



DETENTION CENTER AD HOC COMMITTEE  
February 25, 2020 – 3:00PM  
Administration Conference Room  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Dalhi Myers, Chair, Yvonne McBride and Allison Terracio

OTHERS PRESENT: John Thompson, Michelle Onley, Ronaldo Myers, Hayden Davis, Shane Kitchen, Randy Pruitt, and Fielding Pringle

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Myers called the meeting to order at approximately 3:01 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded Ms. McBride, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ARCHITECT FIRM TO DESIGN A MEDICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH HOUSING UNIT FOR THE ASGDC**

In 2011/2012 County Council approved funding to build additional bed space. The plan was to build a medical and mental health facility. It was placed on hold in 2014. In 2016, Carter Goebel more or less validated what the Detention Center staff wanted to do. Carter Goebel did a population analysis, and they did not feel the population was going to grow at the same rate it had in the past. In 2007/2008 the population had ballooned to an average daily population of 1,300. In recent years, there has been a “population shift” wherein more detainees were charged with violent crimes, and they needed a way to separate them. In addition, the mental health population was increasing, and there was a need for a proper place to house the detainees. Since the mental health detainees do not go into the general population, they are holding up vital beds that could be utilized by detainees charged with violent offenses to prevent them from preying on other detainees.

In February 2019, they put out an RFP and four (4) companies responded. Moseley was the most qualified respondent. They have previously done work at ASGDC, and have done similar projects throughout the United States. Moseley has conducted a walk-through and will be doing a reassessment of the Carter Goebel study.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, staff wants the committee to authorize staff to go ahead with a feasibility study. The motion, as stated on the agenda, is for complete authorization to design the mental and medical units.

Mr. Myers stated Moseley has to go back and review the Carter Goebel study to ensure the proper number of beds are constructed.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the RFQ was for design services. It was mentioned, in the RFQ, that there was a needs assessment done in 2016. She is assuming that Moseley would need to do a review, or update, of the study. One firm would not want to use the data in another firm’s study, so Moseley will likely want to do a feasibility study of their own, even if it is in a limited capacity. The solicitation did not specifically ask for them to do a feasibility study. They mentioned the results of the study, and the fact that one was previously done. The RFQ specifically asked for the design of the interior housing

renovation for single cell detainees, medical treatment needs, housing for mental health needs, any upgrades for electrical and mechanical systems, and fire suppression system.

Ms. Myers inquired about the cost of the feasibility study update.

Mr. Myers stated it will be approximately \$183,000.

Ms. Myers inquired about the total cost of the contract.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the \$183,000 is for the interpretation of the feasibility study, as well as a schematic design, which will tell us how much money is needed. Normally, design fees are based on a percentage of construction costs. She noted that Moseley responded to a RFQ, which does not include funding. The funding comes later in this phased approach. First, we ask for the schematic design. After receipt of the schematic design, if we feel we can move forward, then they would get into the 30% and construction plans.

Ms. Myers stated the motion should be, "The authority to engage Moseley to review and upgrade the feasibility study, and present a preliminary report." The report would then be turned into something that would be brought back to the committee for vetting.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, staff is requesting that we continue with the feasibility study, or is the request to start a new study.

Mr. Myers responded the request is not for a new study, but a review of the existing feasibility study results from Carter Goebel.

Mr. Davis stated what is before the committee is a request to approve the schematic design of the medical and mental health facility. Carter Goebel performed a needs assessment in 2016. Because the assessment is approximately four (4) years old, Moseley would review Carter Goebel's information along with the intake and outtake information collected since the study. Moseley will be updating Carter Goebel's information so they can perform a proper schematic design, in order to ensure all the needs, present and future, are addressed.

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, the next step after the schematic design would be the 30% design.

Mr. Davis stated it would be called design development, which is where they take the schematic design and vet out more of the details. Once that is completed, they come back for our approval. Then, they go into construction documents, which will be documents that go out for bid. The bid and construction processes, which the architect oversees, would follow.

Ms. Myers inquired about the cost of the original feasibility study.

Ms. Wladischkin stated she does not know, but she will provide the information to the committee.

Ms. Myers stated she did not see in the briefing documents where the funding would come from.

Dr. Thompson confirmed with the Budget Director that the funds are currently in the Detention Center's budget.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, Moseley is not re-doing the feasibility study. They are simply combining the Carter Goebel study with their findings.

Ms. Myers stated she was making sure the quote Moseley provided was reasonable for a revision rather than paying for it again, and we are following the procurement policy.

Ms. McBride inquired if we are taking other facilities into consideration as we talk about the needs and population. She stated she is tired of South Carolina trying to make it minimally acceptable, and hopes we take that into consideration since we are talking about people's medical and mental conditions.

Ms. Terracio stated she would be curious what best practices are in the United States, and beyond.

Ms. Myers stated staff will be in better shape if we present the project to Council in stages, instead of as a global request.

Mr. Davis stated the request is listed on p. 62 of the Agenda. "Compensation for Phase 1 services shall be the lump sum of One Hundred Eighty-Five Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$185,000.00)."

Ms. Myers stated the motion should then be to "approve the expenditure of \$185,000 for the first phase of the Alvin S. Glenn contract for Moseley Architects to begin the design of the medical and mental units, as part of the Detention Center's expansion."

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the expenditure of up to \$185,000 for Moseley Architects to begin the initial design of the medical and mental health units, as part of the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center expansion project, which would complete the re-evaluation of the feasibility study."

In Favor: Terracio, Myers and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:34 p.m.