

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

SOUTH CAROLINA



Jail Ad Hoc Committee

Date: Wednesday, April 20, 2016

Time: 11:00 a.m.

Location: 4th Floor Conference Room

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of Minutes: February 16, 2016 [PAGES 2-5]**
- 3. Adoption of the Agenda**
- 4. Discussion: Transportation of Released Detainees**
- 5. Discussion: Space Study Analysis and Staff Recommendations**
- 6. Other Business**
- 7. Adjournment**

Committee Members

Seth Rose, Chair
District Five

Paul Livingston
District Four

Greg Pearce
District Six

Norman Jackson
District Eleven

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

SOUTH CAROLINA

JAIL AD HOC COMMITTEE

February 16, 2016
9:30 AM
4th Floor Conference Room

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rose called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 AM

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.

BRYAN STIRLING, SC DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS

Mr. Rose stated Mr. Bryan, SC Department of Corrections Director, has agreed to present some of the initiatives the Department of Corrections has put into place to address the transportation for former inmates when they are released from incarceration.

- The former inmates are not allowed to leave in prison clothing; there is a "coat closet" with regular clothing
- Allowed to be released on the 1st of the month if they have a ride available; all others are released on the 2nd
- If the former inmate opts to accept a bus pass they are not released on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday
- Sheriff's Deputy patrols area around bus station to discourage illicit behavior
- Attempt to release within an hour of bus departure time
- Bus tickets can be utilized to anywhere within the State lines

Mr. Myers stated the 24-hour bond court for County detainees has assisted with the number of transports requested.



Council Members Present

Seth Rose, Chair
District Five

Paul Livingston
District Four

Greg Pearce
District Six

Kelvin E. Washington, Sr.
District Ten

Norman Jackson
District Eleven

Others Present:

Torrey Rush
Tony McDonald
Cheryl Patrick
Brandon Madden
Warren Harley
Kevin Bronson
Ronaldo Myers
Kathy Harrell
Brittney Hoyle
Jennifer Wladischkin
Elizabeth McLean
Michelle Onley

**ROBERT SCHNEIDER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CENTRAL
MIDLANDS REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY**

Dr. Schneider stated there are 2 primary routes that serve the Southeastern portion of the County. One serves the Route 601/Bluff Road/Shop Road area, which goes near the Detention Center. However, there is not enough volume to sustain a consistent route that would travel to the area every 40 minutes. There are 4 times a day when the bus travels to the Detention Center (8:18 a.m., 11:18 a.m., 1:18 p.m. and 3:18 p.m.). The bus then travels to Windy and Bluff where it meets up with a fixed transit route that runs every 40 minutes.

Mr. Rose inquired if there was any way the COMET could assist with providing service to Detention Center in the evening and on weekends.

Dr. Schneider stated at this time the COMET cannot, but the needs could be reassessed in the future.

Mr. Myers stated the service during the days would work for the Detention Center, but there would need to be service until at least 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and the weekends would represent an issue since the Detention Center is mandated to release individuals within 4 hours.

Mr. Livingston inquired about what is the committee trying to resolve by changing the ridership of the former detainees. It was his understanding the initial concern was the drop off at the transit station. Changing the ridership to the bus pass will not change the outcome.

Mr. Rose stated presently the individuals are dropped off at the transit station without a dime in their pocket or a bus ticket. The issue becomes if they are trying to get to another location they are not able to due to their circumstances.

Mr. Jackson stated there was an agreement with the bus at one time to insure that former detainees did not walk through the community.

Mr. Rose inquired if there was a way to track where the former detainees are dropped off.

Dr. Schneider stated it is an anonymous ridership and there is no way to track passes.

Mr. Myers stated no one is released after 7:00 p.m. anymore to prevent individuals from being released and them being stranded at the bus station due to there being no services available.

Mr. Livingston suggested transporting the former detainees to the transit station and providing them with a bus pass to be utilized to go where they need to go.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it were true that if an individual did not have transportation they were required to take the van to the transit center.

Dr. Schneider agreed to evaluate the possibility of providing limited weekend service to the Detention Center on weekends. He also suggested only transporting individuals to the Windy/Bluff Road bus stop on weekends and evenings after 3:18 p.m. instead of the transit station.

Mr. Rose suggested Mr. Myers, Judge Simons, Dr. Schneider and the Chief City judge to coordinate the potential for providing bus service at or near the Detention Center. He further requested a cost analysis of providing bus service to the Detention Center vs. the current transportation option.

Ms. McLean was requested to provide any potential liability issues with the change in transportation options.

OTHER BUSINESS
(CARTER GOBLE LEE – NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT)

- Three phases to the needs assessment: (1) What do we have today? What does it look like? (2) What's our inmate population and the bed space needs going to look like over the next 20 years? (3) What do we need to do to put in place those needs?
- The infrastructure and the system is in good shape
- Facility almost maxed out capacity wise
- The biggest problems appear to be access to systems (i.e. plumbing, electrical, HVAC)
- Any new construction should be in concert with the maintenance staff
- The current FTEs is 342; the recommended FTEs is 373
- The medium custody inmates that are in open dormitories have been causing a lot of problems. There is currently no place to lock them back because there are no cells.
- Another problem area is the Special Needs inmates. They are inmates that require special housing due to acute or severe mental illness or because of acute medical needs.
- Mentally ill inmates are housed in the SHU. There are protective custody, disciplinary segregation, administrative segregation, psychotic/acute mental illness, medical issues and keep aways from other inmates

Project Proposals:

- Proposal #1 – Convert medium custody dormitory housing into celled housing; may lose a few beds with the conversion.
- Proposal #2 – Construct purpose-built housing for inmates with medical conditions; 32 male beds, double-occupancy
- Proposal #3 – Construct purpose-built housing for inmates with both acute and sub-acute mental illnesses; 80 total beds (16 female acute beds, single-occupancy; 16 male acute beds, single-occupancy; and 48 male sub-acute beds, double-occupancy); will require 3 Detention Officers per shift (one female); located outside fence

- Proposal #4 – Relocate Video Visitation to the Phase IV Building. Current location has near constant activity. Congestion is difficult for staff and visitors. Will require no additional staff
- New construction for the medical housing and mental health services center it would cost approximately \$8,831,475.
- Dormitory renovations would cost approximately \$3,928,500
- The Video Visitation Relocation would be approximately \$407,000.
- The total costs would be approximately \$16,050,543 with a 15% contingency and 6% architectural and engineering costs.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:59 AM

The Minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley, Deputy Clerk of Council