional facilities is attached in the event that a community wishes to contact one in the preparation of the proposal.

4. Approach to the selection criteria.

- a. A Respondent must specifically identify the method and manner in which the community proposes to provide the required services.

- b. A Respondent must submit a written narrative and may submit any other printed material to demonstrate the community's ability to satisfy the selection criteria.
- c. In addition, the Respondent must outline a schedule of events or milestones and indicate the time requirements and key personnel associated with each one.

5. Oral Presentation

Respondents may be requested to orally present their proposal to the Department of Institutions who will schedule the time and location of any requested presentations.

6. Evaluation Process

Proposals will be evaluated by a selection committee composed of individuals designated by the Department of Institutions and a representative from the Department of Administration's Architecture and Engineering Division. Proposals will be judged on the extent to which they meet the needs of women offenders. The committee will use a scoring method based on the extent to which the program and construction criteria are met. Additional consideration will be made regarding an available financial package, community contributions, and the community's ability to complete a major construction project. The committee will make a recommendation to the Director of the Department of Institutions, who will make the final decision.

7. Basis of Awards

The Contract will be awarded to the Respondent whose proposal best serves the interests of the program as defined by the Department in the site and selection criteria and the needs of the Department.

F. Department Responsibility

The Department will comply with all reasonable requests from respondents for additional information that may be required in order to respond to this request. Such request may be addressed in writing or requested verbally through Department contacts listed in this section.

Department of Institutions contact is Dan Russell, Administrator, (406) 444-3902, or Ted Clack, (406) 444-4907, Corrections Division, Capitol Station, Helena, Montana.

2-14-91
Long Range Plan

Partial List of Construction Management and/or
Architects known to have experience in the
Design and Construction of Correctional Facilities

1. Vanir Construction Management Inc.
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 444-3700
Contact: Dick Engler
2. Voinovich California Inc. (Architects)
4740 Northgate Blvd., Suite 135
Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 921-5685
Contact: Peter MacEwan or Pay Snowden
3. Morrison-Knudsen
P.O. Box 7808
Boise, Idaho
(208) 386-5831
4. Heery Program Management
999 Peachtree Street N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30367
(404) 881-1666
5. HDR Inc.
Suite 125
12700 Hillcrest Rd.
Dallas, Texas 75230-2096
(214) 960-4000
Contact; Sue Cunningham
6. Kitchell CEM
1707 E. Highland, Suite 280
Phoenix, AZ 85016
(602) 266-1970
7. DMJM
Denver, CO
(303) 892-1300
8. CRSS
216 16th Mall St., Suite 1500
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 820-5200
9. Rosser FABRAP/Justice Systems
524 W. Peachtree St.
Atlanta, GA 30308
(404) 876-3800

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

**PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF EVENTS FOR SELECTION
OF HOST COMMUNITY FOR THE PROPOSED
WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY**

1. January 30, 1991: Deadline for submission of community proposals.
2. February 4, 1991:
 - a. Letters sent to communities acknowledging receipt of proposals.
 - b. Corrections staff initiates preliminary review of community proposals. The review will entail examination of proposals for compliance with selection criteria. Records of the preliminary screening will be kept to include scores of individual proposals. The preliminary review is intended to initially determine:
 1. That the Department is in receipt of an adequate number of viable responses in compliance with the siting criteria;
 2. That proposed financial arrangements are adequate and affordable;
 3. That, in general, these communities can adequately manage the plan to completion.
 - c. The preliminary review is not intended to determine a final site nor to eliminate any of the proposals from contention.
3. February 8-15, 1991: Present proposals for the Women's Prison to the LRBP. The Department's proposal will preferably be presented at the same time as the house bill sponsored by Rep. Vivian Brooke.
 - a. The Department will provide the LRBP committee with preliminary information about the RFP's regarding the following:
 1. Adequacy and number of responses;
 2. Financial packages;
 3. Capability of communities to manage a project of this magnitude to completion.
 - b. This presentation is intended to result in obtaining approval to build a facility with the funding mechanisms and in the manner proposed by the Department.
 - c. Procedures, criteria and schedules to be followed in final selection of the host community will be mailed once the process is finally approved by the legislature.

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

1
DATE 2-14-91
HB Long Range Plan

FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE APPROVAL:

1. May 1, 1991: Members of the Site Selection Committee will begin the final review process. Correction's Division will staff this process.
2. May 10, 1991: Site Selection Committee identifies the top three community proposals.
3. May 15, 1991: Site Selection Committee completes site visits and completes final review of proposals. Recommendations are forwarded to the Director for his consideration.
4. May 24, 1991: The Director of the Department makes the final decision on the host community.

SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE:

The membership of the Site Selection Committee will consist of individuals selected from the following areas:

2 members of the Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory Council;

2 State Representatives;

2 State Senators;

2 Correctional Professionals;

1 Representative from A & E;

1 Financial Advisor;

1 Citizen at Large.

Selection of the Legislative members of the Committee will be made by the leadership of the houses with the understanding that no committee member will be selected who resides in or represents any of the communities under consideration. The Citizen at Large will be chosen by the Governor's Office and all remaining members will be selected by the Director of the Department of Institutions.

SUGGESTED LETTER

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

January 28, 1991

~F1~

Dear ~F2~:

Your proposal to construct the women's prison has been received in this office. Thank you for your interest and support for this endeavor.

Enclosed you will find two items. One is a tentative schedule of events which will result in the selection of a site for the prison. The other is a preliminary scoring grid to enable us to objectively evaluate all proposals prior to making any site visits.

You will be notified of progress periodically. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Daniel D. Russell, Administrator
~~Assistant Director~~
Department of Institutions

CC:JP:bt

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

FAVORABILITY SCALE

#1 Commitment by Local Government	Public and officials strongly opposed.	Public or officials strongly opposed.	Moderate support/resistance. Would probably be accepted with lobbying effort.	Idea appears to be supported by residents and officials as evidenced by public hearing.	No controversy or opposition is expected on the part of local residents or officials and written support from local org., women support groups, employment oppor- tunities, etc.
#2 Hospital and Physician Services	21 or more miles from these services.	16 - 20 miles from these services.	Within 11-15 road miles of referral hospital with 24 hour E.R. service and attending physician.	Within 6-10 road miles of referral hospital with 24 hour E.R. service and attending physician.	Within 5 miles of referral hospital with 24 hour E.R. service and attending physician, OB-GYN, psychiatrist, internists, dentist.
#3 Ambulance Service	This service is available with a response time of greater than 20 minutes.	This service is available with a response time of 16 - 20 minutes.	This service is available with a response time of 11 - 15 minutes.	This service is available with a response time of 6 - 10 minutes.	A 24-hour ambulance service is available with a response time of less than 5 minutes.
#4 Fire Protection	No protection.	Volunteer protection or a response time of 16 minutes or more.	A 24-hour fire protection service is available with a response time of 11 - 15 minutes.	24-hour protection with a response time of 6 - 10 minutes.	A 24-hour fire protection service is available with a response time of less than 5 minutes.
#5 Public Water and Sewage	Neither water or sewage facilities are available on site. Will require drainfield and well drilling.	Neither is available. Can be "brought in" at considerable expense.	Water or disposal facilities is available. The other can be developed at minimal cost.	Both services are avail- able nearby and can be developed at minimal cost.	Public water supply and sewage disposal facilities are available on site.
#6 Availability of Interstate Highway	26 miles or more.	Interstate or highway exit is available within 21 - 25 miles.	Interstate or highway exit is available within 16 - 20 miles.	Interstate or highway exit is available within 11 - 15 road miles.	Interstate or highway exit is available within 10 road miles.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

