

**Questions from the AB 900 Jail Construction  
Request for Proposals Bidders' Conference  
January 8, 2008  
Sacramento, CA**

The following is a complete list of questions from the Bidders' Conference, either submitted ahead in writing and restated at the conference, or asked the day of the event. For ease in reading, the questions and answers have been grouped into four broad categories – General; Lease-Revenue Bond Financing/State Public Works Board Process; Parolee Mental Health Services Funding Preference; and Reentry Facility Funding Preference. For answers that include additional information from what was provided at the Bidders' Conference, it is noted in the answer that clarification has been added. Any additional questions regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP) process may be directed at any time to Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) staff (contact information is located on page 3 of the RFP document).

**GENERAL**

**Under Section 3, Project Timetable, it is stated that occupancy must occur within 90 days of construction. Does this refer to a specific level of occupancy, or can occupancy be underway by this period in the form of transitional occupancy?**

*At 90 days from completion of construction, all detention facility areas within the project scope must be fully staffed and operational, therefore transitional occupancy must occur within this timeframe. A portion of unoccupied beds to allow for appropriate and optimal classification is acceptable, as long as all housing units and other spaces within the project scope are staffed and operating.*

**Construction bids submitted to the county may turn out to be higher than what is stipulated in the county's proposal. The RFP states that the scope of the project cannot be reduced. Is this scope of work specific to bed count?**

*Yes, the scope of work is specific to bed count as well as other factors. In part, the county's proposal was rated, and thus funded, based on the number of beds to be gained. Net gain in beds is a significant factor in this funding process.*

**Under Section 4 of the Proposal Form, Narrative, Item B.6 asks for a list of non-compliance findings or recommendations. Is this list specific to the selected jail construction site, or does this refer to all jails in any one county's jurisdiction?**

*The referenced list is to include all jails in any one county's system. Further, this is an opportunity for the county to describe the relationship between the non-compliance issues and the proposed project.*

**Title 24 guidelines require the submission of a Letter of Intent to the CSA whenever there is intent to build a detention facility. Is this required in conjunction with the RFP, or does the RFP supersede this requirement?**

*Proposal submissions will be considered a Letter of Intent as required by Title 24.*

**In Section 1 of the Proposal Form, the county is asked to check a box to indicate whether the proposed project is for a *new* or *existing* facility. Since we are building a new facility on a current jail site, what box should be checked?**

*If adding a new stand-alone jail facility, even if on an existing site, a county should check the box indicating it is building a new facility.*

**A question in the RFP asks: Will the proposed project be used to replace an existing facility – yes or no? If replacement is the long term goal but not a forgone conclusion, how should this box be checked?**

*If an existing facility will be closed within months of the completion of the proposed project, then the new project would be considered a replacement facility. If the existing facility will not be closed for some years after completion of the proposed project, then the proposed project is not a replacement facility.*

**It is our understanding the same RFP will be used to award second phase funding. Is there something that we must do in the first RFP to indicate that we also want to be considered for second phase funding?**

*While CSA intends to issue a second and separate RFP for Phase II funding, there is no guarantee that will occur. It is unknown how quickly Phase II funding can be accessed once conditional awards are made for Phase I funding. With this said, any county wanting to compete for funding, whether Phase I or Phase II, is advised to submit a proposal for Phase I funding. There is nothing more a county needs to do at this time to be considered for second phase funding.*

**Our county may temporarily close a section of the old jail to do upgrades and repairs though it will reopen as soon as those are completed. Currently the costs related to this are not intended to be part of the county's submission on the RFP. This temporary loss of beds should not count against our project net gain in beds in our opinion, but will CSA look at it that way?**

*If the county clearly states this situation and its intentions in their proposal, and provides a reasonable timeline committing to the reopening of the beds that are subject to the upgrades and maintenance, then this would not be considered an elimination of beds affecting the net gain.*

**Page 9 of the RFP, bottom paragraph reads "Subject to these maximum state funding limits, the state has no overall limit on the total cost of an eligible county project, so long as the county demonstrates adequate local funding for the local match and ongoing operational costs of the facility." What sort of demonstration is necessary to meet this expectation?**

*At this point in time there is no further demonstration required beyond what is requested in the RFP – Proposal Form. Awarded counties will be notified if the State Public Works Board (SPWB) requests additional information at a later date, although this is not anticipated.*

