



Richland County
Administration and Finance Committee
November 18, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Malinowski, Chair, Yvonne McBride, Overture Walker and Jesica Mackey

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Cheryl English, Gretchen Barron, Derrek Pugh Paul Livingston, Michelle Onley, Tamar Black, Leonardo Brown, Patrick Wright, Jennifer Wladischkin, Dale Welch, Geo Price, Aric Jensen, Randy Pruitt, Syndi Castelluccio, Bill Davis, Lori Thomas, John Thompson, Stacey Hamm, Michael Maloney, Justin Landy, Kyle Holsclaw, Michael Byrd, Ashyia Myers, John Ansell, and Synithia Williams

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. **Regular Session: October 26, 2021** – Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. O Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve the agenda as published.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

a. **Department of Public Works- Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Residential Curbside Collections Services, Area 3 – Contract Award recommendation** – Mr. Brown stated staff's recommendation is to award the contract for residential curbside collections service area 3 to Coastal Waste and Recycling. The procurement process required a RFP and that the award go to the highest ranked vendor.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the contract with the current vendor is for \$4.1M.

**Administration and Finance Committee
November 18, 2021**

Ms. Wladischkin stated the existing contract is for \$4.3M.

Mr. O. Walker noted the documentation read the current contract was for \$4.1M and under the new contract it will be \$4.3M.

Ms. Wladischkin noted the \$4.3M includes an anticipated CPI increase.

Mr. O. Walker stated, for clarification, we anticipate paying \$4.3M under the new contract, or what the contract amount for the current vendor.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the \$4.3M is for the current vendor.

Mr. O. Walker inquired about the cost with the new vendor.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the RFP is confidential, but the information was provided to the committee members prior to the meeting.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the current vendor is headquartered in Richland County.

Ms. Wladischkin responded they have a facility in Richland County.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the recommended vendor is an out-of-state vendor.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the vendor is currently out-of-state.

Mr. Malinowski stated, while the current vendor has a facility in Richland County, it is his understanding they did not have a facility prior to being awarded the contract.

Ms. Wladischkin responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the terms of the contract.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the contract is for 3 years with up to two (2) one-year renewals.

Ms. McBride inquired if the staff's recommendations includes the CPI.

Ms. Wladischkin responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired, if we change vendors, what happens to the current employees.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the existing contract requests that the awarded vendor work with the current vendor regarding employees and equipment.

Ms. McBride noted some of the current employees that reside in Richland County may not find employment with the recommended vendor.

Mr. Wladischkin responded in the affirmative.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the CPI of 5.3% was an estimate, and not a hard number.

Ms. Wladischkin responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride noted, with the CPI note being a hard number, it could exceed the amount we are paying to the current contractor.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the new contract would be based on what they submitted in the RFP, and not be effected by CPI.

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to forward to Council with a recommendation to deny the contract award.

In Favor: McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- b. **Department of Public Works- Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Residential Curbside Collections Services, Area 6 – Contract Award recommendation** – Mr. Brown noted staff recommended awarding the contract to Waste Management.

Mr. O. Walker inquired why staff recommended the current vendor that has received numerous complaints. Based on the previous item, staff recommended a different out-of-state vendor based on the number of complaints. He noted staff recommended a contract extension with a service improvement plan.

Ms. Wladischkin stated staff's recommendation was based off the RFP scoring.

Ms. Mackey stated this is concerning since they currently know they have concerns from residents, and we should be making better decisions. She noted there should be some weighted system that accounts for residents' concerns about not receiving efficient and adequate services delivered. Even with vendors from out-of-state versus in-state that have worked in Richland County, there should be a weighted balance in making a decision. She noted the current method is concerning.

Mr. Brown stated this is a learning experience. He noted Council and committee members have given feedback about somethings they think are important to the criteria. He spoke with staff about discussing the criteria they are looking at, receiving feedback from the body and then building a process to create clarity. He believes there is only one vendor that originated in Richland County. All other vendors are here by way of acquisition. He noted this would be a future step on RFPs to ensure we are specifying criteria, having feedback, and then building that into an RFP before the RFP is sent out.

