

GEORGE W. HILL CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
DE-PRIVATIZATION FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT

March 29, 2021

Prepared by:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Approach	2
GWHCF Operating Cost Analysis	3
Capital and Transition Costs	15
Project Schedule	19

Executive Summary

Analysis of the projected operating costs for the GWHCF under County management and operations indicates potential annual savings of \$3.0 - \$7.8 million, depending upon assumptions used for staff compensation, inmate population levels, and facility staffing patterns.

As detailed below, we developed three financial model scenarios for the prison operations, as summarized in the following chart:

Table 1: Comparison of GEO Contract Costs with Alternative Scenarios

	Facility ADP*	FTEs**	Total Spending	Per Diem
GEO Base Contract	1,883	499.9	\$52.9 million	\$76.71
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	499.9	\$52.4 million	\$80.82
County Management Scenarios				
#1 – Status Quo/Salary Increase	1,883	445.9	\$49.9 million	\$72.56
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	445.9	\$49.0 million	\$75.88
#2 – County Revised Staffing Plan	1,883	397.4	\$47.7 million	\$69.42
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	397.4	\$46.8 million	\$72.54
#3 – County Reduced ADP/Increased Programs	1,450	377.7	\$43.1 million	\$81.44

*Average Daily Population

**Full time Equivalents

Challenges of Transitioning to County Operations

This is a complex process that will require multiple contract procurements and negotiations, a lengthy hiring process and upgrades to the facility. Key challenges during the transition process are:

- Dedicated Human Resource staff to do the hiring of staff.
- Negotiating a new Collective Bargaining Agreement with correctional union.
- County resources needed to manage the health services, food services and commissary.
- Substantial capital investment to support lower staffing levels.
- Litigation costs are a concern but can be mitigated through liability insurance and enhanced security systems.

Approach

This assessment provides a comparison of the cost of the current operation of the GWHCF under the contract with GEO, with the potential cost of government management of the facility. The analysis provides a high-level examination of the key cost factors that should be considered by the County in determining the feasibility of de-privatization of the GWHCF. As such, the purpose of this review is not development of a detailed budget for County management of the GWHCF but is instead to evaluate those critical cost factors associated with prison operations, develop projections of these costs, and outline alternatives to mitigate their impact.

It is important to note that cost is not the only, or even the primary factor the County should consider in its evaluation of this issue. Operational performance, correctional officer and inmate safety and welfare, and accountability to the public are among the factors that require careful evaluation. The purpose of this analysis is limited to examination of the likely cost implications of de-privatization for the County.

Report Organization

The analysis begins with documentation of the annual cost of the current GEO contract as well as associated support costs incurred by the County. The analysis then projects ongoing County costs for operation of the GWHCF, assuming the same configuration of staffing and programs as currently exists at the facility. We then project the cost impact of applying different staffing, operations, and program service assumptions to County management. A comparative analysis of the cost impacts of the different scenarios follows.

The next section of the report reviews one-time cost factors such as capital repairs, equipment, and potential transition costs associated with de-privatization alternatives.

GWHCF Operating Cost Analysis

County expenditures for the GWHCF in 2020 totaled \$48.6 million. The largest component of this spending was the GEO contract, which had a net cost to the County of \$46.7 million. As shown in Table 2, this net cost includes \$50.8 million in operating services fees¹, which are offset by deductions for facility population levels below 1,883 inmates² and penalties for vacant staff positions.

Table 2: 2020 GEO Contract Billings

Operating Service Fee	Population Deduction	Staffing Penalty	Maintenance	Other ³	Net Payment
\$50,837,316	(\$3,293,121)	(\$1,015,086)	\$171,933.48	(\$33,985)	\$46,667,056

In addition to these contract costs, the County incurred \$1.8 million in direct expenditures in support of the facility. The majority of these costs were for utilities and services such as waste hauling and boiler maintenance. Together with the GEO contract costs, these expenses totaled \$48,558,339.

Table 3: Total 2020 County Expenditures – GWHCF

	2020 Spending
GEO	\$46,667,057
Utilities	\$1,600,520
Facility Services	\$132,479
Waste Hauling	\$98,565
Other	\$59,718
TOTAL	\$48,558,339

The GEO contract assumes a base population of 1,883 which corresponds to the capacity of the GWHCF. At this population level the contract per diem cost per inmate is \$76.77. However, due to the COVID pandemic, Delaware County, like virtually all other large jail systems in the United States, experienced a major reduction in the incarcerated population.