**With respect to page 11 of the RFP – Technical Requirements Review of Draft Proposal, how do we make a draft submission for review, to whom specifically, and when is the final date for a submission? When can we anticipate a response from the CSA?**

*Counties choosing to submit a draft proposal for CSA staff to review prior to the formal submission required by March 18, 2008, may do so up to two weeks prior to the submittal deadline. Two weeks prior would mean no later than March 4, 2008. Page 3 of the RFP lists staff contact information that may be used for submitting draft proposals in whatever concise format the county desires (email or paper). CSA staff will turn draft proposal reviews around as quickly as possible, recognizing that timeframes for that may vary depending on the number of draft proposals submitted at any given time.*

**Regarding county presentations of their projects in April 2008 (page 11 of RFP), do we schedule a time now, and how much time are we allowed for our presentation, or will we be advised? How many from the county can attend? Can the consultants attend the presentation to clarify to the county representatives specific points, or are they not allowed to be present at all?**

*County presentations will be scheduled for either April 23 or 24, 2008 in Sacramento. Once it is known which counties have submitted a proposal by March 18, 2008, county presentations will be scheduled. Presentations will be brief (5 to 10 minutes generally), and counties will be notified of the exact timeframe to be allowed. There is not an anticipated limit on the number of county representatives that may be present. The presentation must be done by county representatives although consultants for the county may be present in the audience.*

**Regarding the retention referenced on page 24 of the RFP, is the referenced 20% retention amount the first 20% of reimbursable expenses that is being held back?**

*The non-negotiable 20% retention to be held will occur when the balance of state funds reaches 20%. In other words, the 20% withheld will be the last 20% of state dollars to be paid out to the county towards the end of the project. This amount is withheld until all contractual obligations between the state and county are met (i.e., staffing and operating the facility and completing the final audit within 90 days from construction completion).*

**Assuming additional questions will come up in this process, how long can we continue to ask questions beyond the pre-proposal? And, who is the point of contact and in what form should the questions be submitted?**

*CSA staff will be available to answer questions throughout the entire process; there is no cutoff date. Questions may come in the form desired by the county (i.e., phone call, email). Page 3 of the RFP lists staff contact information.*

**With the ability for small counties to potentially have up to 20% of in-kind match reduced through petition to the CSA Board, does that mean the state dollars will cover more costs?**

*Yes, it is possible; however, fundamental rules that do not change are that: 1) state dollars will pay for actual construction costs only, up to the maximum allowable state dollar project cap for small counties of \$30 million, and 2) all small counties will be responsible for the 5% minimum cash match. The county is still responsible for paying for all match-only items, as are identified in the project budget depicted on page 5 of the Proposal Form, even if there is a reduction in match granted by the CSA Board. Depending on project size, this could mean that the state dollars will pay for 95% of construction costs. This scenario will play out differently for different counties. Small counties are strongly encouraged to contact CSA staff to discuss options for maximizing state dollars on the project.*

**What is the petition format small counties are to use when petitioning the CSA Board for a reduction in match?**

*Each small county that intends to petition the CSA Board for a reduction in match must submit a letter from the authorized county representative, justifying the request for a reduction in match, and how much reduction is being requested. Keep in mind this request needs to explain to the broad-based 19-member CSA Board why the county feels this reduction is needed and how the county will benefit. Letters to the Board may be submitted via CSA staff.*

**Will state staff be in place by May 2008 to assist counties that are ready to proceed and either have complete, or nearly complete design documents?**

*Yes, state staff will be available to assist counties with their projects following the notice of conditional award for state funding in May 2008.*

**The provided timelines appear to add one to two years to projects that are "ready to go," with a contributing factor being a limited number of state staff dedicated to jail construction. Can the process be expedited and state staff available to reduce this time frame?**

*One to two years may be longer than required. The timeframes provided in the RFP are not a function of limited staff, but rather of processes. The significant and new lease-revenue bond financing process is far different than what has been experienced previously in California with local detention facility construction administered by the state. Each county must assess the information provided in the RFP and determine timeline impacts for their project.*

**What building code will CSA be using to review plans and specifications?**

*CSA does not review for building codes, but does review plans and specifications using the Minimum Standards for Local Detention Facilities as contained in Titles 15 and 24, California Code of Regulations (CCR). The State Fire Marshal will also be onsite at CSA doing plan reviews pertinent to fire and life safety regulations.*