Ms. Mackey stated, for her personally, when we look at vendors, cost is important but we want to look at Richland County first, and if they did not originate here, who is currently operating here. Prior to looking out of state, we need to see who is in South Carolina. We need to take care of home first. The contract is for a lot of money, and awarding it without having that in consideration concerns her.

Ms. Newton stated she represents the area served by District 6, and she has heard many complaints. The level of complaints are well outside the standards and the parameters we have set for service. She inquired how the top ranked vendor can be the same vendor who is currently not providing a

level of service they set as a minimum baseline. She noted she is not on the committee, but she would prefer to see the contract re-bid and review the criteria they used, particularly when it relates to current service and how it is weighted when points are awarded for contracts. She inquired about the process we use to evaluate current projects because there are complaints we are receiving through the Ombudsman's Office, but there might be a different procurement complaint process. This concerns her because the level of service has been so poor you would think it would have triggered a review of the current contract.

Ms. Barron inquired if there is a vendor in Richland County that did not qualify to meet the standards they are looking for. What could the County do to raise them to the level of qualification? She noted she would be more comfortable if we had an out-of-state vendor partner with a local vendor that needed additional resources to get the job done. She suggested having a conversation with Procurement and OSBO about how they are awarding contracts. She noted the OSBO could ensure the businesses have what they need to bid on the contracts.

Ms. McBride voiced her concerns about the overall evaluation process.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to deny the contract award and re-bid the contract.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. **Emergency Services Department** – Mr. Malinowski noted the original information was updated with a list of requested supplies.

Mr. Brown stated staff's recommendation is to allow the Emergency Medical Services Department to procure the items. This item is before the body because the amount is above the Administrator's \$100,000 threshold.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the purchase of the medical supplies.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. **Department of Public Works – Knollwood Drive & Planters Drive Drainage Improvements – Contract Award Recommendation** – Mr. Brown noted a request for bid was advertised by Procurement on September 23, 2021 and closed on October 25, 2021, with five (5) contractors responding. The submittals were reviewed and the recommendation is to award the contract to Cherokee Construction, who is the lowest responsible bidder deemed the most advantageous to the County. He noted on July 11, 2017, the Blue Ribbon Committee approved the acquisition and demolition of properties associated with the 2015 flood. Phase II of the project is the current item, which is budgeted in the Stormwater Management division's capital construction account. After the project is completed, it will address the blight and floodplain management through the approval of

this project.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the “pocket park” was a part of the Blue Ribbon Committee’s recommendation or was the recommendation strictly to maintain and restore the area.

Ms. Williams responded the Blue Ribbon Committee originally approved just the demolition and removal of the properties. She stated they are to continue working with the neighborhood to come up with a solution to alleviate flooding that would also fit in with the ascetics of the neighborhood.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this would be an allowable cost under the reimbursement from the Federal Government.

Ms. Williams responded in the affirmative. She noted even though it was called a pocket park it will not have any structures. It more of a place for the water to spread out, settle and go back into the ditch that they will restore.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the annual cost to maintain the pocket park.

Ms. Williams responded it will be added to their current contract and the maintenance would be to mow the grass.

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Knollwood Drive and Planters Drive Drainage Improvement contract award recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. **Palmetto Pride Litter Crew Grant** – Mr. Brown stated staff requested to seek funding from Palmetto Pride to conduct at least one litter removal/blight remediation project in each of the 11 Council districts. Staff will work with Councilmember to identify an area in their district.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there is a match required.

Mr. Brown responded there is not a match required.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Palmetto Pride Litter Crew Grant.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. **Richland County Sheriff’s Department – School Resource Officer Grant** – Mr. Brown stated this item would normally be addressed during the budget process, but the item was not available at that time. He stated the request is for approval of up to 10 additional School Resource Officers to be

assigned to the Sheriff's Department, and placed in Richland School District 2 schools. The grant will cover 100% of the costs.

Mr. O. Walker inquired how long the grant is for.

Chief Polis responded it will be funded for at least the first full year from the State.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if Richland County would have to provide the funding after the first year.

Chief Polis responded it would be incumbent upon the County and the Richland School District 2.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if there is an outstanding balance owed to the County regarding a MOU from the previous school year regarding the SRO Program.

Chief Polis responded, in FY21, the Sheriff's Department drafted a MOU to be executed by the County and the School District, which included a 6% increase. He noted the Sheriff's Department and the School District disagreed when it came to whether the School District owed approximately \$67,000 between school year 2019-2020 and school year 2020-2021.