FAVORABILITY SCALE

	-	-	+	+	++
#7 Availability of Emergency Law Enforcement Agency	21 miles or more away.	16 - 20 miles from law enforcement agency.	11 - 15 miles from law enforcement agency.	6 - 10 miles from law enforcement agency.	Within 5 miles of full-service emergency law enforcement. (Consider existence of a SWAT team?)
#8 Compatible with Local Zoning Ordinances	Incompatible; no hope for change or revision.		Compatibility is subject to interpretation.		Fully compatible at present.
#9 Availability of Human Services	Services are unavailable.	The site is in excess of 15 miles to these services.	All services are available within 15 miles on a <u>private</u> <u>basis only</u> .	The site is within 15 miles to the following: 1. Chemical Dependency Counseling (certified and licensed centers who agree to contract with state for their services) 2. Mental Health Services also, battered women, parenting, etc. (certified and licensed centers who agree to contract with state for their services)	The site must be within 15 miles of inpatient & outpatient services on both a public & private basis. Licensed and certified professional staff. 1. Statement by local DRS Regional Admin. re: availability of registered day care, licensed foster care.
#10 Availability of Educational Services	Services are unavailable.	Available by telecommunication or satellite.	One of the two types of education is readily available.	Both types of education are available, but without on-site involvement.	1. Vocational Education Center (on-site availability of interns & with appropriate programming for women's level of ed. and needs) 2. Unit of Higher Education (on-site availability of interns & with appropriate programming for women's level of ed. and needs)

DATE 2-14-91
 HB Long Range Plan

#11 Interstate Transportation	No interstate transportation services.	Interstate transportation services are more than 25 miles away.	Community is served by means of interstate bus transportation only.	Community is served by two modes of interstate transportation. One must be air.	Community is served by interstate air, rail and bus services.
#12 Accessibility from All Parts of State	Site is remote, not near counties contributing to the majority of female commitments.	Site is within 300 miles of counties contributing the majority of female offenders (10 or more percent)	Site is within 250 miles of counties contributing the majority of female offenders (10 or more percent)	Site is within 200 miles of counties contributing the majority of female offenders (10 or more percent)	Site is within 150 miles of counties contributing the majority of female offenders. (10 or more percent)

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

2-14-91
Long Range Plan

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Community #1	Community #2	Community #3	Community #4	Community #5	Community #6
Commitment by Local Government	10						
Hospital and Physician Services	10						
Ambulance Service	9						
Fire Protection	10						
Water and Sewage	8						
Availability of Interstate Highway	6						
Availability of Emergency Law Enforcement	9						
Local Zoning Ordinances	9						
Availability of Human Services	8						
Availability of Educational Resources	8						
Interstate Transportation	9						
Proximity to Counties of Commitment	7						
Total	103						
Total Possible	206						

FOR DECISION ONLY

$$\frac{X.66}{136} = \text{MINIMUM SCORE FOR CONSIDERATION}$$

A Request for Proposal was issued by the Department of Institutions in November, 1990. The RFP was intended to determine community interest in and capability of providing a new women's prison for lease/purchase by the State. All Montana county governments and 44 community governments received copies of the RFP. An informational meeting was held December 14, 1990 to advise interested local governments of the particular requirements of the RFP. Particular attention was paid to the Department's site selection criteria. Those criteria are:

1. Commitment by Local Government
2. Hospital and Physician Services
3. Ambulance Service
4. Fire Protection
5. Water and Sewage
6. Availability of Interstate Highway
7. Availability of Emergency Law Enforcement
8. Local Zoning Ordinances
9. Availability of Human Services
10. Availability of Educational Resources
11. Interstate Transportation
12. Proximity to counties of major female commitments

Corrections Division staff completed a preliminary assessment of community proposals to construct a women's correctional facility during the week of February 3, 1991. The focus of the assessment was to determine each community's capability to respond to the criteria established by the Department. Each proposal was rated on the favorability of response to each criteria from "very desirable" to very

1
2-14-91
Long Range Plan

undesirable" to assist the selection committee in further evaluating the proposals. Division staff did not attach any order of importance to each criterion but treated them all as if equally important. "Fine-tuning" by the selection surely will result in some variation of importance among all criteria. Eight proposals were received and evaluated. Most of them appropriately addressed the criteria. Preliminary scoring demonstrated that as many as five of the proposals are viable and deserving of further evaluation. A summary of the responses to the criteria follows:

1. Commitment by Local Government.

Six of the proposals evidenced a very high level of commitment. Some had gone so far as to hold public hearings. Others had solicited various levels of support. All demonstrated an ability to complete major construction projects.

2. Hospital and Physician Services

Only two proposals were considered to provide a "highly favorable" response to this need. Most of the remaining responses were "favorable". One proposal did not adequately address the issue. Those rated "favorable" generally received this rating due to:

- a. Distance to the Services;
- b. Unavailability of certain services.

3. Ambulance Services

Four communities were rated "highly favorable". Three were rated "favorable." The differences were primarily relative to response time. One proposal did not address the issue.

4. Fire Protection

Five proposals rated as "highly favorable" in this regard. One was rated as "unfavorable". The differences were due to:

- a. Response time;
- b. Full-time public v. volunteer;
- c. Both of the above.

One proposal did not address the issue.

5. Water and Sewage

Seven of the proposals were rated "highly favorable". One was rated as "fair". The differences in rating were due to:

- a. Distance to these services;
- b. Cost to develop;
- c. Both of the above.

1
2-14-91
HB Long Range Planning

6. Availability of Interstate Highway

Seven of the proposals were rated "highly favorable". One proposal was rated "highly unfavorable" due to the distance to an interstate highway.

7. Availability of Emergency Law Enforcement

Five proposals were rated "highly favorable". Two were rated "favorable" and one proposal failed to address the issue. Differences in ratings were due to:

- a. Response time, or;
- b. Size of force, or;
- c. Availability of special teams or services.

8. Local Zoning Ordinances

Five proposals were rated "highly favorable" as no changes would be required. Two proposals would require changes, but no difficulties were foreseen.

One proposal failed to address the issue.

9. Availability of Human Services

Two proposals were rated "highly favorable". Five were rated "favorable" and one was rated as "fair". The differences were due to:

- a. Availability of both inpatient and outpatient programs;
- b. Availability of both public and private services;
- c. Licensure and certification of providers.

10. Availability of Educational Resources

Four proposals were rated "highly favorable". One was rated "fair". One was rated "unfavorable" and two were rated "highly unfavorable". The differences are primarily attributable to:

- a. Proximity to both Vo-Tech schools and units of higher education;
- b. Availability of interns;
- c. Availability of on-site services.

1
2-14-91
Long Range Planning

11. Interstate Transportation Services

Four communities were rated "favorable". Four were rated "fair". None of the communities could boast air, bus and rail services. The "favorable" ratings were due mostly to the proximity to a major airport and bus service. Those rated "fair" were served primarily by bus.

12. Proximity to Counties of Commitment

Two communities were rated as "highly favorable". Four were rated as "favorable", one was rated as "fair" and one was rated as unfavorable.

Differences were due to the distances from the proposing communities to those counties committing the highest numbers of females to prison.

In summary, eight Montana communities submitted positive responses to the Department's RFP. Those responses were reviewed by Division staff. Five of the eight proposals are considered worthy of further, more detailed analyses.