**Is there a dollar amount that determines what is cost effective in terms of cost per bed?**

*No, CSA does not have a cost per bed figure to use as a base, largely because there is a lack of current jail construction cost data. The last significant amount of jail construction in our state was completed by the early 1990s.*

**Does the state offer any advice as to where in the budget to put cost escalation and contingency?**

*Escalation and contingency on construction costs should be built into the project's construction budget. Counties are allowed up to 10% of the state funds requested for construction contingency.*

**On page 26 of the RFP – Project Timelines, it states that the county is to provide CSA with a copy of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination within the first 6 months. This may not be realistic as CEQA could take up to a year to complete.**

*This activity chart with approximate timeframes was provided only as a guide, and primarily for the purpose of displaying the SPWB process. The timeline begins when the county receives the notice of intent to award conditional funding. It is recognized some processes may take longer than estimated on the activity chart.*

**On page 20 of the RFP there is an explanation of cash match. Can you expand on how the points will be assigned by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC)?**

*For each proposal, percentage cash match will be calculated by dividing cash match by total state funds requested (and multiplying by 100). The distribution of calculated percentages, arranged from highest to lowest, will be provided to the ESC members for review and discussion. The ESC members will then decide how to assign points (up to a maximum of 25) for this evaluation factor.*

**How does the fact that the state is under federal receivership affect a county jail project?**

*The state is under federal receivership for health care in the prison system. Any county operating a reentry facility or co-locating a reentry facility with a county jail will have to submit to and comply with the federal receiver's orders. There will be a boiler-plate, non-negotiable agreement that the county will have to sign to this effect.*

**Is the one-page abstract required by the RFP to be single or double spaced?**

*The one page abstract is to be double spaced.*

**The RFP states that state funding can only be used to build to 2011 needs. How does a county build to needs beyond 2011 in this project if desired?**

*Ideally, the county would be able to separate out the portion of the new construction that addresses needs to 2011. Any county intending to build beyond 2011 needs is encouraged to contact CSA staff immediately to discuss ramifications and options.*

**How will the escalation of construction costs be factored into the cost effectiveness evaluation criteria, as some county projects will take longer to complete than others?**

*The cost effectiveness evaluation factor is based on the amount of state dollars the county is requesting divided by the net gain in beds. The evaluation factor formula does not, and is not intended to, consider escalation of construction costs.*

**Does the cost effectiveness formula take into consideration the type of bed you are building, dormitory vs. cell?**

*No it does not, and is not intended to do so. On a related note, your needs assessment must support the type of bed the county is proposing to build.*

**Does construction need to be complete within three years from when you get the intent to award?**

*Federal tax law affecting this financing process requires that construction be substantially complete (approximately 90%) within three years after the county begins construction (the notice to proceed is issued). (Note: clarification added.)*

**Is a program statement required with the submittal of the proposal?**

*No, the operational program statement required by Title 24 must accompany the schematic design submittal. The proposal submittal must include only that information requested in the RFP, accompanied by a needs assessment. The information provided in a county's proposal must be supported by what is contained in their needs assessment.*

**Is there a deadline for when schematic design must be submitted?**

*While there is no specific deadline, each county needs to provide a reasonable timeline in their proposal.*

**Will there be any consideration to projects that propose using a design-build construction process?**

*CSA will need to work with a county individually as the design-build process may not be compatible with the SPWB process.*

**Can a county withdraw from the funding program after they are given a letter of intent to award conditional funding if they realize by then they can not meet the three year timeline to complete construction?**

*Yes, counties can withdraw early on in the process after receiving the notice they are being conditionally awarded the state funding, and before starting construction. The three year timeline to complete construction begins when the county issues the notice to proceed for construction.*

**In establishing current market value for the county property for the jail to be used as in-kind match, what kind of price comparison vehicle must be used?**

*In using site acquisition as match, a county must stipulate the land cost/value in the Board of Supervisors' resolution required with the proposal submittal. Actual on-site land cost documentation (i.e., bill of sale) or an independent appraisal value will be required as a pre-agreement condition. (Note: clarification added.)*

## **LEASE-REVENUE BOND FINANCING/STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD PROCESS**

**Does the county's land for the jail construction project transfer to the state?**

*The county maintains title on the land. Through a series of agreements and leases the state obtains ownership interest in the land.*