¹ The GEO contract established monthly fees of \$4,236,443 for operation of the GWHCF in 2020.

² The deduction calculation is \$13 per day for per inmate for the difference between 1,883 and average daily population levels.

³ Includes fees for the ICE contract, excess water flow deduction charges, and fiber optic lease costs.

The average daily population at the GWHCF fell from a high 1,614 in January 2020 to a low of 990 in May of that same year. The number of inmates incarcerated at the facility averaged 1,193 in 2020, by far the lowest population level experienced since early years of operation. With total county expenditures for the GWHCF of \$48,558,339, as outlined above, this population level resulted in an average cost per inmate per day of \$111.21. Table 4 shows total and per diem spending for the GWHCF over the past three years.

Table 4: GWHCF Historical County Spending

	2018	2019	2020
GEO contract	\$48,558,561	\$48,515,326	\$46,667,057
Other County Spending	\$2,459,993	\$1,898,890	\$1,891,282
Total GWHCF Spending	\$51,018,554	\$50,414,216	\$48,558,339
Average Daily Population	1,762	1,775	1,193
Per Diem Cost	\$79.33	\$77.81	\$111.21

In order to provide the County with alternatives for consideration, we developed scenarios that project the cost of operations using the GEO contract as a baseline for operations. These baseline costs are presented as two alternatives, one with the facility operating at full capacity of 1,883 and one with a facility average daily population of 1,769 which represents the actual average daily population for the facility from 2018 – 2019. The difference in cost between these alternatives is simply the population deduction of \$13 per day for every inmate below the 1,883 baseline capacity level, as required by the contract. We note these scenarios are estimates based on available data and assumptions on staffing levels, service delivery models, program services, and facility population levels.

Table 5: Baseline Costs - GEO Contract at Full Capacity and 2018 - 2019 ADP

	Facility ADP	FTEs	Total Costs	Per Diem
Population @ Capacity	1,883	499.9	\$52,869,046	\$76.71
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	499.9	\$52,382,002	\$80.82

Scenario #1 County Management - Status Quo.

The Status Quo scenario makes the following assumptions:

- **Personnel Costs:** The current GEO facility staffing pattern remains in place with exceptions for health care and food service, which will be contracted out, as described below. County salaries for facility employees will be a percentage increase above GEO’s

current 2021 salary levels⁴. This analysis assumes a 6 percent salary increase above current GEO hourly rates to encourage retention of staff and mitigate current extremely high staff turnover rates. We apply the current County fringe benefit factor of 58 percent⁵ to projected salary levels to generate total personnel costs.

- **Average Daily Population:** Using the same assumptions as the GEO caseline cost projection in the jail of 1,883 as set in the GEO contract, and 1,769 which represents the average daily population from 2018 – 2019..
- **Programs:** The current set of GEO programs remains in place without augmentation of program offerings. Current programs include General Educational Development (GED), Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Substance Abuse, Thinking for a Change, Anger Management, Sex Offender Behavior Modification, Houses of Healing, Parenting, and Transgender Group.
- **Services:** The scenario assumes that health services and food service delivery will be contracted out. In the case of health services, contracting for specialized management and staffing of jail healthcare is the predominant model of service delivery in the industry. The specialized nature of the services and the potential liability associated with failure to meet service standards requires specialized expertise that the County does not possess. Contracting for food services allows the County to access economies of scale in food purchasing, access to specialized food service management expertise, and the ability to outsource badly needed upgrades in GWHCF kitchen equipment. This model of outsourcing both health care and food service is used throughout large jail systems in the United states, including the Philadelphia Department of Prisons.

The Status Quo scenario, as described above, includes a 6 percent across-the-board salary increase for the 445.94 FTEs positions included in the current facility staffing plan (excludes current positions assigned to health care and food service). Applying the County’s 58 percent fringe factor to the resulting salary rates for these positions results in a projected total personnel cost of \$28,737,320. This represents a \$3.8 million increase in cost for these same positions over our estimate of GEO’s costs for these same positions.⁶

In addition to these salary and benefit costs, the analysis also assumes overtime is incurred at a rate of 2% of annual salary costs. This is consistent with the experience of jails that are fully staffed and well-managed.

We assume health care contract costs will average \$15.45 per inmate per day. This represents the weighted average of current health care contract costs paid by Chester, Bucks, and Berks counties. The contractor in these counties is required to achieve National Commission on

⁴ Based on 2021 GEO schedule of hourly salaries by position for penalty adjustments.