MONTANA WOMEN'S PRISON FACILITY FINANCING SUMMARY(1)

EXHIBIT 2
DATE 2.14.91
HB 5 Long Range Plan

	<u>LEASE OPTION</u>	<u>G. O. OPTION</u>
Par amount of Bonds sold(2).....	\$12,970	\$12,820
Average interest rate(3).....	6.44%	6.29%
Avg annual debt service pmts(4).....	\$1,171	\$1,144
Total debt service payments(5).....	\$25,052	\$24,447

(1) Dollar figures are in thousands. All figures are preliminary estimates only.

(2) See accompanying Source and Application of Funds Schedule. Note that for simplicity of presentation, figures shown include no provision for a capitalized debt service reserve fund.

(3) Based upon interest rates in effect on February 13, 1991. Assumes lease revenue bonds are rated 'A-' by bond rating agencies.

(4) Averages shown are for 20 year period beginning with completion of construction.

(5) See accompanying debt service schedules.

MONTANA WOMEN'S PRISON FACILITY FINANCING SUMMARY

SOURCE AND APPLICATION OF FUNDS SCHEDULE(1)

	<u>LEASE OPTION</u>	<u>G. O. OPTION</u>
SOURCE OF FUNDS:		
Proceeds of Bonds.....	\$12,970	\$12,820
Interest earnings during constr(2).....	955	950
TOTAL FUNDS PROVIDED.....	\$13,925	\$13,770
 APPLICATION OF FUNDS:		
Construction & related costs.....	\$12,000	\$12,000
Capitalized interest(3).....	1,630	1,575
Financing costs(4).....	295	195
TOTAL FUNDS APPLIED.....	\$13,925	\$13,770

(1) Figures are in thousands and are preliminary estimates only. For simplicity of presentation no debt service reserve fund is shown to be capitalized in either option.

(2) Assuming a level construction drawdown over two years and average earnings on the construction and debt service accounts of 7.0 % per annum.

(3) Assuming interest is capitalized for the entire two year construction period at average interest rates of 6.44 % for the lease option and 6.29 % for the G.O. option.

(4) Assuming total financing costs of 2.25 % of the par amount of Bonds sold for the lease option and 1.5 % of the total amount of Bonds sold for the G. O. option.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
LEASE REVENUE BONDS
(STATE OF MONTANA LEASE REVENUE BONDS)

DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

2
2-14-91
Long Range Planning

DATE	PRINCIPAL	COUPON	INTEREST	PERIOD TOTAL	FISCAL TOTAL
1/ 1/92			407,492.50	407,492.50	
7/ 1/92			407,492.50	407,492.50	814,985.00
1/ 1/93			407,492.50	407,492.50	
7/ 1/93			407,492.50	407,492.50	814,985.00
1/ 1/94			407,492.50	407,492.50	
7/ 1/94	355,000.00	5.150000	407,492.50	762,492.50	1,169,985.00
1/ 1/95			398,351.25	398,351.25	
7/ 1/95	375,000.00	5.350000	398,351.25	773,351.25	1,171,702.50
1/ 1/96			388,320.00	388,320.00	
7/ 1/96	395,000.00	5.500000	388,320.00	783,320.00	1,171,640.00
1/ 1/97			377,457.50	377,457.50	
7/ 1/97	415,000.00	5.600000	377,457.50	792,457.50	1,169,915.00
1/ 1/98			365,837.50	365,837.50	
7/ 1/98	440,000.00	5.700000	365,837.50	805,837.50	1,171,675.00
1/ 1/99			353,297.50	353,297.50	
7/ 1/99	465,000.00	5.800000	353,297.50	818,297.50	1,171,595.00
1/ 1/ 0			339,812.50	339,812.50	
7/ 1/ 0	490,000.00	5.900000	339,812.50	829,812.50	1,169,625.00
1/ 1/ 1			325,357.50	325,357.50	
7/ 1/ 1	520,000.00	6.000000	325,357.50	845,357.50	1,170,715.00
1/ 1/ 2			309,757.50	309,757.50	
7/ 1/ 2	550,000.00	6.100000	309,757.50	859,757.50	1,169,515.00
1/ 1/ 3			292,982.50	292,982.50	
7/ 1/ 3	585,000.00	6.200000	292,982.50	877,982.50	1,170,965.00
1/ 1/ 4			274,847.50	274,847.50	
7/ 1/ 4	620,000.00	6.300000	274,847.50	894,847.50	1,169,695.00
1/ 1/ 5			255,317.50	255,317.50	
7/ 1/ 5	660,000.00	6.400000	255,317.50	915,317.50	1,170,635.00
1/ 1/ 6			234,197.50	234,197.50	
7/ 1/ 6	705,000.00	6.450000	234,197.50	939,197.50	1,173,395.00
1/ 1/ 7			211,461.25	211,461.25	
7/ 1/ 7	750,000.00	6.500000	211,461.25	961,461.25	1,172,922.50
1/ 1/ 8			187,086.25	187,086.25	
7/ 1/ 8	795,000.00	6.550000	187,086.25	982,086.25	1,169,172.50
1/ 1/ 9			161,050.00	161,050.00	
7/ 1/ 9	850,000.00	6.600000	161,050.00	1,011,050.00	1,172,100.00
1/ 1/10			133,000.00	133,000.00	
7/ 1/10	905,000.00	6.650000	133,000.00	1,038,000.00	1,171,000.00
1/ 1/11			102,908.75	102,908.75	
7/ 1/11	965,000.00	6.650000	102,908.75	1,067,908.75	1,170,817.50
1/ 1/12			70,822.50	70,822.50	
7/ 1/12	1,030,000.00	6.650000	70,822.50	1,100,822.50	1,171,645.00
1/ 1/13			36,575.00	36,575.00	

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
LEASE REVENUE BONDS
(STATE OF MONTANA LEASE REVENUE BONDS)

DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

DATE	PRINCIPAL	COUPON	INTEREST	PERIOD TOTAL	FISCAL TOTAL
7/ 1/13	1,100,000.00	6.650000	36,575.00	1,136,575.00	1,173,150.00
	12,970,000.00		12,081,835.00	25,051,835.00	
ACCRUED	12,970,000.00		12,081,835.00	25,051,835.00	

Dated 7/ 1/91 with Delivery of 7/ 1/91

Bond Years 187,525.000

Average Coupon 6.442786

Average Life 14.458365

M I C % 6.442786 % Using 100.0000000

STATE OF MONTANA
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
(WOMEN'S PRISON FACILITY)

DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

2
2-14-91
Long Range Planning

DATE	PRINCIPAL	COUPON	INTEREST	PERIOD TOTAL	FISCAL TOTAL
1/ 1/92			392,972.50	392,972.50	
7/ 1/92			392,972.50	392,972.50	785,945.00
1/ 1/93			392,972.50	392,972.50	
7/ 1/93			392,972.50	392,972.50	785,945.00
1/ 1/94			392,972.50	392,972.50	
7/ 1/94	355,000.00	5.000000	392,972.50	747,972.50	1,140,945.00
1/ 1/95			384,097.50	384,097.50	
7/ 1/95	375,000.00	5.200000	384,097.50	759,097.50	1,143,195.00
1/ 1/96			374,347.50	374,347.50	
7/ 1/96	395,000.00	5.350000	374,347.50	769,347.50	1,143,695.00
1/ 1/97			363,781.25	363,781.25	
7/ 1/97	415,000.00	5.450000	363,781.25	778,781.25	1,142,562.50
1/ 1/98			352,472.50	352,472.50	
7/ 1/98	440,000.00	5.550000	352,472.50	792,472.50	1,144,945.00
1/ 1/99			340,262.50	340,262.50	
7/ 1/99	465,000.00	5.650000	340,262.50	805,262.50	1,145,525.00
1/ 1/ 0			327,126.25	327,126.25	
7/ 1/ 0	490,000.00	5.750000	327,126.25	817,126.25	1,144,252.50
1/ 1/ 1			313,038.75	313,038.75	
7/ 1/ 1	515,000.00	5.850000	313,038.75	828,038.75	1,141,077.50
1/ 1/ 2			297,975.00	297,975.00	
7/ 1/ 2	545,000.00	5.950000	297,975.00	842,975.00	1,140,950.00
1/ 1/ 3			281,761.25	281,761.25	
7/ 1/ 3	580,000.00	6.050000	281,761.25	861,761.25	1,143,522.50
1/ 1/ 4			264,216.25	264,216.25	
7/ 1/ 4	615,000.00	6.150000	264,216.25	879,216.25	1,143,432.50
1/ 1/ 5			245,305.00	245,305.00	
7/ 1/ 5	655,000.00	6.250000	245,305.00	900,305.00	1,145,610.00
1/ 1/ 6			224,836.25	224,836.25	
7/ 1/ 6	695,000.00	6.300000	224,836.25	919,836.25	1,144,672.50
1/ 1/ 7			202,943.75	202,943.75	
7/ 1/ 7	740,000.00	6.350000	202,943.75	942,943.75	1,143,887.50
1/ 1/ 8			179,448.75	179,448.75	
7/ 1/ 8	785,000.00	6.400000	179,448.75	964,448.75	1,143,897.50
1/ 1/ 9			154,328.75	154,328.75	
7/ 1/ 9	835,000.00	6.450000	154,328.75	989,328.75	1,143,657.50
1/ 1/10			127,400.00	127,400.00	
7/ 1/10	890,000.00	6.500000	127,400.00	1,017,400.00	1,144,800.00
1/ 1/11			98,475.00	98,475.00	
7/ 1/11	945,000.00	6.500000	98,475.00	1,043,475.00	1,141,950.00
1/ 1/12			67,762.50	67,762.50	
7/ 1/12	1,010,000.00	6.500000	67,762.50	1,077,762.50	1,145,525.00
1/ 1/13			34,937.50	34,937.50	

STATE OF MONTANA
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
(WOMEN'S PRISON FACILITY)

DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

DATE	PRINCIPAL	COUPON	INTEREST	PERIOD TOTAL	FISCAL TOTAL
7/ 1/13	1,075,000.00	6.500000	34,937.50	1,109,937.50	1,144,875.00
	12,820,000.00		11,626,867.50	24,446,867.50	
ACCRUED	12,820,000.00		11,626,867.50	24,446,867.50	

Dated 7/ 1/91 with Delivery of 7/ 1/91

Bond Years 184,820.000

Average Coupon 6.290914

Average Life 14.416537

M I C % 6.290914 % Using 100.0000000

DATE 2.14.91

HB Long Range Planning

52nd Legislature

HB 0528/02

APPROVED BY COMMITTEE
ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

HOUSE BILL NO. 528

INTRODUCED BY BROOKE, YELLOWTAIL, WYATT, FRANKLIN, VAUGHN,
FRITZ, S. RICE, VAN VALKENBURG, REAM, BECKER, STICKNEY,
SQUIRES, J. BROWN, RUSSELL, COCCHIARELLA, HANSEN, MESSMORE,
SOUTHWORTH, J. JOHNSON, MEASURE, STRIZICH, R. JOHNSON

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT REQUIRING THE
DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS TO DEVELOP A REQUEST FOR
PROPOSALS TO SOLICIT PROPOSALS FROM MONTANA LOCAL
GOVERNMENTAL UNITS FOR THE ~~EXISTING~~ SITING OF A WOMEN'S
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY; REQUIRING THE DEPARTMENT TO SOLICIT
PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO THE REQUEST; SPECIFYING CERTAIN
CRITERIA FOR THE SITE OF THE FACILITY; CREATING A COMMITTEE
TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSALS; PROVIDING FOR THE EVALUATION OF
THE PROPOSALS AND SELECTION OF A FACILITY SITE; AUTHORIZING
THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO FINANCE
CONSTRUCTION OF THE FACILITY; AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AND
STATUTORILY APPROPRIATING THE PROCEEDS OF THE BONDS FOR THAT
PURPOSE; APPROPRIATING MONEY ~~TO~~ FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE SITE
SELECTION COMMITTEE; AMENDING SECTIONS 17-7-502, 53-1-202,
53-30-101, AND 53-30-102, MCA; AND PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE
EFFECTIVE DATE AND A TERMINATION DATE."

WHEREAS, Article II, section 28, of the Montana
Constitution states that laws for the punishment of crime

HB 0528/02

should be founded on the principles of prevention and
reformation; and
WHEREAS, the current Women's Correction Center was
created in 1982 as a temporary facility; and
WHEREAS, the current Women's Correction Center is a
totally inadequate correctional facility consisting of a
vacant nurses' dormitory at Warm Springs State Hospital,
which provides inadequate security; inadequate medical,
vocational, and other educational and rehabilitative
services; and inadequate space for the state's rising
population of female inmates; and

WHEREAS, population projections by the Department of
Institutions estimate 124 female inmates will be
incarcerated in a state facility, INCLUDING PRERELEASE AND
COMMUNITY-BASED FACILITIES, by the year 1995; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 518, Laws of 1989, required the
Department of Institutions, in cooperation with the
Governor's Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory
Council, to develop a comprehensive plan for housing female
inmates and required submission of the plan to the 52nd
Legislature; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Institutions has begun a
request for proposal process by which it is soliciting
proposals from various Montana communities to construct a
women's correctional facility; and

SECOND READING

EXHIBIT

4

DATE

2.14.91

Madam Chairman, Members of the Committee:

HB 528 Long Range Planning

For the record my name is Mike Wingard, Senior Performance Auditor with the Legislative Auditor's Office.

Before I discuss the development of the Request for Proposal you have in front of you, I would like to explain our involvement in the siting of a new Women's Correctional Center up to this point.

In early December we were asked to examine and monitor the Department of Institutions process for identifying and selecting a site for their proposed women's correctional facility. As a result, we attended the briefing the department conducted for the interested local government entities, and obtained the RFP which the department used to gather proposals from the local entities. We evaluated the RFP to determine:

the validity of the site criteria established by the department:

whether the information to be submitted by the applicants could be measured against the established criteria; and,

to assess whether documentation was available to support the criteria and/or decision to use a particular criterion.

We completed the evaluation by interviewing the Administrator of the Corrections Division and obtaining the documentation the department used to develop the RFP. Additionally, we interviewed the Architecture and Engineering Division's facility planner and gathered information from other state's corrections agencies.

Our preliminary findings as of January 9th indicated the site location criteria established by the department was valid in terms of being similar to either national or other state's standards for the siting of a correctional facility. However, we did have some concerns about the RFP language regarding the clarity of the RFP requirements. To our knowledge, the department did not modify their RFP to address our concerns prior to the RFP submittal deadline of January 30th. The Department of Institutions at that time also had not completed the procedures they intended to use to score the proposals submitted by the applicants.

In early January, Representative Brooke asked our office to review a RFP that she had devised for the siting of the proposed Women's Correctional Center. After our review and further discussion with Representative Brooke, she asked that we put together an RFP which addressed the concerns we had with the Department of Institution's RFP, include any other criteria that we thought was important, and finally to develop a method for scoring the proposals submitted by

the local governments. Representative Brooke partially developed House Bill 528 based upon information gathered and compiled for the model RFP, ~~you have before you~~. The purpose of the RFP was to give the administration committee and other members of the Legislature some idea of what types of information should be collected to help the site selection committee make its decision, should House Bill 528 be given favorable consideration.

