GRAND COUNTY
— UTAH —

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Public Safety Complex
Feasibility Study

RFP Number:	GC10024
Issue Date:	March 3, 2026
Proposals Due:	March 17, 2026 at 4:00 PM MDT
Issuing Office:	Grand County Administration

Grand County Commission
125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah 84532
CommAdmin@grandcountyutah.gov

Section 1: Introduction and Purpose

1.1 Introduction

Grand County, Utah ("County") is issuing this Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified firms to conduct a Feasibility Study for a proposed Public Safety Complex. The study will evaluate the viability of developing a new or significantly renovated public safety complex and provide the baseline information necessary for the Grand County Commission to make informed decisions regarding the project and potential funding through a 0.3% Fixed Guideway sales tax under Utah Code § 59-12-2216.

1.2 Background

The Grand County Commission has established a Fixed Guideway Tax Subcommittee to evaluate, plan, and make recommendations on the possible implementation of 0.3% sales tax for public safety purposes. The County's current public safety facilities, including the courthouse, jail, and county offices at the Grand County complex, need significant updates to address operational deficiencies, safety concerns, and capacity limitations. The current 60-bed jail does not meet the projected need for approximately 100 beds and does not adequately support rehabilitative and educational programming. The Sheriff's Department, County Attorney, and court services also need improvement, additional capacity, and would benefit from being housed in a consolidated space.

The County has approximately $1.5 million in remaining debt from a 2017 jail renovation. Financial advisors indicate that a 0.3% Fixed Guideway sales tax could support bonding capacity of $40 to $45 million. The County is also exploring supplemental funding through the Community Impact Board.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this Feasibility Study is to determine whether the proposed Public Safety Complex project is financially and physically feasible within the constraints of projected tax revenue and other funding sources. It will provide the Fixed Guideway Tax Subcommittee with the data needed to make a recommendation to the full Commission for a vote. The study must provide sufficient information for the subcommittee and Commission to make informed, fiscally responsible decisions about whether and how to proceed with the project and the tax.

1.4 Preferred Site

The preferred site for consideration is the current Grand County complex, which includes the courthouse, jail, and offices. Preliminary assessments by design professionals suggest the current parcel is not undersized and appears suitable for expansion or new construction. Options may include new construction with adaptive reuse of existing structures for office space. The study should also identify and evaluate one to two additional potentially viable sites for comparison, including any county-owned properties.

Section 2: Scope of Services

The selected consultant shall perform the following tasks as part of the Feasibility Study. All work products must be in a format suitable for public review and Commission decision-making.

Task 1: Site Assessment and Feasibility

1.1 Site Identification and Evaluation

The consultant shall identify two to four viable sites, with the current Grand County complex as the priority site. Each site shall be evaluated against the following minimum criteria:

- Access to utilities (water, sewer, power, natural gas), including capacity confirmation from service providers
- Adequate road access and traffic capacity
- Zoning compliance or feasibility of zoning change
- Topography and geotechnical suitability
- Environmental constraints
- Expansion potential for future growth (minimum 30-year horizon)
- Infrastructure capacity to support expanded inmate population (e.g., sewer and water capacity for up to 200 inmates)

1.2 Site Development Analysis

For each site, the consultant shall provide:

- Preliminary geotechnical assessment (desktop analysis, existing data review; field investigation if warranted)
- Utility capacity confirmation from service providers
- Traffic impact preliminary assessment
- Quantified site development costs including grading and earthwork, utility extensions and connections, access roads and parking, stormwater management, and other necessary site improvements

1.3 Deliverables

- Site evaluation matrix ranking sites by suitability and cost
- Recommended primary and alternate sites with justification

Task 2: Facility Programming and Cost Estimation

2.1 Facility Programming

The consultant shall confirm space requirements through coordination with County stakeholders, including:

- Sheriff’s Department operational needs (including space for GCSO, Moab City Police, Utah Highway Patrol, Search and Rescue)

- Jail capacity requirements: current operations (approximately 43 inmates in a 60-bed facility) and 20- to 30-year projections targeting approximately 100 beds with expansion potential
- Rehabilitative and educational programming spaces (substance abuse treatment, sex offender treatment, domestic violence programs, mental health counseling, educational classrooms, vocational training, life skills and job readiness, family visitation, re-entry planning, and general multipurpose programming rooms)
- County Attorney office space
- Courthouse and court services space (coordination with Utah Courts required)
- Evidence storage and processing
- Support spaces (sally port, intake, booking, training, multipurpose areas)

The consultant shall develop a preliminary space allocation by department and function, and provide a total gross square footage estimate including circulation, mechanical, and structural space. Facility design should consider modern “pod type” jail configurations that maximize staffing efficiency.

2.2 Conceptual Design

The consultant shall develop two to three conceptual site layouts showing:

- Building footprint and orientation
- Parking and circulation
- Security zones, access control, and housing classification separations
- Potential phasing approach
- Design elements critical to cost and function

Conceptual options should include, at minimum: (a) new construction with demolition of existing structures; (b) new construction with renovation of existing structures for office or support use; and (c) significant renovation and expansion of existing facilities.