**On page 7 of the RFP, paragraph 1, it states "It is expected that facility ownership will then vest with the participating county." How else might this take place? Is it possible that the state will retain ownership?**

*There is no plan for the facility ownership to vest with any jurisdiction other than the county once the bond indebtedness is paid off. The state does not intend to retain ownership interest.*

**Our project scope includes the remodel of portions of the kitchen, laundry and video visitation, all of which are located within the existing facility. If the cost of this work is included as part of our eligible project costs, must these areas (or the entire building that these areas are located in) be brought up to current seismic and fire/life safety requirements? Also, must these areas be segregated from the existing facility, and included as part of the project site?**

*All areas of a facility that are being remodeled and included as part of the project scope (or eligible project costs), will be subject to current seismic and fire and life safety standards. Segregating portions of an existing facility that are under one roof will not be possible for purposes of determining project scope.*

**May a county identify a scope of work as an alternate bid item, and undertake that portion of the construction contract with the use of county funding only, and not include it in the scope of work on the proposed jail construction project?**

*Yes, that is possible. Contact CSA staff for guidance on this issue.*

**When completed, the entire facility (new and old), must work as an integrated unit, including such systems as the following: site utilities, telecommunications, security locking systems, video surveillance, video**

**visitation, inmate monitoring, life safety, fire alarm, etc. Must all of these infrastructure improvements in the existing facility be included as part of the project site if they are included as eligible project costs? If these systems are not included as an eligible project cost and are funded solely with local funds as a separate bid item, may the systems interconnect with the state funded buildings?**

*Construction work in an existing facility, and included in the project scope or eligible project costs, must be included in the project site. State funded buildings may interconnect with non-funded existing facilities in terms of infrastructure, although the state funded building must be able to be functionally independent in terms of operating its own controls for those infrastructure tie-ins. As an example, it would not be acceptable for the existing facility to be able to turn off the HVAC system for the new facility, without the new facility portion being able to override.*

**Under what conditions will the SPWB waive the 5 to 15 foot buffer requirement and allow a seismic joint to serve as the separation to provide for a “clean footprint”?**

*There is no waiver criteria set for this situation. CSA encourages each county to meet the 5 – 15 foot buffer if desiring to create a truly separate project and “clean footprint” that does not involve the existing facility. Otherwise, exceptions to this requirement will be considered by the SPWB on a case-by-case basis, although to date the SPWB has not given any indication of waiving this requirement.*

**Will a free standing secured breezeway be allowed to span the 5 – 15 foot buffer between the state financed portion of the building and an existing structure that is not part of the lease-revenue bond funded portion?**

*Direction from SPWB indicates that permanent structures joining the new portion of the facility with the existing building will likely cause the existing facility to become part of the footprint or project site. These issues will have to be worked out with SPWB.*

**Regarding the metes and bounds survey as referenced on page 25 of the RFP, must there be a separate parcel and Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN), or just a public document providing definition?**

*A separate APN is not required for determining the project site for purposes of this funding. The survey/legal description will determine the project site including the appropriate buffer zone.*

**Zero setbacks are common, so why is there the requirement for a 5 – 15 foot buffer from other buildings? This adds costs and reduces efficiency.**

*Some counties have indicated they choose to keep the boundaries of the project site at a minimum, i.e., that area of a project subject to state ownership interest, approval and oversight. This is where the buffer may be used by the county in creating a separation and minimizing the project site or footprint. Otherwise, having the buffer between buildings is not necessarily a requirement of this funding.*

**Inability to share infrastructure with other buildings (water, power, sewer) increases costs and lessens the number of beds provided with scarce funding. Is this a requirement of the bond?**

*Shared infrastructure is allowable, although when the new construction is separated by a buffer from the existing facility for purposes of limiting the project site or footprint, the new construction must be functionally independent. This requires that the new portion have its own controls of the infrastructure components so that it cannot be shut off by the existing facility without the ability to override. This is a bond marketing requirement.*

**What are the specific requirements that must be met for the building to be eligible for bond funding? Can we get a copy of the requirements now so we can see if we can meet them?**

*A list of lease-revenue bond financing requirements is not available, as each project will be reviewed for its unique qualities, and will be assessed by the SPWB for the state's ability to sell bonds on that project. Many of the requirements are market driven, rather than from regulatory or statutory codes. CSA staff is available as a conduit to the SPWB to facilitate assessment of individual and specific project situations when needed. On a separate track, projects must comply with Titles 15 and 24, CCR (minimum jail standards and state fire marshal's fire and life safety regulations). Other building codes also apply.*