HB 528 is a compilation of materials obtained from various sources, with the basic format being the Dept. of Institution's RFP. We then modified the RFP in an attempt to clarify the basic requirements outlined by the department, added more criteria based upon data obtained from other states, and categorized criteria into both mandatory and scored criteria. Additionally, Representative Brooke's bill details the membership of the site selection committee and what their functions/responsibilities are relative to the selection of a site for the correctional facility.

The differences between HB 528 and the RFP process currently being used by the Department of Institutions are significant. The Dept. of Institution's RFP is based upon the premise the proposed correctional facility's construction will be financed by the local govt. entity whose site is selected for the facility. House Bill 528 assumes facility construction will be funded by general obligation bonds issued by the State of Montana.

Another fundamental difference between the Dept. of Institution's approach to site selection and that proposed by Representative Brooke is in the area of site location criteria. The criteria outlined in House Bill 528 before you are more comprehensive than those used by the department and even more importantly, Representative Brooke's proposal establishes both mandatory and scored criteria for site selection, whereas the department just has scored criteria. The importance of this difference is Representative Brooke believes there are minimum standards which any applicant must be able to meet before a proposal can be considered by the site selection committee, the department's process is to evaluate and score all proposals submitted--there are no specific mandatory criteria.

While there are differences between the two proposals, HB 528 acknowledges the Dept. of Institution's process in two ways. It limits community proposals to those submitted by January 30, 1991 and allows for the dept. or site selection committee to obtain additional information from the communities if their original proposals do not fully satisfy the mandates of HB 528.

As a point of information, the Department of Institutions recently sent us a draft version of the proposed time-frame they intend to follow for their RFP process, as well as a draft version of the scoring methodology to be used to score the submitted proposals.

2-14-91
528 Long Range Plan

We ^{are} ~~will~~ ^{ing} continue to monitor the department's process as well as evaluate their scoring methodology.

Madam Chairman, that concludes my overview, I will be available to answer questions from the committee.

EXHIBIT

DATE 2.14.91

HB 528 Long Range Plan.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
COMMUNITY SITE SELECTION FOR A
WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

General requirements for the proposals concerning
a site selection for a women's correctional facility.
(as revised for HB 528)

I. Project Description

The Department of Institutions, hereinafter called the Department, will propose that a 200-bed minimum, medium, and maximum security prison for women be built. The Department/Legislature requests proposals from communities wishing to locate and construct a new women's prison to be built to Department pre-established specifications. The Montana Legislature is asked to authorize the spending and approve the project. The host community and prison site will be chosen by a site selection committee using specific, scored site criteria developed by the Legislature and the Department.

II. Proposal

The Respondent shall present a proposal which outlines the community's ability to best provide the site and services required for the placement of the proposed 200 bed, minimum, medium, and maximum security women's correctional facility. The proposal must include:

- A. Documented demonstration of the extent to which a sponsoring community complies with the Department and Legislature's mandatory and scored site criteria;

III. Criteria

The Legislature has determined criteria will be categorized into "mandatory" and "scored" criteria. Mandatory criteria are defined as services/circumstances which must be available prior to consideration of the proposal by the site selection committee. Scored criteria are defined as services/considerations which should be available, but which may vary among the communities responding. These criteria will be judged and given a score by the site selection committee based on the extent to which the criteria are met by the responding communities. The following outlines the mandatory and scored criteria based upon construction and ancillary requirements.

A. Mandatory Construction Criteria

1. The proposed site(s) must be 15-20 acres with potential for expansion up to at least 25-30 acres if the inmate population increases beyond 200 inmates. (The Respondents may submit more than one site for consideration) The respondents must provide the following information about the proposed site(s):
 - a. Ownership information including the name of the legal owners and the location of the deed book and page number where the owner's deed is recorded;
 - b. If the site is not already in the Respondent's possession, identify how long acquisition will take and the projected costs for both the initial site and any future expansion.
 - c. Identify site configuration for the site(s), e.g. is the site square, rectangular, oblong?
 - d. Identify site topography.
 - 1) Land contours.
 - 2) Do buffer zones exist around the perimeter to minimize unauthorized contact, prevent passage of contraband, and protect privacy. (Generally a zone width of 200 feet is considered adequate).
 - 3) Identify whether the site has any natural or manmade features to screen the site from the community.
 - 4) Document surrounding land use, current and projected.
2. For each proposed site, drawings should be included which detail the following.
 - a. Location plan: indicate general location of site within community. Also indicate retail districts, hospitals and medical facilities, city/county offices, parks, schools, churches, libraries, fire stations, and arterial streets.

- b. Area-wide master plan: indicate planned and existing land use of community.
 - c. Site plan: indicate property lines, adjacent property, road right of ways, easements, sidewalks, encroachments, deed restrictions, and available service and utility lines, both public and private.
3. The proposed site must have direct access to paved public streets, reliable utilities such as water, sewer system, natural gas, electricity, and telephone services. The respondent should respond to the following questions about the above site requirements:
- a. Does the site have year around access?
 - b. Does the site have limited, but maintained road access?
 - c. Does the site have two access points to developed roadways?
 - d. Does the site have a water system that is able to provide a minimum of 1500 GPM with 20 PSI residual pressure and meet EPA primary drinking water regulations?
 - 1) If city water, how far will water lines have to be extended in order to provide service to the site, what are the projected hookup costs, and what are the user fees?
 - 2) If not city water, identify the distance of the water source to the site, hookup costs, cost of test wells, drilling, treating, etc.
 - e. Does the site have local sewer access or on-site treatment capability sufficient to support the staff and population of the facility?
 - 1) If city sewer facilities, what are the costs to extend services, hookup costs, and user fees? Would sewage have to be pumped to the plant or would gravity pipes be sufficient?

- 2) If not city sewer, identify what is being proposed and the associated costs.
 - f. Does the site have natural gas available?
 - 1) How far will lines have to be extended?
 - 2) What are the costs for hookup?
 - g. Does the site have available three phase power with a minimum of 3500 KVA?
 - 1) What is the distance from the site to the nearest power source?
 - 2) What is the cost of extending the service?
 - 3) What is the load capacity?
 - h. Does the site have phone service to support regular and reliable telephone service?
 - 1) Is there capability for remote communications via computers and facsimile service?
 - 2) What are the costs of extending phone services to the site?
 - i. Identify where the closest sanitary landfill is.
 - 1) What is it's remaining capacity?
 - 2) What is the hauling distance?
 - 3) What are the hauling fees and user fees?
 - 4) What are the days of operation?
4. For each proposed site there must be documentation that the property does not lie in FEMA Flood Hazard Boundary Maps, Soil Conservation Service Flood Hazard Studies, or Corps of Engineers Flood Information Reports.
5. For each proposed site there must be documentation that the water table will allow the facility a

basement structure; and must include subsurface soils and water table analyses based on actual site investigations or general description based on soils in the immediate area. (Final selection will require an actual soil investigation). The respondents must also answer the following questions:

- a. What has the land use been for the past 30 years?
 - b. Are or have there been any hazardous wastes of any kind stored or dumped on the property?
6. The respondent must document climatic information about the general location including but not limited to: average monthly temperature, average monthly precipitation, monthly solar days, and monthly average wind speeds and direction.