⁵ Provided by Delaware County Human Resources.

⁶ The lower cost for GEO is a result of the 6 percent increase provided by the County and a lower assumed fringe benefit factor for GEO (45.6%), based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020 Survey of Employee Compensation for Private Industry Workers by Census Region and Division for the Mid-Atlantic Region.

Correctional Health Care (NCCHC) accreditation, which is generally considered the gold standard in correctional health care standards.

The scenario assumes a food service contract cost of \$1.61 per meal, which represents the weighted average of food service contract costs in five large jail systems (Allegheny (PA), Cuyahoga (OH), Minnehaha (SD), Philadelphia, and Montgomery (OH)). However, actual costs may be higher depending upon the amount of replacement kitchen equipment the County builds into the contract.

We assume maintenance, utilities, and telecommunications spending will remain at 2020 levels. Other costs, including uniforms, bedding, household supplies, equipment, and insurance are based on our experience with the cost of these budget components in other comparably sized county prisons in the United States. In addition, we include a 5 percent contingency factor to address unforeseen or unexpected expenditures.

Using these assumptions, annual County spending for Status Quo operation of the GWHCF would total \$49.9 million. This represents \$3 million less than projected annual spending with the GEO contract for the same facility population level. The per diem cost experienced under this scenario is \$72.56.

Table 6: Scenario #1 County Management – Status Quo Operations

	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,883 ADP	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,769 ADP	Difference
Salary & Benefits	\$28,737,320	\$28,737,320	-
Overtime	\$255,536	\$255,536	-
Health Care	\$10,616,973	\$9,971,384	\$645,589
Food Service	\$3,319,711	\$3,117,848	\$201,862
Maintenance	\$881,880	\$881,880	-
Telecommunications	\$64,128	\$64,128	-
Utilities	\$1,600,520	\$1,600,520	-
Household Supplies	\$625,572	\$625,572	-
Staff Uniforms & Equipment	\$469,976	\$469,976	-
Inmate Clothing & Bedding	\$335,299	\$335,299	-
Equipment	\$200,000	\$200,000	-
Insurance	\$385,913	\$385,913	-

	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,883 ADP	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,769 ADP	Difference
Contingency	\$2,374,641	\$2,332,269	\$42,373
TOTAL	\$49,867,470	\$48,977,646	\$889,824

Scenario #2 County Management – Revised Staffing Plan with Increased Inmate Programming

Scenario #2 continues the same assumptions of prison operations at full capacity, 6 percent salary increases, and outsourcing of health care and dietary services as described in Scenario #1; but also implements a more efficient staffing plan, consistent with best practices in well-run jails and prisons throughout the United States. Additional inmate programs will also be implemented. Our preliminary assessment of facility staffing focuses on administrative positions which could be eliminated under de-privatization, as well as redundant or narrowly focused assignments that could be consolidated under other existing positions. In total our initial review identified 48.5 FTEs that could be eliminated to increase the efficiency of current operations. We note, this analysis is currently based on our experience analyzing staffing needs of jails across the country and is not considered final, as we have not conducted a detailed staffing analysis that would provide a more definitive understanding of staffing needs.

With reductions in staff, projected personnel spending at the facility would drop to \$25.2 million, a reduction of \$3.5 million from personnel costs in Scenario #1.

Under this scenario, the County also increases inmate program services available at the GWHCF to support policies to limit the size of the inmate population. The actual design of a comprehensive program of rehabilitative services for offenders at the GWHCF requires a thorough assessment of inmate program needs. There are a variety of diagnostic instruments available to perform this assessment, such as the Level of Service Inventory-Revised, which match inmates with appropriate evidence-based programs, including cognitive behavioral therapy, anger management, job readiness, reentry, substance abuse treatment, and mental health treatment.

Because this type of assessment of offender needs is not in place, it is not possible to design an effective set of programs at this time. However, for illustrative purposes, we have used research conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) on evidence-based justice system programs for incarcerated individuals to identify the potential cost of a set of programs widely recognized as successful and cost-effective. WSIPP conducted a meta-review of the research literature on criminal justice system programs to identify those programs with the highest probability of success as well as the highest benefit/cost ratio. Table 7 summarizes these programs, the average cost per participant, and suggested annual caseload levels. The programs,

largely directed at substance abuse treatment and behavioral therapy, have a projected annual cost of \$1.6 million and would support a caseload of 1,000 offenders.