**If a county wants to enlarge the kitchen to accommodate the increase in beds, does the kitchen remodel become part of the project and does it have to be brought up to current seismic and fire safety codes?**

*If the kitchen remodel is part of the county's scope of work and proposed project under this program, then the kitchen would have to be brought up to current seismic and fire and life safety codes. Generally speaking, this would also apply to the remainder of the facility in which the kitchen is located, as it would be subject to state ownership interest. CSA staff can provide more information to individual counties, taking into account a particular county's facility layout and how that may work within the lease-revenue financing process.*

**If the newly constructed building is 5 – 15 feet away from the existing facility, can the two buildings be connected with a tunnel?**

*A tunnel would be considered a permanent structure attaching the newly constructed building to the existing facility, thus requiring the existing facility to be part of the project footprint and subject to current seismic and fire and life safety code requirements.*

**If not a tunnel, what if the new building were connected to the existing building with a chain-link breezeway?**

*A chain-link connection would be considered less permanent and not connecting the new construction to the existing facility. Counties will have to work out the specifics of the breezeway construction and the potential impact on their facility operations.*

**On page 25 of the RFP under Project Scope it states that a project with less than a 5 – 15 buffer will have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Is there someone at the SPWB a county can contact to discuss this?**

*CSA is the contact for counties with questions regarding the SPWB process. If a county has a specific situation that can be clearly articulated, CSA will assist in attempting to get a response from SPWB to the county's proposed scenario, recognizing the buffer is generally required when wanting to separate an existing facility from new construction.*

**In Section 4 of the Proposal Form under Project Need there are several criteria listed. Will the ESC break down the 250 points for each of the criteria, and if so, can that be made public?**

*There is no breakdown of the points for each of the items that must be included in each section of the narrative. It will be up to each ESC member to assign a point value of up to 250 points for project need, based upon their independent assessment of the narrative response.*

**Regarding the 5 – 15 foot buffer, can that buffer zone be crossed with computer lines for such things as video visitation and security systems? What about sewer connections and electrical?**

*The new building must be functionally independent of other existing buildings (having its own controls of the systems), but may tie in to existing infrastructure.*

**What is the revenue stream to pay back the lease-revenue bonds and how will the state budget deficit affect the lease-revenue bond process?**

*The state's general fund is the revenue source to pay the lease payments on the bonds. It is not expected that the state budget deficit will have an effect on the lease-revenue bond process.*

**What is the timeline to issue the bonds?**

*The bonds are not sold until the construction of the facility is nearly complete. The interim funding until the bonds are sold comes from sources such as the Pooled Money Investment Board loans. If the state cannot sell the bonds, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) budget is responsible for payment of the outstanding loans. However, this scenario is unlikely.*

**The RFP states that the cost of the real estate due diligence is to be charged to the county. Where does this get reflected in the county's budget summary?**

*The cost of real estate due diligence itself is not part of the eligible costs in the budget, and CSA does not know what amount to advise counties to budget for this. CSA has been told that on prison projects the real estate due diligence can cost as much as \$50,000, but it could be less. The cost will vary project by project.*

**If the county has already performed some of the real estate due diligence activities, can that be used for the state's purpose? Will the state charge staff time to the county's project?**

*It is true that the counties will be preparing their own CEQA and EIR documents for their projects. It is unknown at this point whether or not those documents will be utilized by the state for their real estate due diligence process. The state will charge counties for the cost of completing the real estate due diligence, which may be conducted by the state's Department of General Services staff or contracted out to an independent engineering firm. CSA staff time related to real estate due diligence, if any, will not be charged to the counties.*

**PAROLEE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FUNDING PREFERENCE**

**Mental Health Sites – Does the state prefer vacant land, existing vacant buildings or some other option for locating mental health day treatment and crisis care for parolees (the reference to physical location is vague)?**

*Interested counties are encouraged to contact Robert Storms, Staff Services Manager II, of the Division of Adult Parole Operations to initiate discussion on mentally ill parolee needs, and current services available in their county. CDCR would like to refer mentally ill parolees to services that currently exist, whether they are site specific or not. It is the goal to match the needs to currently available services whether provided directly by the counties, or contracted out. CDCR has sought funding for the contracted services, and plans to pay for*