B. Mandatory Ancillary Criteria

1. A 24-hour emergency medical service vehicle must be available with a 10 minute or less response time upon notification of an emergency. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of a 24-hour emergency medical service vehicle to the proposed site upon notification of an emergency.
 - a. Identify the number of emergency vehicles typically available for responses.
 - b. Identify the number of designated EMS personnel and their certification levels.
2. A 24-hour active fire protection service must be available with a 15-minute or less response time upon notification of an emergency. The respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of a 24-hour active fire protection service to the proposed site upon notification of an emergency.
 - a. Identify current firefighting equipment.
 - b. Identify the number of certified firefighters.
3. An interstate or highway exit must be available within 10 road miles of the site. The Respondent

will demonstrate the proximity of an interstate or major highway exit to the proposed site.

4. The site shall be within a 10 minute response time of a certified local law enforcement agency capable of emergency response. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity of a certified local law enforcement agency to the proposed site, and the level of capability of emergency response.
 - a. Identify the agencies represented and the number of personnel in each.
5. The respondent will demonstrate the compatibility of the proposed site(s) with local zoning ordinances.
6. The site community must be served by interstate transportation services (e.g. air, bus, or train services). The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and availability of these services.
7. The site must be located reasonably close to counties contributing a majority of the inmates. The Respondent will demonstrate their proximity to these counties. Proximity to the committing counties is particularly important in terms of transportation for parent/child relational development, legal counsel, and other visitors.

C. Scored Criteria

The proposed site must be reasonably close to certified and/or licensed sources of the following services.

1. Medical Services The site shall be within 15 road miles of a referral hospital with 24-hour emergency room service and an attending physician. The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity and current availability of a full range of medical care for the routine and emergency medical care of the inmates on a 24-hour basis including, but not limited to:
 - a. a referral hospital with a 24-hour emergency room service and an attending physician.
 - b. the hospital must offer medical specialties (on both an in-patient and out-patient basis) needed by female inmates (i.e., obstetrical and gynecology, family practice,

internal medicine, etc.) The Respondent will also demonstrate the willingness of medical providers to provide these services to inmates of the proposed prison.

- c. Identify available dental services (dentists, orthodontists, periodontists) and demonstrate their willingness to provide services to inmates of the proposed prison.
2. Chemical Dependency The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, current levels of service, and willingness to contract with the state to deliver chemical dependency services.
3. Mental Health Services The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, current levels of service, and willingness to contract with the state to deliver mental health services. These services must include all levels of mental health services including, but not limited to, psychiatric care, clinical services, inpatient and outpatient treatment, and programs appropriate to women's needs.
4. Vocational education center or programmatic equivalent and unit of higher education (public or private) The Respondent will demonstrate the proximity, availability, and types of training available in the vocational education center and the programmatic post-secondary institutions such as units of higher education (public or private). The Respondent will demonstrate the extent to which the available programs present basic skill development opportunities and should demonstrate a willingness to allow selected inmates to attend the programs; a willingness to meet inmate's special needs; and, the willingness to allow their staff to contract with the prison to provide these services on-site to educate those unable to leave the facility. The institutions should show a willingness to place interns from appropriate fields of study in programs at the prison.
5. Child care and foster care The Respondent must demonstrate the quantity and availability of licensed foster care and all levels of child care including, but not limited to, registered day care, licensed group care and out-of-home care. A Respondent may do this by contacting the

Department of Family Services Regional Administrator for their region.

6. Public Transportation The Respondent must identify what public transportation services are available, e.g. taxis, bus service, etc.
7. Court Access The Respondent must identify the proximity to the court system and legal community.
8. Motel/Hotel Accomodations The Respondent must identify the number and availability of motels/hotels in the community and their proximity to the proposed site(s).
9. Vendor Access The Respondent must identify the proximity and availability of various vendor services to the proposed site(s).
 - a. Food vendors.
 - b. Fuel supply vendors.
 - c. Other service vendors such as vehicle repair, office supply/repair, building supplies.
10. Availability of Workforce The Respondent must demonstrate the availability of a local work force to adequately staff the facility.
11. Availability of Staff Housing The Respondent must demonstrate there is available and affordable housing resources to support the proposed staff of the facility.
12. Organizational Support The Respondent will demonstrate the existence of established organizations whose primary missions are specific to women's needs, i.e. battered spouse, incest victims support groups, rape victims programs, parenting skill support groups, self-esteem building, employment skills, displaced homemaker programs, etc. The Respondent must also demonstrate the existence of established organization(s) which emphasize and are concerned with Native American issues.
13. Employment The Respondent will demonstrate the community's ability to sufficiently absorb out-of-facility possibilities for inmate employment. This should be shown by supplying potential

employment data from local Job Service Offices,
JTPA providers and prospective employers, etc.

IV. Building Model

- A. The design and construction of the facility will represent the latest conceptual advancements for constructing a women's correctional facility, conform to American Correctional Association standards, and be similar to the design of the Minnesota Correctional Facility at Shakopee, Minnesota.

V. Special Instruction to Respondents

- A. Authorization: This request for proposal (RFP) is issued in accordance with 18-4-304, Montana Code Annotated and 2.5.602, Administrative Rules of Montana. The RFP process is a procurement option allowing the award to be based upon stated criteria or evaluation factors.
- B. Financial Information: The estimated cost of this facility is approximately \$12,000,000. This estimated cost does not include land acquisition costs. The Respondent is expected to provide site(s) which comply with the mandatory and scored criteria outlined in the RFP.
- C. RFP Information:
1. Proposals must be signed, sealed, and delivered to the:

Department of Institutions
1539 11th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620

no later than 5:00 pm 1991. The proposal should contain an original document and four copies. The proposals will remain sealed and unopened until the closing date and time.
 2. Proposals must provide all data required herein. Failure to submit all such data will be deemed sufficient cause for rejection of a proposal.
 3. If it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, revisions will be provided to all Respondents who receive the initial RFP at least one week (seven calendar days) before the close of the response period.

4. The Respondent must assume sole responsibility for the complete efforts as required by this RFP and will be considered the sole point of contact with regard to contractual matters.
5. The Department of Institutions assumes no responsibility or liability or costs incurred by communities prior to issuance of a Contract.
6. The Respondent shall be responsible for any and all injury or damage as a result of the research and preparation of the proposal.
7. A Contract may be awarded in response to a proposal considered to be in the best interest of the Department contingent upon project approval by the Legislature.

D. Approach to the selection criteria:

1. A Respondent must specifically identify the method and manner in which the community proposes to provide the required services.
2. A Respondent must submit a written narrative and may submit any other printed material to demonstrate the community's ability to satisfy the selection criteria.

E. Oral Presentation: Respondents may be requested to orally present their proposal to the Department of Institutions and the site selection committee who will schedule the time and location of any requested presentations.

VI. RFP Evaluation Process

- A. Legislative authority (time line)
- B. Community submission of proposals (time line)
- C. The proposals will be evaluated as follows:
 1. ALL provisions of III A and B must be present for a proposal to be considered by the site selection committee.
 2. The site selection committee will consist of the following persons:
 - a. one representative of the Architecture and Engineering Division of the Department of

Administration, appointed by the Director of the Department of Administration:

- b. two members of the subcommittee on women's correctional center from the Governor's Criminal Justice and Corrections Advisory Council, appointed by the Governor;
 - c. two representatives of the Department of Institutions, appointed by the Director of the Department of Institutions;
 - d. two members of the House of Representatives neither of whom may be a resident of a local governmental unit submitting a proposal, appointed by the Speaker of the House; and,
 - e. two members of the Senate, neither of whom may be a resident of a local governmental unit submitting a proposal, appointed by the president of the senate.
3. The scored criteria will be judged with a weighted scale process, with the site selection committee establishing a score for each criteria listed. For example, an individual score will be established for medical services, mental health services, child care, etc. The scoring will be determined based upon the documented demonstration of:
- a. the number of available resources in the community;
 - b. the strength of a community's resources; and,
 - c. the community's willingness through both contracted and volunteer entities to provide the resources to the Women's Correctional Center.
- The four communities with the highest total scores on the scored criteria will be eligible for further consideration, which will be based upon on-site reviews and input from public hearings. Additional consideration will be made regarding community contributions to the proposed project.
4. In addition to establishing scores for each submitted proposal, the Department of Institutions and the site selection committee will perform on-

site evaluations of the proposed sites of the top four communities and conduct public hearings regarding the potential siting of a correctional facility at the proposed site(s).