Mr. O. Walker inquired why there was a difference of opinion.

Chief Polis responded the 6% increase represents the salary increases for the officers assigned to these specific schools. He noted the School District felt they paid their bill in full for 2019-2020, and there was a period of time where there were no SROs in schools. The School District felt they were owed a credit or rebate and questioned the increase during the middle of a pandemic.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the SROs continued to provide the services during the pandemic.

Chief Polis responded in the affirmative.

Mr. O. Walker inquired, if this is to be approved, the County would be required to fund an additional 10 SRO positions, while not being fully reimbursed from another MOU where the Sheriff's Department says there is an outstanding balance.

Chief Polis responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride noted, if the Sheriff's Department took on additional staff, they could not reduce the staff, and inquired if that applied to the SROs.

Mr. Brown noted it is his understanding Council is unable to remove Sheriff's personnel from the Sheriff, but he is not sure if it applies to grant funded personnel.

Ms. McBride inquired if the grant is for four years.

Chief Polis responded it will be funded 100%, as long as the State continues to provide the proviso, but it would be funded for at least one year.

Ms. McBride inquired if the grant is renewed annually.

Chief Polis responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if the School District has funds for the SROs or would it have to come through the County.

Chief Polis responded it would be their recommendation that the School District would be required to fund 100% of those SROs beyond the State's proviso.

Ms. McBride voiced her concern with the Sheriff's Department having to maintain its staffing levels after the grant expires.

Mr. Brown responded they would look into that information.

Ms. Barron inquired if there is a commitment from Richland School District 2 regarding the grant.

Chief Polis responded they have not received a commitment as of yet.

Ms. Barron inquired why Richland School District 2 was chosen and not District 1 or even a combination of the two districts.

Chief Polis responded the SROs had to go to schools that did not currently have SROs, which is how School District 2 was chosen.

Ms. Barron noted Richland District 2 was in need of those SROs to provide safety to their students.

Chief Polis noted Richland One and Lexington-Richland Five are fully staffed.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the County is required to pick up the positions after grant, if we receive the grant.

Chief Polis responded, once the State proviso goes away, the funding has to be picked up by the County or the School District.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the grant covers equipment.

Chief Polis responded it does cover equipment.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there is a deadline.

Chief Polis responded the State would notify the Sheriff's Department by January 1, 2022 whether they were awarded the grant, and the SROs have to be in the school by March 31, 2022.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the total costs for the officers, so we have an idea of what the budget amount may be.

Chief Polis responded it would be approximately \$900,000 for the 10 officers.

Ms. Mackey stated she has concerns about the disagreement regarding the money owed in relation to the salary increase. She noted an increase in salary would be expected for Richland County employees, and that should be taken into account for MOUs.

Ms. McBride inquired how this could impact the budget.

Mr. Brown responded, for the time period in which it is fully funded, it will not affect the budget. Afterwards, it could affect other potential hires since the SROS would need funding.

Ms. McBride inquired where the funds would come from.

Mr. Brown responded generally the funds would come from the General Fund.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there is a draft MOU.

Chief Polis responded for 2021-2022 Richland School District 2 signed a new MOU for \$1.24M.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, the new MOUs would anticipate the School District covering 100% of the costs versus the 60-80% they have paid in the past.

Chief Polis stated they would address that in the new MOU.

Ms. Mackey inquired, if the \$67,000 in question is not paid by the end of the budget cycle, whose budget would it come from.

Chief Polis responded that it would come out of the General Fund.

Mr. Malinowski stated it would need to be addressed with a MOU as well.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to hold this item in committee.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

- a. **I move that Richland County Council direct the County Administrator and his staff to conduct an equity and inclusive assessment of Richland County Administrative policies and services; and provide recommendations for a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for people of color, women and others who have been historically under- served, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent inequality. By advancing equity across Richland County Government, we can create opportunities for the improvement of businesses, communities and individuals that have been historically under-served, which will benefit all of Richland County. Appropriate assessments will better equip Richland County to develop policies and programs that deliver resources and benefits equitably to all. [McBride –March 2, 2021]** – No action was taken.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:58PM.