*contracted services. Rather than the high cost of building or leasing sites for these services, CDCR would prefer supplementing the counties to increase capacity so that the mentally ill parolees can receive services within their current infrastructure. (Note: clarification added.)*

**If access is provided to existing mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for parolees and post-parole individuals, does this satisfy the requirements for awarding preference points?**

*As far as qualifying for the funding preference points, the county need only indicate that they agree to assist the state, and do so in the format prescribed in the RFP.*

**Are there any minimum standard guidelines or approaches to mental health day treatment, like a specific risk-needs assessment tool that must be used?**

*During negotiations with the interested counties, mental health service availability and parolee needs in each geographical location will be identified. A mutually agreed upon scope of services will then be developed by both parties, and will include an eligibility determination process with exclusionary criteria. (Note: clarification added.)*

**Can a county contract out to a private company to provide the services, e.g. day treatment program?**

*Yes, a county can contract with a private company for the mental health and substance abuse services to the parolee population. (Note: clarification added.)*

**An increase in services for the parolee population means an increase in costs. This sounds like a shift in costs with the county paying for the parolee treatment instead of the state?**

*There is no expectation that the county pay for the costs of parolee mental health services that are referenced in the RFP and that relate to the preference factor for assisting the state with providing these services. CDCR has sought funding for the contracted services with counties for the parolee population, and plans to pay for the contracted services. However, when it comes to the preference factor of assisting with the continuum of care to parolees so that they can receive services at the conclusion of their period of parole, there would be no state funding for this as the ex-parolee would be a citizen of the community without a connection to the state at this point.*

**Has CDCR defined “day treatment?” This is an old model that is not used much anymore.**

*CDCR, with input from various county representatives and the California Mental Health Directors Association has defined day treatment as “Mental Health Rehabilitative Services designed to target individual needs of mentally ill parolee-clients.” In addition, the term crisis care has been defined as “In-Patient Mental Health Services designed to stabilize and treat mentally ill parolee-patients in need of an acute level of care.” (Note: clarification added.)*

**Are there going to be future meetings to address the mental health/parolee questions?**

*There are no future meetings planned to discuss mental health services for parolees; however, CSA has listed contact information in the FAQs for parole program and reentry questions. We encourage counties to contact them directly.*

### **REENTRY FACILITY FUNDING PREFERENCE**

**As it relates to siting a reentry facility, if a county considers the use of an existing jail facility, can this be conditioned upon receiving maximum funding?**

*If a county offers to assist the state in siting a reentry facility, that offer may be conditioned upon receiving state funding for the county’s proposed jail project.*

**Does CDCR view the operation of the reentry facilities part of the county’s obligation to receive funds?**

*Counties do not need to operate reentry facilities; CDCR would prefer to operate the state prison reentry facilities with its own staff.*

**Will counties be more favorably rated in their jail construction proposal if they desire to operate the reentry program?**

*The operation of the actual reentry program is not within the rating factors for jail construction proposals. There will not be additional points afforded for reentry programming operations.*

**Regarding the gradation of reentry preference points of up to 300 points, is that gradation either 150 points or 300 points, or is there a scale in between?**

*It is either 150 points or 300 points. The criterion for gaining each is outlined in the RFP.*

**If a county chooses not to assist the state with those issues tied to funding preferences (reentry siting and parolee mental health services), what are the ramifications?**

*Other than not gaining the preference points, there are no other ramifications.*

**On page 14 of the RFP, Co-locating Jails and State Secure Reentry Program Facilities, is there any kind of guidance from the state to determine what is reasonable to share?**

*State dollars from this RFP process can only pay for jail construction costs. If a county chooses to co-locate a jail and a reentry facility, CSA staff will have to work with the county to help apportion those costs so that they clearly represent only jail construction and not reentry facility costs.*

**Will there be funding to staff the reentry facilities?**

*CDCR prefers to staff and operate the reentry facilities with state employees, and the operational funding is proposed through the state budget process on a year-to-year basis.*

**Will Parole fund the necessary services for parolees once they are released from the reentry facility?**

*Yes, CDCR intends to fund AB 900 authorized mental health services provided in the county for parolees by way of contracts. In addition, CDCR continues to provide outpatient mental health treatment and medication management by way of its Parole Outpatient Clinics.*