5. In the event of a tie among or between proposals, further details from the submitted data will be used to make a final site determination. The following describes the criteria to be used in the event of a tie-breaker:

- a. Documentation of the strength of community volunteer resources in terms of providing help and services to the WCC inmates;
- b. The ability of the community's post-secondary programs to provide appropriate interns. For example, are there programs relating to the services outlined in the scored criteria, such as mental health services, chemical dependency, etc.?
- c. Does the community have the ability to provide employment for released inmates as demonstrated by female employment statistics in the community;
- d. Documented demonstration of district schools' receptivity to enrolling inmates' children in local schools; and,
- e. Documentation of the community's ability to provide ethnic and cultural diversity, as demonstrated by identification of community social and cultural resources such as social organizations, theatres, museums, art galleries, etc.

D. Basis of Awards

The facility will be awarded to the Respondent whose proposal best serves the interests of the program as defined by the site selection committee and the Department of Institutions in the site and selection criteria and the needs of the Department.

E. Department Responsibility

The Department will comply with all reasonable requests from Respondent's for additional information that may be required in order to respond to this request. Such requests may be addressed in writing or requested

EXHIBIT
DATE 2.14.91
HB 528 Long Range
Plan.

verbally through Department contacts listed in this section.

Department of Institutions contacts are Dan Russell, Administrator, (406) 444-3902, or Ted Clack, (406) 444-4907, Corrections Division, Capitol Station, Helena, MT.

A RFP SCORING METHODOLOGY FOR
COMMUNITY PROPOSALS FOR THE WCC

Introduction

The following outlines a potential methodology which could be used for scoring the information submitted by the Respondents to the criteria established for siting of the Women's Correctional Center (WCC).

The site selection committee will establish a score for each criterion in the scored criteria section of the RFP. A total possible score has been established for each criterion based upon its importance relative to serving the best interests of the program. For example, medical services and education have a higher potential score possibility than does the availability of public transportation or motel/hotel accommodations. The total possible score for each criterion will be determined based upon the information provided by the respondents, with the following questions being answered for each:

1. Are the required resources available?
2. What is the strength of those resources in terms of quantity and quality?
3. What is the community's demonstrated willingness to provide these resources?

The following identifies the total possible points which could be awarded for each criterion and how the total was arrived at.

SCORED CRITERIA

<u>Medical Services:</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>
W/in 15 miles-10 points	
24 hr. ER w/ Physician-10 points	
Applicable Medical Specialists-50 points	
Gynecologist(s)	
Obstetrician(s)	
Family Practitioner(s)	
Internist(s)	
Dentists/Orthodontists/Etc.	
Willingness to provide services-30 points	
Total	100 points

<u>Chemical Dependency:</u>	
Proximity/Availability-10 points	
Current Level of Service-25 points	
Willingness to Contract-25 points	
Total	60 points

<u>Mental Health Services;</u>	
Proximity/Availability-10 points	
Current Levels of Service-25 points	
Willingness to Contract-25 points	
Specific Services Provided-20 points	
Psychiatric Services	
Clinical Services	
Inpatient Treatment	
Outpatient Treatment	
Appropriate Women's Programs-20 points	
Total	100 points

<u>Voc. Ed Capabilities and</u>	
<u>Unit of Higher Education:</u>	
Proximity/Availability-10 points	
Voc.Ed Training Available-30 points	
College Training Available-20 points	
Demonstration of Basic Skills Training-50 points	
Institution(s) Willingness To Provide:-80 points	
Allow Inmate Attendance	
Meet Special Inmate Needs	
Allow Staff Visits	
Provide Interns	
Total	190 points

<u>Child Care and Foster Care:</u>	
Quantity of Licensed Foster Care-10 points	
Availability of Licensed Foster Care-10 points	
Quantity of all Levels of Child Care-10 points	
Availability of all Levels of Child Care-10 points	
Total	40 points

EXHIBIT 5

DATE 2.14.91

HB 528 Long Range
Plan.

Organizational Support:

Existence of Established Organizations
Which Emphasize and are Concerned With
Women's Needs:-35 points

Battered Spouse Group
Incest Victims Group
Rape Victims Group
Parenting Skills Group
Self-Esteem Building Group
Appropriate Employment Skills Group
Displaced Homemaker Program

Existence of Established Organizations Which
Emphasize and are Concerned With Native American
Issues-20 points

Total

55 points

Employment:

Identify Possibilities for Inmate Employment-50 points

Employment Data From Job Service
Employment Data From JTPA Providers
Employment Data From Prospective Employers

Total

50 points ✓

Public Transportation:

Taxis-5 points

Bus Service-5 points

Total

10 points ✓

Court Access:

Proximity to Court and Legal Community-10 points

Total

10 points ✓

Motel/Hotel Accomodations:

Proximity/Availability-10 points

Total

10 points ✓

Vendor Access:

Proximity/Availability-10 points

Total

10 points

Workforce Availability:

Employment Data From Job Service-20 points

Total

20 points ✓

Housing Availability:

Housing Data From Local Realtors-20 points

Total

20 points ✓

Total Possible Points From Criteria

675 points

EXHIBIT 6
DATE 2-14-91
HB 528 Long Range
Planning

Womens's Correctional Facility
Comparison Long-Term Financing

Facility Funding	G.O. Bond 7%	Lease Purchase 7.1%	Difference
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Costs			
200 Bed Unit \$12,000,000	\$22,654,302	\$22,830,678	\$176,376
120 Bed Unit \$10,000,000	\$18,878,585	\$19,025,565	\$146,980
Annual Costs			
200 Bed Unit \$12,000,000	\$1,132,715	\$1,141,534	\$8,819
120 Bed Unit \$10,000,000	\$943,929	\$951,278	\$7,349

	G.O. Bond 7%	Lease Purchase 7.25%	Difference
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Costs			
200 Bed Unit \$12,000,000	\$22,654,302	\$23,096,362	\$442,060
120 Bed Unit \$10,000,000	\$18,878,585	\$19,246,968	\$368,383
Annual Costs			
200 Bed Unit \$12,000,000	\$1,132,715	\$1,154,818	\$22,103
120 Bed Unit \$10,000,000	\$943,929	\$962,348	\$18,419

Women's Correctional Facility
Cost Projection
Fiscal 1994

	(1) 200 Bed Facility	(2) 200 Bed Facility	(3) 120 Bed Facility
FTE	108.0	91.5	91.5
Salaries	\$1,960,188	\$1,673,072	\$1,673,072
Benefits	450,843	384,806	384,806
Total Per. Services	\$2,411,031	\$2,057,878	\$2,057,878
Operating Costs			
Contract Services	\$161,838	\$97,103	\$97,103
Supplies	391,390	234,834	234,834
Communications	70,000	42,000	42,000
Travel	16,666	10,000	10,000
Rent	7,778	4,667	4,667
Utilities	308,670	231,503	185,202
Repairs	68,083	40,850	40,850
Other	71,343	42,806	42,806
Total Oper. Exp.	\$1,095,768	\$703,763	\$657,462
Equipment	\$266,666	\$160,000	\$160,000
Total Program	\$3,773,465	\$2,921,641	\$2,875,340
Debt Service	\$1,132,715	\$1,132,715	\$943,929
Total Costs	\$4,906,180	\$4,054,356	\$3,819,269
Boarder Revenue (50%)	1,565,850	0	0
Net Costs	\$3,340,330	\$4,054,356	\$3,819,269
	=====	=====	=====

Column 1 - Assumes Excess Beds at 50% Occupied with
Federal and Other States' Prisoners.