2.3 Cost Estimation

The consultant shall develop a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost estimate including:

- Building construction (cost per square foot based on comparable projects)
- Site development costs
- FF&E (furniture, fixtures, and equipment)
- Technology and security systems
- Professional fees (architecture, engineering, design)
- Construction contingency
- Escalation to estimated mid-point of construction

The estimate shall include a cost range of the most likely cost plus or minus 20%. Separate costs shall be provided for optional elements including contract prisoner housing expansion, future expansion zones, and additional courtroom capacity.

2.4 Deliverables

- Facility program summary document
- Conceptual site plans (preliminary)
- Detailed cost estimate with assumptions and qualifications

Task 3: Revenue and Financial Capacity Analysis

3.1 Revenue Projections

The consultant shall confirm 0.3% sales tax revenue projections including:

- Annual revenue estimates under conservative, most likely, and optimistic scenarios
- Five-year projection with growth assumptions
- Identification of statutory or practical restrictions on use
- Review of historical Grand County sales tax performance
- Revenue volatility and economic sensitivity analysis

3.2 Debt Service Capacity Analysis

The consultant shall determine maximum supportable project cost based on revenue projections, considering:

- Assumed bond term (20–30 years)
- Estimated interest rates (current market conditions)
- Required debt service coverage ratio (typically 1.2x minimum)
- Impact of existing debt obligations (approximately $1.5 million remaining from 2017 jail renovation)

Modeling shall include scenarios for: new bond only (existing debt paid separately); consolidated bond (refunding existing debt with new project); and phased approach (multiple bond issuances).

3.3 Revenue Allocation Framework

The consultant shall develop a recommended allocation of annual tax revenue addressing:

- Bond debt service (estimated annual payment)
- Existing debt payoff strategy
- Critical immediate repairs and improvements
- Operations and maintenance (within 20% statutory soft cap)
- Reserve fund requirements

A 30-year cash flow pro forma shall be provided showing annual revenue, annual bond payments, cumulative revenue versus expenditures, and reserve balance over time.

3.4 Financial Self-Sustainability Analysis

The consultant shall specifically analyze the facility's potential to be financially self-sustaining through operational revenue, including revenue from housing state contract prisoners. This analysis shall address specialized programming that meets state contract requirements, adequate space and infrastructure for increased capacity, and projected revenue offsets to operational costs.

3.5 Deliverables

- Financial capacity analysis report
- Bond sizing recommendation with supporting calculations
- 30-year pro forma financial model (Excel format)
- Revenue allocation framework document

Task 4: Implementation Feasibility and Risk Assessment

4.1 Project Delivery Analysis

The consultant shall recommend a project delivery method, evaluating at minimum Design-Bid-Build, Construction Manager at Risk, and Design-Build, along with any other alternatives appropriate for this project type and scale. The consultant shall provide a preliminary project schedule from tax approval through occupancy, identifying critical path items and potential delays.

4.2 Risk Assessment

The consultant shall identify and evaluate key project risks including:

- Revenue volatility and shortfalls
- Construction cost escalation (historically approximately 5% annually)
- Site-specific challenges (including geotechnical and infrastructure constraints)
- Regulatory and permitting risks
- Market conditions (contractor availability, material costs)
- Political and public perception considerations

Risk mitigation strategies shall be provided for all significant identified risks.

4.3 Deliverables

- Implementation roadmap with key milestones
- Risk register with mitigation recommendations

Task 5: Feasibility Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary Report

The consultant shall prepare a comprehensive summary including:

- Executive summary of findings (two to three pages)
- Recommended project scope and budget
- Financial feasibility determination addressing: Can the project be bonded within available revenue? Is the tax sufficient to cover debt service, existing obligations, and necessary operations and maintenance? What contingencies or alternatives exist if revenue underperforms?

- Go/No-Go recommendation with conditions

5.2 Final Deliverables

- Comprehensive Feasibility Study Report (40–60 pages) including all task deliverables, appendices with supporting data and assumptions, and visual aids (maps, charts, renderings)
- Executive presentation (PowerPoint, 15–20 slides)

Section 3: Study Requirements

3.1 Timeline

- Study duration: Six weeks from authorization to proceed
- Draft report delivered for review: Two weeks before final report
- Final report and presentation: Eight weeks from authorization to proceed

3.2 Coordination

The selected consultant shall coordinate with:

- Grand County Administration
- Grand County Sheriff's Department
- Grand County Attorney
- Financial Advisor
- Correctional Programming Advisor
- Utah Courts representative
- Other stakeholders as identified by the Commission

3.3 Information Provided by the County

The County will provide the following information to the selected consultant:

- Existing facility condition reports and studies
- Historical sales tax data
- County-owned property records and maps
- Current jail population data and projections
- Any existing space needs assessments
- Programming requirements and capacity goals for state prisoner housing
- Existing debt schedules and financial statements
- Contact information for utility providers and regulatory agencies

3.4 Meetings and Presentations

The consultant shall plan for the following meetings at minimum:

- Kickoff meeting with the Fixed Guideway Tax Subcommittee
- Mid-study progress briefing
- Draft report presentation to subcommittee
- Final presentation to the subcommittee (and potentially full Commission)

Section 4: Proposal Requirements

Proposals shall be organized in the following format and include, at minimum, the information described below.

