



Richland County Council
Administration and Finance Committee Meeting
MINUTES
September 27, 2022 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Malinowski, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Joe Walker (via zoom), Jessica Mackey

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Bill Malinowski called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **July 26, 2022** – Ms. McBride moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Mackey

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Livingston moved to approve the agenda as published, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey.

The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. **Information Technology – Enterprise Resource Planning Software** – Mr. Brown stated the last time the County procured a system of this sort was in 2007. We are looking to update not only the County’s resources, but to bring its services into compliance with the needs in the Human Resources and Finance Departments. What we currently have is not workable and in some instances we are stilling utilizing paper. This would bring us up-to-date.

Ms. Mackey inquired why we will be the first in South Carolina to partner with this provider and the reason we picked this one over other providers in the State. Would utilizing this provider cause a hindrance in terms of working with other agencies?

Mr. Brown responded, in terms of working with other agencies, what we currently have does allow us to that. The new product will be more in line with the type of product other agencies

are utilizing. They reviewed other services and chose this particular vendor because when an organization is trying to get their foot into the market, you may be able to capitalize on the services and prices. In terms of the capability they have just as much as the other vendors.

Mr. Brian Fitzgerald, Information Technology, stated working as a team with both Human Resources and Finance, they have been evaluating products for the last year. The current system is antiquated and does not meet the basic needs of these departments. The vendor they chose does not currently work in other governmental agencies, but they are with other organizations like MUSC. More than 50% of the Fortune 500 are using Workday. He expects other government agencies to start moving toward Workday in the future.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the 15-year agreement is common.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this product will allow other departments to collaborate together, as this was previously a problem.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded in the affirmative. He noted this will allow offsite access from any device.

Ms. McBride inquired if the new system will also work with the grants.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded it does have a grant component. They will probably supplement with some other grant systems.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the number of companies reviewed.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded they evaluated approximately 6-7.

Mr. Malinowski stated this is a contractual matter and inquired if they needed to go into Executive Session to discuss this matter.

Mr. Wright responded there are particular items that he would like to discuss in Executive Session.

Mr. Malinowski noted the agenda was public and it had sections that were confidential.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded the vendor was made aware of it.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why Council was not given updates throughout the process so that they would be able to make a more informed decision. He also inquired about the payment schedule and what the annual percentage increase was as it was not the 2%.

Mr. Deshpande responded the way the vendor structured the payment is when we enter into the price negotiations with Workday, the County gave them the base budgetary threshold limit for the overall period of the contract. Workday agreed to meet the County's bottom line, as well as the annual average budget over the next 15 years.

Mr. Malinowski stated it looks more like 10-11%.

Mr. Deshpande responded it looks like that because the year 2 payment was much lower than what Workday initially quoted the County.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we have to pay \$322,000 to Workday to assure they are going to deliver the product.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded in the affirmative. Workday is the developers and they allow trusted partners to do the implementation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about changing the start date and service date as Council will not be able to approve the contract until after October 4th.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded they can change those dates. The intended start for the project will be around October 15th.

Ms. Mackey moved to enter Executive Session to receive legal advice related to the contract, seconded by Ms. McBride.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston and Mackey

Opposed: J. Walker

The vote was in favor of going into Executive Session.

***The committee went into Executive Session at approximately 7:21 PM
and came out at approximately 7:31 PM***

Ms. McBride moved to come out of Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous

Mr. Malinowski stated they entered Executive Session to receive legal advice regarding a contractual matter and no action was taken.

Mr. Brown stated he will reach out to Workday through IT and address the committee's concerns. He requested the committee to consider moving this item forward with the understanding we will work out the details. For whatever reason, if we cannot work out the details he will notify Council and allow them to have the opportunity to make a decision they feel is appropriate.

Ms. Mackey moved to approve the Administrator's recommendation, seconded by Mr. J. Walker.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

- a. Direct the County Administrator to look into what it will take to have Richland County CASA receive state funding to operate the way that all other CASA groups in the state do, with state funding. Richland County should not be excluded from something that is provided to all other counties by the state. [MALINOWSKI - May 3, 2022] – No action was taken.
- b. Direct the County Administrator to create a new IGA regarding the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center Inmate Per Diem rate. Richland County is operating on fees that were implemented

effective July 1, 2018 and but did not go into effect until July 1, 2019 due to the 90 day notice requirement pursuant to the agreement. The agreement in effect at that time was to have the fee only increase \$10 per year until it reached 95% of the actual cost to the County. We are currently losing thousands of dollars per year the way this is being handled.

Richland County should not have taxpayers pay for outside entities who placed individuals in the County Detention Center, as that is the responsibility of the placing entity. Every entity who places an individual in the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center should have an IGA with Richland County that reflects the current rate they will be paying as well as the fact rates are subject to change upward or downward on an annual basis. Those IGA's should also be worded as an annual agreement with up to so many extension years and the 90 day notice needs to be either reduced or more closely followed by staff. [MALINOWSKI - May 3, 2022] - No action was taken.

- c. Any agency receiving funds from Richland County must provide an accounting for those funds prior to a request for funds in the next fiscal year budget. REASON: Accountability is a must for taxpayer dollars [MALINOWSKI - June 7, 2022] - No action was taken.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** - Mr. Livingston move to adjourn, seconded by J. Walker.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.