Table 7: Evidence-Based Jail Program Services Cost⁷

Program	Cost per Participant	Annual Caseload	Annual Cost
Case Management: Drug-Involved Persons	\$401	200	\$80,200
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy	\$1,470	250	\$367,500
Sex Offender Treatment	\$4,817	50	\$240,850
Employment Counseling	\$2,563	250	\$640,750
Outpatient Drug Treatment	\$788	200	\$157,600
Therapeutic Communities	\$2,315	50	\$115,750
TOTAL		1,000	\$1,602,650

Holding all other operating costs assumptions the same, annual County spending for the operation of the GWHCF under Scenario #2 would total \$47.6 million, or \$5.2 million below projected annual spending with the GEO contract for the same facility population level. The per diem cost experienced under this scenario is \$69.42.

Table 8: Scenario #2 County Management – Revised Staffing Plan/Enhanced Programs

	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,883 ADP	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,769 ADP	Difference
Salary & Benefits	\$25,179,243	\$25,179,243	-
Overtime	\$234,081	\$234,081	-
Health Care	\$10,616,973	\$9,971,384	\$645,589
Food Service	\$3,319,711	\$3,117,848	\$201,862
Maintenance	\$881,880	\$881,880	-

⁷Washington State Institute for Public Policy, *Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Programs for Adult Corrections*, February 2018.

	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,883 ADP	Projected Annual Expenditures – 1,769 ADP	Difference
Telecommunications	\$64,128	\$64,128	-
Utilities	\$1,600,520	\$1,600,520	-
Household Supplies	\$625,572	\$625,572	-
Staff Uniforms & Equipment	\$431,098	\$431,098	-
Inmate Clothing & Bedding	\$335,299	\$335,299	-
Equipment	\$200,000	\$200,000	-
Insurance	\$351,553	\$352,448	-
Inmate Programs	\$1,602,650	\$1,602,650	-
Contingency	\$2,272,135	\$2,229,808	\$42,373
TOTAL	\$47,714,843	\$46,825,959	\$889,824

We further note that this revised staffing plan does not address all potential efficiencies to be achieved in staffing the facility. A review of current operational practices shows a number of areas that may require fewer security staff than currently allocated.

If the County assumes responsibility for operation of the jail, a more detailed on-site staffing review should be conducted. This would include:

- Detailed staffing needs assessment and organizational review,
- Relief factor calculation,
- Operational review of current security, programs, and support practices to discern how staff currently supervise, manage, and provide services to the inmate population. This would allow identification of areas of concern that may need to be corrected. The analysis would identify efficiencies to support streamlining staffing needs; identify ways to use the OMS to produce information relevant to the courts; improve internal practices such as release processing; and establish systems for management and operational accountability.

Scenario #3 County Management – Reduced Facility Population/Increased Programming

Scenario #3 assumes the staffing efficiencies implemented in Scenario #2, includes the additional allowance for inmate program services to reduce recidivism, and assumes a reduced inmate population. Consistent with this initiative, Scenario #3 assumes an average daily inmate

population of 1,450. This represents a significant reduction from full facility capacity (1,883 inmates) but still is a substantial increase above current facility population levels.⁸

If population levels remain below historical levels, housing units could be closed thereby reducing staffing needs. Currently the DUI/Work Release housing unit is vacant, and the unit has 13.12 assigned FTEs. While we expect this specific unit to reopen after the pandemic, other units could be closed. To understand the impact of housing unit closure on the number of FTEs needed, Table 8 provides the number of security FTEs (corrections officers and sergeants) assigned to each housing unit. The table also identifies the housing unit capacity and the type of offenders in the unit.

Table 9: Security FTEs by Housing Unit – GEO Staffing Plan

Housing Unit	Capacity	Population Type	Total FTEs
Unit 2	150	General Population, Protective Custody, Vivitrol	19.71
Unit 3	32	Youthful Offender, Special Management	16.43
Unit 4	206	General Population	19.71
Unit 5	206	General Population	19.71
Unit 6	206	General Population /Inmate Workers	19.71
Unit 7	206	General Population /State/Writs/Transfers	19.71
Unit 8	206	Intake/Classification and GP	32.83
Unit 9	206	Female Unit (GP, Special Management)	26.03
Unit 10	206	General Population, Max, Ad Seg, Disciplinary	31.21
Medical	54	Medical	26.32
DUI/Work Release	205	DUI and WR participants	13.12
Total	1,883		243.03

A total of 243 FTEs are assigned to housing unit supervision, with each unit housing general population inmates requiring nearly 20 FTEs.