Column 2 - Assumes no Boarders.

EXHIBIT 8
DATE 2.14.91
HB 528 Long Range
Planning

WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Differences Between House Bill 528 and Proposal by DofI

I. Site Selection - Committee

a. DofI proposes two more members (1 Financial Administrator and 1 Citizen at Large) than HB 528 Section 5.

b. Selection of committee differs - DofI proposal has director selecting all members except Citizen at Large and the Members of the Legislature. HB 528 has director appointing only DofI Members with the Governor appointing remainder except for the legislators. Both have appointments of Legislators by Leadership.

II. Site Selection - Scoring Criteria

a. HB 528 has two sections with site selection criteria. Section 4 (Pg 6) places mandatory requirements for certain site selection criteria and provides for a scoring procedure for others in Section 6 (3). The DofI proposal has a scoring procedure for all criteria with more weight on those that are considered essential.

III. Site Selection - Approval

a. The DofI proposal gives the approval for the site selection to the director of the department based on recommendations of the committee. HB 528 gives the approval for the site selection to the committee.

IV. Funding

a. HB 528 provides a G.O bond issue of \$12 million for the project funding while the DofI proposes funding for the project be from the successful applicant with the department entering into a long-term lease purchase contract for the facility.

- V. Legal Opinion from Legislative Council stating that only the DofA can enter into a lease purchase contract for the facility. This requires a two-thirds vote of the legislature as does the G.O bond.

Action Pending

Agency	A&E Priority	Capital Projects Fund	State Special Revenue	Federal Special Revenue	Other Revenue	LRBF Bond Proceeds	Total
Highways							
Maintenance Projects - Statewide	48		\$443,500				\$443,500
Construct & Expand Maint. & Equipment Buildings	49 & 50		1,167,600	115,925			1,283,525
Fish, Wildlife, & Parks							
Remove Underground Storage Tanks	35		150,000				150,000
Headquarters Maint. & Improvements	36		85,000				85,000
Property Development	37		360,000				360,000
State Parks Development & Improve.	38		3,798,500	1,124,500			4,923,000
Fish Hatchery Maintenance	39		37,500	112,500			150,000
Fishing Access Site Improvements	40		286,000	858,000			1,144,000
Motorboat Access Site Facilities	41		67,000	201,000			268,000
River Restoration	42		219,000				219,000
Fishing Access Site Acquisition	43		881,000				881,000
Wildlife Habitat Maintenance	44		304,000				304,000
Wildlife Habitat Acquisition	45		4,923,356				4,923,356
Waterfowl Habitat Enhancement	46		399,500				399,500
Bighorn Sheep Habitat Acquisition	47		48,500				48,500
School for Deaf & Blind		20,000					20,000
Academic Building Repairs							
Institutions							
Roofs Bd. of Pardons & Warehouses	9	30,000					30,000
Seal Buildings - Prison	15	25,000					25,000
Expand Industries Facilities	54			14,000	321,976		335,976
Major Prison Expansion	57	877,500				19,360,745	20,238,245
Montana State University							
Engineering/Physical Science Bldg.	58	1,165,290			3,335,250	17,734,460	22,235,000
University of Montana							
Life Science Building-Planning	26			50,000	150,000		200,000
Business Administration Bldg.	59	604,705			2,322,900	12,558,395	15,486,000
Eastern Montana College							
Renovate Absaurke Hall	61	71,640				1,228,360	1,300,000
University System							
"Must Do" List		5,455,805			48,115		5,503,920
Deferred Maintenance Projects		19,129,600					19,129,600
University Major Construction							
Life Science Bldg - UofM							
Gen. Classroom & Office Bldg. EMC						16,500,000	16,500,000
Metallurgy Bldg Renovation Tech.						3,795,000	3,795,000

EXHIBIT 9
DATE 2.14.91
HB 5 Long Range Plan.

Total Action Pending

\$27,379,540 \$13,170,456 \$2,475,925 \$18,678,241 \$71,176,960 \$132,881,122

07-Feb-91

Long-Range Building Program
1993 Biennium

LRB Committee Action

Agency	ACE Priority	Capital Projects Fund	State Special Revenue	Federal Special Revenue	Other Revenue	LRBF Bond Proceeds	Total
Administration							
Hazardous Materials Abatement	4	\$650,000			\$150,000		\$800,000
Construction Litigation	10	345,000					345,000
Alternate Water Supply	32				50,000		50,000
Property Acquisition	33				123,014		123,014
Commerce							
Pavement - West Yellowstone Airport	34			465,957	51,773		517,730
State Lands							
Maint. & Improve. Projects	11						
Construct Unit Office	24	118,280		100,000			218,280
Construct Greenhouses	52	235,000	191,900				235,000
							191,900
Labor							
Renovate Job Ser. Bldg. G.F.	51			310,000			310,000
Major Maintenance				209,450			209,450
Family Services							
Security Fence - Pine Hills	3	27,000					27,000
Repair Roofs - MVS and PHS	7	127,600					127,600
School for Deaf and Blind							
Academic Bldg Roof & Repairs	8	339,000					339,000
Military Affairs							
Kitchens Upgrade - Statewide	19	45,000					45,000
Rifle Range Rehab. - Statewide	25	10,000					10,000
Armory Additions	29	150,000		555,000			16,155,000
Land for Armory - Billings	30	150,000		16,155,000			16,305,000
Expand Vehicle Compounds	31	5,000		200,000			16,350,000
Maint. Existing Facilities	53			275,000			280,000
				300,000			300,000
Institutions							
Water & Steam Lines MDC	5	149,208					149,208
Moisture Protection EHS	12	598,450					598,450
Roads & Park. Lots Maint.	14	150,000					150,000
Bldg. Improvements CFA	20	105,015					105,015
Multi purpose Bldg. Floor MSH	22	26,800					26,800
University System							
Replace Roofs	6	1,089,550					1,439,550
Improve Underground Utilities	13	296,000			350,000		1,496,000
Improve Handicap Access	17	335,000			200,000		335,000
Improve Sidewalks & Fire Access	21	86,000					86,000

EXHIBIT

DATE

2-14-91

LB

Montana State Univeersity Centennial Mall	-		1,600,000	1,600,000
University of Montana Install Fire Alarm	2	70,000		70,000
Plan Chem/Pharm Rennovations	26	50,000		50,000
Various Improvements	55		2,584,600	2,584,600
Eastern Montana College Primary Electrical Vault	1	31,000	14,000	45,000
Mt. College of Mineral Science Plan Metallurgy Bldg. Remodel	27	50,000		50,000
Western Montana College Repair Heating System	16	57,900		57,900
Remodel Student Union	56		600,000	600,000
Vocational-Technical Center Replace Carpet - Great Falls	18	60,000		60,000
Total Approved by Committee		\$5,356,803	\$191,900 \$18,570,407 \$5,723,387	\$0 \$29,842,497
LRB Cash Available		\$7,630,938		
Balance Remaining		\$2,274,135		

Long Range Planning

DATE 2-14-91

DIVISION _____

Highways, FWP

PLEASE PRINT

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.