



Richland County Council
Administration and Finance Committee Meeting
MINUTES
October 25, 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), Jesica Mackey

OTHERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Anette Kirylo, Leonardo Brown, Tamar Black, Michelle Onley, Aric Jensen, John Ansell, Angela Weathersby, Jennifer Wladischkin, Shirani Fuller, Kyle Holsclaw, Justin Landy, Jani Hussain, Michael Maloney, Chelsea Bennett, Patrick Wright, Abhijit Deshpande, Dale Welch, Dante Roberts, Michael Byrd, Susan O’Cain, Stacey Hamm, Bill Davis, and Ashiya Myers.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Bill Malinowski called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. September 27, 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** – Ms. McBride moved to adopt 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. Department of Public Works – Solid Waste & Recycling – Articulated Dump Truck – Mr. Livingston moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the purchase of a Caterpillar 730-04A Articulated, off-road Dump Truck, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there is a Sourcewell from John Deere, Komatsu or Volvo.

Mr. Ansell responded the Sourcewell quote was from the Fleet Manager, and he could not answer the specifically.

Mr. Brown responded this is a cooperative agreement, which is why there are looking at this particular vendor versus another vendor.

Mr. Malinowski stated he conducted his own research and discovered the Volvo 30-ton articulated dump truck was approximately \$58,000 less than the Sourcewell contract. He requested the matter be researched further prior to this item going before Council.

Mr. Ansell stated the Caterpillar truck is a local vehicle that is available for immediate delivery. He noted they currently own the Volvo truck and have had issues with parts, as they are manufactured elsewhere. We have an extensive dealer network locally available to service the Caterpillar vehicle during the warranty period. Those factors were involved in determining the Caterpillar is a better choice.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion to send this item to Council without a recommendation and to request additional information, seconded by Mr. J. Walker.

Ms. Mackey stated, for clarification, Mr. Malinowski wants staff to review just the Volvo's pricing.

Mr. Malinowski responded they should look at the main brands: John Deere, Volvo and Komatsu.

Ms. Mackey noted she was under the impression this had previously been done.

Mr. Malinowski stated it seems like they only looked locally at the Caterpillar.

Mr. Ansell stated, for clarification, he indicated he was unable to speak on behalf of the Fleet Manager and his procurement process. He is providing the information provided to him.

Mr. Malinowski responded if the Fleet Manager did the research he could provide that information to Council.

Ms. Mackey inquired if Mr. Malinowski is requesting staff to provide the requested information to justify the recommendation. The goal is to find a cheaper price, but not jeopardize the quality.

Mr. Malinowski responded he was told the machinery is compatible.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the information was provided by staff.

Mr. Malinowski responded it was by a private construction person, not a staff member. He noted he made the inquiry of someone he knew that was familiar with this equipment.

Ms. McBride inquired, if we do find a lower price, if we would be able to negotiate the price.

Mr. Ansell responded since this is a cooperative agreement the negotiated price is built into the offered price. He is not 100% certain, but that could be an option.

Mr. J. Walker inquired, as far as standard operating procedure for a Fleet Manager, would our process include the process contemplated by Council.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. J. Walker withdrew his second to the substitute motion.

Mr. Malinowski seconded the substitute motion.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride and Livingston

Opposed: J. Walker and Mackey

The vote was in favor.

- b. Department of Public Works – Engineering Division – Summit Ridge/Summit Parkway Project – Mr. Brown stated staff recommends Council approve the award of the rehabilitation of Summit Parkway and Summit Ridge to Palmetto Corp. in the amount of \$2,114,010.65. He noted the funding was awarded from the County Transportation Committee (CTIP) and the price is within the bid amount.

Mr. J. Walker moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the award of the rehabilitation of Summit Parkway and Summit Ridge to Palmetto Corp. in the amount of \$2,114,010.65, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how these items get to the CTC and who determines what projects go to CTC.

Mr. Brown responded he can provide the committee with a packet with the guidelines of how CTC selects and funds projects. It is not a County decision.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Utilities Department – Engineering Services for the Design and Construction of an Elevated Water Tank – Mr. Brown stated this item would address water concerns in an underserved community. The water tank would provide redundancy in the Lower Richland Community. The request is for approval of the design work, which will be funded with ARPA funds.

Mr. J. Walker moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to award the design and construction for a new elevated water tank for the Southeast area to AECOM, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

Ms. McBride inquired if this was approved through County funds.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if there are additional funds to help with water needs in the district.

Mr. Brown responded there are other funds at the State and Federal levels.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if every time we decide to build a water tank we would have to build a second one.

Mr. Brown responded he would not say that, but we are talking about the Lower Richland Community where the County is trying to address ongoing water and sewer needs.

Mr. Malinowski noted he did not receive the information that was “under separate cover” and requested the information be provided to him.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Department of Public Works – Engineering Division – Little Jackson Creek Upditch Improvement Project – Mr. Brown stated staff recommends approval to award the

construction contract for the Little Jackson Creek Upditch Drainage Project (RC-536-B-23) to North State Environmental, Inc. in the amount of \$752,077.94 with a contingency of \$152,409.06. The project will be funded by the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

Ms. McBride moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to award the construction contract for the Little Jackson Creek Upditch Drainage Project to North State Environmental, Inc. in the amount of \$752,077.94, which will include a contingency of \$152,409.06, seconded by Mr. J. Walker.

Mr. Livingston inquired why the contingency is so high.

Mr. Maloney responded multiple pools in the sand soils require a contingency on hand. The amount will be funded by Federal Grant Share and the CBDG State grant for that matching amount. The grants will cover the entire amount.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

- 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] – Mr. Malinowski inquired if it would be possible for Council to get this into the State’s GAL program in FY2024.

Mr. Brown responded what is in the packet was a response to the question in the motion. He noted staff is not recommending any action because the request was to bring back information about the process. In addition, the current CASA employees may not be afforded an opportunity to continue their CASA employment if the State takes the program over.

Mr. Wright noted this would be a two-prong process. The Legislature will have to vote to change the statute. Before that happens, a budget with all the delineated items will have to be provided to the Legislature. It will be a significant process that will require a lot of staff time.

Mr. Malinowski moved to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to direct the Administrator to begin gathering the information needed to provide a fiscal impact statement to the Legislative Delegation, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED**

- a. 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.

- b. 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.

7. **ADJOURNMENT** – Mr. J. Walker moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.