Maintaining a facility average daily population of 1,450 would allow for the closure of one general population housing unit, enabling a staff reduction of 19.71 FTEs. This action would

⁸ On March 11, 2021 the GWHCF inmate population count was 1,265.

further reduce facility personnel costs by \$1.2 million for a total \$24 million. The lower inmate population level will also reduce facility costs for health care, food service, and inmate supplies.

Adding in the new program costs and adjusting food, medical, household supplies, and other costs directly related to the number of inmates housed in the facility, results in projected expenditures annual facility spending of \$43 million. The per diem cost for operation of the facility under these assumptions is \$81.44.

Table 10: Scenario #3 County Management – Reduced ADP/Enhanced Programs

	Projected Annual Expenditures
Salary & Benefits	\$24,018,655
Overtime	\$219,390
Health Care	\$8,175,577
Food Service	\$2,556,336
Maintenance	\$881,880
Telecommunications	\$64,128
Utilities	\$1,600,520
Household Supplies	\$625,572
Staff Uniforms & Equipment	\$402,490
Inmate Clothing & Bedding	\$335,299
Equipment	\$200,000
Insurance	\$331,994
Inmate Programs	\$1,602,650
Contingency	\$2,050,722
TOTAL	\$43,065,162

All of the scenarios described above indicate de-privatization can produce substantial savings from the current GEO contract. The key factor that drives the County’s current cost of the privatized facility appears to be the structure of the GEO contract, which requires low marginal cost reductions (\$13 per inmate per day) for population levels below the 1,883 capacity level of the facility. In 2020, the facility’s average daily population level fell by 37% from the contract level (1,883 to 1,193), but contract expenditures only decreased by 8.3%.

Under the contract, very large population reductions result in relatively small reductions in contract expenditures. The GEO contract is more cost-effective when the facility operates at or close to its capacity. If the County is committed to keeping the average daily prison population at 1,450 or lower, de-privatization appears to be a cost-effective alternative to the GEO contract.

Table 11: Comparison of GEO Contract Costs with Alternative Scenarios

	Facility ADP	FTEs	Total Spending	Per Diem
GEO Base Contract	1,883	499.9	\$52.9 million	\$76.71
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	499.9	\$52.4 million	\$80.82
County Management Scenarios				
#1 – Status Quo/Salary Increase	1,883	445.9	\$49.9 million	\$72.56
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	445.9	\$49.0 million	\$75.88
#2 – County Revised Staffing Plan	1,883	397.4	\$47.7 million	\$69.42
Population @ 2018-2019 Average	1,769	397.4	\$46.8 million	\$72.54
#3 – County Reduced ADP/Increased Programs	1,450	377.7	\$43.1 million	\$81.44

Capital and Transition Costs

The annual operating costs described above do not include transition costs that may be associated with de-privatization or addressing the facility’s significant capital repair needs. Transition costs would include one-time costs for purchases of equipment and supplies required for facility operations, as well as contracted services to support transition activities.

GEO owns a significant amount of equipment used in the detention facility. A comprehensive inventory of current facility equipment by room will need to be developed. If the equipment is in acceptable condition, the County should attempt to negotiate a fair market value price for acquisition of the current inventory. However, the current contract with GEO stipulates that any equipment purchased must be done at the replacement cost. If GEO holds to this position, the County will be required to purchase new equipment and furnishings for the facility.

Replacement equipment will need to be purchased, installed, and tested. Some specialized equipment may have long lead times for delivery. Equipment needed may include:

- Security equipment – metal detectors, weapons, restraints, ammunition, radios
- Fire suppression equipment
- Office furniture
- Telecomm, computers, and networking equipment
- Tools
- Vehicles
- Food Services equipment (could be provided by contract food service vendor)
- Health Services equipment (could be assumed by vendor)

Fully equipping a new facility typically costs approximately 3 percent of construction costs. Based on recent prison construction projects throughout the United States, a rough estimate of the cost of building a facility comparable in size to the GWHCC is \$268.6 million. The equipment and furniture budget for a facility of this size would be approximately \$8 million, which may serve as a rough estimate of cost if the County is required to replace all equipment and furnishings in the facility.

