



Richland County Council
Administration and Finance Committee Meeting
MINUTES
July 26, 2022 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Malinowski, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Joe Walker and Jesica Mackey

OTHERS PRESENT: Allison Terracio, Overture Walker, Chakisse Newton, Anette Kirylo, Leonardo Brown, Patrick Wright, Lori Thomas, Tyrell Cato, Joh Ansell, Sarah Scheirer, Syndi Castelluccio, Brittney Terry, Aric Jensen, Michael Maloney, Michael Byrd, John Thompson, Stacey Hamm, Jennifer Wladischkin, Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Justin Landy, Tamar Black and Ashiya Myers

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. June 28, 2022 – Ms. McBride moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Joe Walker and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride move to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Joe Walker and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

a. Department of Public Works – Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Waste Tire Disposal and Recycling Contract – Mr. Leonard Brown, County Administrator, stated this item reflects a compliance matter that Richland County is responsible for complying with. Section 44-96-170 “Waste Tires of the SC Solid Waste Policy Management Act (SCSWMP Act) dictates each County will establish approved waste tire accumulation sites, designate waste tire processing, recycling and disposal methods to be used, and begin disposal operations in compliance with

the applicable regulation” This contract satisfies all the requirement. This item was bid out unsuccessfully and it would not be prudent to continue that process, but approve the current provider.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the contract renewal with Ridge Recyclers for the disposal of waste tires collected from Richland County, seconded by Mr. J. Walker.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the cost to transport the tires and if the County could do it on their own. He noted an acceptable explanation would be we do not have the equipment or manpower to do so.

Mr. Brown responded that it is a true statement.

Mr. Malinowski inquired what the County paid last year and the estimate for this year.

Mr. Brown stated the price per ton increased from \$150.00 to \$185.00.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we are mandated to sue the US Energy Information Administration fuel prices or could we use another source since South Carolina has some of the lowest gas prices in the nation.

Ms. Jennifer Wladischkin, Procurement Director, responded we could communicate with the provider and see if they would accept the change to their proposed contract.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we could add recoupment of damages upon termination to the contract.

Mr. Patrick Wright, County Attorney, responded that is something we could address if we choose to.

Mr. Brown stated it is something we could consider. He noted we currently have a good provider and he would not want to hinder our ability to utilize the contractor.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the minimum amount of insurance coverage.

Ms. Wladischkin responded we could discuss this with the Risk Management Office and implement any changes they recommend.

Mr. Malinowski noted, 14.2) states, “This Contract may be changed only by agreement in writing and signed by both parties hereto.” He inquired if we want to specify within a certain amount of time.

Mr. Wright responded, since this section is about grieving only, he does not know if it is necessary to have time period.

Ms. McBride inquired if there are State guidelines regarding the price per gallon.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the fuel adjustments are typically the price per gallon.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- b. Department of Public Works – Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Collection Area 6 – Mr. Brown stated this is a new provider staff is recommending for approval to remedy service issues.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to award a contract to NewSouth Waste for residential curbside solid waste collection services in Area 6, seconded by Ms. McBride.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the yard waste fee is based on the total number of customers or per user.

Mr. Michael Maloney, Public Works Director, responded it is based on the total number of customers.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Risk Management – Fleet Services – Central Garage Canopy Addition Project – Mr. Brown stated staff recommended approval and there will be no request for additional funding as it is in the department's budget.

Ms. Mackey moved to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the selection of HMB Contracting (Hoover Metal Buildings) for the construction of a canopy work area for the Heavy side shop at the Central Garage facility, with an addition which will extend the side of the building, increasing the dimensions of the working space, seconded by Mr. Livingston.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Fleet Management always came under the Rick Management budget.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if staff tried to find other vendors at a lower price.

Ms. Wladischkin stated there were two competitive solicitation processes, which garnered no submittals. We decided to negotiate with Hoover, since they had competitively won a bid for Eastover Public Works building and was familiar with the project.

He noted the proposal has expired, and was curious how the County plans to proceed.

Ms. Wladischkin responded we will be approaching the vendor to hold their prices submitted.

Mr. Malinowski requested an itemized list of costs.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- d. Community Planning & Development – Community Development Grant (CDBG) and HOME investment Partnership (HOME) FY 2022-2026 Five Year Consolidated Plan; FY 2022 Annual Action Plan – Mr. Aric Jensen, Assistant County Administrator, stated HUD gives various block grants to communities throughout the country. One is called an entitlement community, which is less than 50,000 in population or meets certain poverty guidelines. They get money directly from HUD. If the community does not meet these guidelines they receive their funds directly from the County, but the funds still come from HUD. The City of Columbia is an incorporated community, and also an entitlement community. Eastover, Irmo and Blythewood were below the threshold and have to be administered by the County on HUD's behalf. HUD requires every three years that the County offer this service to the communities that are not entitlement communities. They have to opt in or out of the program. Staff is requesting approval to move forward with the three-year process. Every five years the communities have to create a five-year plan and an annual action plan, which has to be prepared this year. A consultant was hired as HUD requires a lot of information in a specific format. The responsibility of Council, and the Committee, is to determine how much money they want allocated for each subset of programs.

Ms. Mackey inquired if this is the maximum amount of CDBG money or could they receive more from other categories.

Mr. Jensen responded we always request the maximum amount.

Ms. McBride moved forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the 5-Year Consolidated Plan FY22-26 and FY22 Annual Action Plan budget and projects for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) federal funds, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

- a. Direct staff and CASA 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 staff and legal 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 a 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 IGAs 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.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** - Mr. Livingston moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. McBride.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:36 PM.