4.1 Cover Letter

A cover letter signed by an authorized representative of the firm, including the firm name, address, primary contact person, telephone number, and email address.

4.2 Firm Qualifications and Experience

- Description of the firm, including years in business, size, and organizational structure
- Demonstrated experience with similar public safety complex projects, correctional facility programming and operations, and rural or small county facility planning
- Experience with financially sustainable facility development and understanding of Fixed Guideway tax and alternative funding mechanisms
- Experience with community integration and re-entry planning
- Experience with facility renovation and adaptive reuse, in addition to new construction
- A minimum of three references from recent projects of similar scope, including project name, client contact, project cost, timeline adherence, and client satisfaction

4.3 Project Team

Identification of all key personnel who will be assigned to the project, including their qualifications, relevant experience, and roles. Resumes or brief biographies shall be provided for all team leads. If subconsultants are proposed, their qualifications and roles shall also be described.

4.4 Technical Approach

A detailed description of the proposed approach to each task identified in the Scope of Services (Section 2), including methodology, key assumptions, and any proposed modifications or enhancements to the scope that the firm believes would add value.

4.5 Project Schedule

A proposed project schedule showing major milestones, deliverable dates, and meeting dates within the six-week study and eight-week delivery and presentation period. The schedule shall identify the critical path and any dependencies on County-provided information.

4.6 Fee Proposal

A not-to-exceed fee proposal including:

- Total project fee broken down by task
- Estimated reimbursable expenses (travel, printing, etc.)

- Payment schedule tied to deliverable milestones

Proposers should understand that the study is time-sensitive and must align with subcommittee deadlines, work may be adjusted if preliminary findings indicate the project is not feasible, and additional scope items may be negotiated separately if identified during the study.

Section 5: Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated by the Fixed Guideway Tax Subcommittee based on the following criteria. Evaluation will weight qualifications more heavily than cost, reflecting the subcommittee's priority on selecting the most capable and experienced firm.

Criterion	Weight	Max Points
Firm qualifications and relevant experience	30%	30
Project team qualifications	20%	20
Technical approach and methodology	25%	25
Project schedule and responsiveness	10%	10
Fee proposal	15%	15
Total	**100%**	**100**

The County reserves the right to conduct interviews with the top-ranked firms and contact references given before making a final selection. The County also reserves the right to negotiate scope and fee with the top-ranked firm.

Section 6: Submission Instructions

6.1 Submission Deadline

Proposals must be received no later than 5:00 PM Mountain Daylight Time on March 17, 2026. Late submissions will not be considered.

6.2 Submission Method

Proposals shall be submitted electronically to the U3P Portal at **utah.bonfirehub.com**

Alternatively, proposals may be submitted by the deadline in hard copy (three copies) to:

Grand County Clerk/Auditor
125 East Center Street
Moab, Utah 84532

6.3 Questions and Clarifications

All questions concerning this RFP shall be submitted to the Public Q+A section of the U3P Portal prior to March 9 at 5:00 PM MT.

6.4 Proposal Format

- Proposals shall not exceed 30 pages (excluding resumes and appendices)
- Minimum 11-point font
- Page-numbered
- Organized according to the sections described in Section 4

Section 7: General Terms and Conditions

7.1 Right to Cancel or Amend

The County reserves the right to cancel this RFP, to reject any or all proposals, to waive irregularities, and to re-advertise if determined to be in the best interest of the County. The County also reserves the right to amend the RFP at any time prior to the submission deadline.

7.2 Proposal Costs

The County shall not be liable for any costs incurred by proposers in the preparation or submission of proposals.

7.3 Public Records

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP become the property of Grand County and are subject to the Utah Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA). Study findings will be public record and may be used in public communications about the tax.

7.4 Contract Negotiation

The County intends to negotiate a contract with the top-ranked proposer. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the County may negotiate with the next-ranked proposer.

7.5 Insurance Requirements

The selected consultant shall maintain, at a minimum, commercial general liability insurance, professional liability (errors and omissions) insurance, automobile liability insurance, and workers' compensation insurance in amounts acceptable to the County. Proof of insurance shall be provided prior to contract execution.

7.6 Acceptance Criteria

The Feasibility Study will be considered complete when the subcommittee can confidently answer the following questions:

1. Has a site been identified that can accommodate the project?
2. Is there a defensible project scope and cost estimate?
3. Can the County bond for the required amount with the projected tax revenue?
4. Will the tax revenue cover debt service, existing obligations, and necessary operational costs?
5. Have major risks been identified and planned for?
6. Is there sufficient information to make a fiscally responsible recommendation to the full Commission?

7.7 Disclaimer

This Feasibility Study is intended to provide decision-making information, not final design. Consultant recommendations are advisory; final decisions rest with the County Commission. The accuracy of cost estimates is limited by the preliminary nature of design; contingencies and escalation factors should be robust.