



Richland County  
Detention Center Ad Hoc Committee  
March 16, 2021 – 3:00 PM  
Zoom Meeting  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Chair, Yvonne McBride, and Cheryl English

OTHERS PRESENT: Gretchen Barron, Michelle Onley, Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Ashiya Myers, Elizabeth McLean, John. Thompson, Hayden Davis, Shane Kitchen, Lori Thomas, Jennifer Wladischkin, Leonardo Brown, Ronaldo Myers, Tamar Black, Lauren Hogan, and Randy Pruitt

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. McBride called the meeting to order at approximately 3:01 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. May 4, 2020 – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the minutes as distributed.  
  
In Favor: McBride and Terracio  
  
Not Present: English  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the agenda as published.  
  
In Favor: McBride and Terracio  
  
Not Present: English  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ELECTION OF CHAIR** – Ms. McBride nominated Ms. Terracio for the position of Chair.  
  
Ms. Terracio accepted the nomination  
  
In Favor: McBride and Terracio  
  
Not Present: English  
  
The vote in favor was unanimous

**DETENTION CENTER AD HOC COMMITTEE**  
**March 16, 2021**

5. **DETAINEE PHONE SYSTEM** – Mr. Myers stated the phone system is very crucial to the detainees. If there is going to be a commission rate to ensure they are charging what Council wants.

Ms. Terracio stated one of her main concerns was the cost per minute versus what it actually costs to provide the service. Her intention was to keep those numbers as close to each other as possible.

Ms. McBride stated, if there is any revenue, it should be directed to the detention facility for social services and other areas of need for the detainees. Previously, those funds went to the General Fund for the County.

Ms. Terracio agreed any profits made at the detention should be reinvested. She noted, in the packet, it states, "Despite staff attempts the current vendor and the proposed vendor have not provided information relative to the cost of service and equipment provision."

Mr. Myers responded the companies probably do not know because this is a complete start up for them. They have approximated it would be \$.06 - \$.07 per call.

Ms. Terracio inquired if that would be the point to start negotiations. She also inquired how to go from a \$0.16 per minute rate to something closer to costs.

Ms. Wladischkin responded, regarding the negotiation of the rates, she is confident the County would be able to negotiate. Her understanding is we want to negotiate the commission structure. In regards to the costs, there may be some reticence with them disclosing their fee structures.

Ms. McBride inquired if we will be able to decide how we spend the fee once we decide the amount to charge.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride noted we are looking at the vendor, and once we made a determination, we will be in a better situation to move forward. She inquired about the technological needs of the center.

Mr. Myers responded there is technology grant the phone system gives, so facilities can upgrade their jail management systems. He noted they desperately need this. The current jail management system is so archaic that a new script or program has to be made to retrieve data from the system. The system generates more reports than the ones required causing staff to sift through the extra paperwork. He would like the new technology to be included in the phone contract.

Ms. Terracio inquired how the current system operates.

Mr. Myers responded the JMS system is where all the inmate/detainee information will be stored. It keeps all the records, reports, statistics, and infractions at the officer's fingertips. Currently, they do not have anything like that available.

Ms. Terracio inquired if there is an estimate for the costs of the new technology.

Mr. Myers responded the estimate would come out of the revenues from the phone. The phone company would solicit on the Detention Center's behalf and bring back proposals to pick the best fit for the facility.

Ms. McBride inquired if the JMS system is something the current vendor provides.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired, if we contract with GTL, they would be able to provide the JMS System as a part of the contract.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if that would be included in the overall negotiated fee.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired, if the system is already included in the fee, if it was possible to still set the rate at \$.10 per minute and still generate revenue.

Mr. Myers responded until we negotiate and find out which way they are going to go with this, he would be hesitate to respond. He is sure they could come close to \$.10 per minute.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to accept the contract with GTL, the call center rate will be set at \$.10 per minute and to authorize the jail to have the technology grant through GTL for the jail management system. In addition, any revenue generated from the ICS contract be placed into the Detention Center budget for mental health needs and other services for the detainees.

Ms. Terracio inquired if GLT was the new provider, and if they would be able to provide the jail management service as a part of the contract.

Ms. McBride responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, we need this jail management system upgrade because the current system is paper heavy.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired, with the new system, would employees be able to access records from a device at a moment's notice.

Ms. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if there would be security in place to protect the device, in the event the device got into the hands of someone that did not have permission.

Mr. Myers responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: McBride, Terracio, and English

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20PM.