Table 12: Facility Equipment & Furnishings Cost Estimate

GWHCF sq. ft.	298,450
Average Construction Cost per sq. ft.	\$900
Projected Facility Replacement Cost	\$268,605,000
Equipment/furnishings at 3% of Construction Cost	\$8,058,150

Supplies and commodities (office supplies, cleaning supplies, uniforms, bedding, etc.) will also need to be inventoried and purchased if available from GEO. Insofar as these are consumable goods purchase by GEO for Delaware County, these inventories should be available for transfer or purchase. Otherwise, County Central Purchasing staff will need to assure purchasing, delivery, and storage of these supplies during the transition period. A forecast of expenditures for these items will require better information on what will be available from GEO.

Hiring staff for the GWHCF during a transition period to County management will be a significant Human Resource challenge. This is a time and labor intensive process that requires recruitment, background checks, and training prior to staff becoming available for duty. Steps in this process include:

- Establishment of county positions
- Position postings
- Interviews and any other screenings required. For security staff would include background check, physical, psychological evaluation, testing.
- Job Offer
- County onboarding process (includes the change out of current uniformed staff and lead time for equipment exchange and supplies)
- Training (for non-GEO staff)

These activities will require assignment of dedicated HR staff to bring over 400 FTEs on to county employment. If a significant number of GEO employees chose not to continue working at jail, transition resource needs would increase to aid in recruitment and training. The current level of staffing in the County’s HR Office will not support this level of effort. The County HR Office has indicated it is understaffed and experiences difficulty in keeping up with normal work demands. As a result, the County may need to engage a contractor to support human resource activities during the transition period.

In addition to human resources support, the County will also incur one-time expenditures for information systems support, procurement assistance, and other technical support. Assuming a 9 month transition schedule, we estimate these costs at a maximum of \$1,088,100, as summarized in Table 13.

Table 13: Transition Support Costs

ITEM	TOTAL COST
<i>Information Systems Transition</i>	
IT Systems Lead	\$ 158,000
Software Licenses	\$ 15,000
Hardware	\$ 25,000

ITEM	TOTAL COST
subtotal	\$ 198,000
<i>Finance & Budget Support</i>	
Financial Analysts	\$ 100,625
Procurement Specialist	\$ 46,875
Hardware	\$ 2,500
subtotal	\$ 150,000
<i>Personnel Support</i>	
Supervisor	\$ 45,000
Recruiter	\$ 37,500
Specialist	\$ 26,250
Testing, Training, Tavel	\$ 35,000
subtotal	\$ 143,750
<i>Other Direct Costs</i>	
Controller's Office Support	\$ 75,000
Owner's Rep Contract	\$ 300,000
Printing and Other Services	\$ 25,000
Misc Supplies & Materials	\$ 15,000
subtotal	\$ 415,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED TRANSITION COSTS	\$ 906,750
CONTINGENCY	20%
ADJUSTED ESTIMATE	\$ 1,088,100

In terms of capital repairs, there appear to be significant physical plant repair needs that have been deferred for many years. The County will need a clear understanding of the deferred maintenance and capital needs of the facility prior to taking over. The Facility Condition Assessment being independently conducted should identify these needs. Significant issues with the facility include the following:

- Antiquated security controls and door locks are obsolete, making repairs and finding parts difficult. Long-term, the County will need to consider upgrading their security electronics to match their newest addition (Unit 10) or replace all systems.
- The kitchen is in very poor condition and requires extensive work.
- Housing units require good quality cameras to provide better vision into these areas for the control room officers and for staff in central control. Kitchen, Laundry, Program Classrooms and Warehouse areas also lacked camera surveillance needed for adequate supervision.
- Roofing throughout the facility is failing, resulting in significant water damage.

GEO conducted a review of facility capital needs in 2019 which identified \$14 million in needed capital facility repairs. The Facility Condition Assessment now underway will provide greater detail on deferred maintenance and needed capital repairs, which will be the responsibility of the County.

Draft Project Schedule

The following schedule outlines the key tasks and associated timeframes for a phased de-privatization initiative, should the County make the decision to de-privatize the prison. Key milestones dates could change based on results of RFP processes.

January - March 2021	April - July 2021	August 2021	August 2021 - March 2022	March 2022
Complete Cost & Schedule Analysis				
	Develop RFP's - Medical, Food, Commissary			
		Decision on Notice of Termination for GEO		
			Transition & Startup	
				Takeover of GWH Operations