



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

December 17, 2019 – Immediately Following Zoning Public Hearing
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Dalhi Myers, Joyce Dickerson, Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Bill Malinowski, Jim Manning, Yvonne McBride, Chakisse Newton and Allison Terracio

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Kim Williams-Roberts, John Thompson, Ashiya Myers, Ashley Powell, Angela Weathersby, Geo Price, Allison Steele, Brad Farrar, James Hayes, Stacey Hamm, Judy Carter, Jeff Ruble, Tariq Hussain, Chris Eversmann, Beverly Harris, Clayton Voignier, Leonardo Brown, Larry Smith, Sandra Haynes, Denise Teasdell and Dwight Hanna

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 7:20 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
 - a. **Special Called Meeting: December 10, 2019** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the minutes as distributed.

Mr. Malinowski stated, at the end of the meeting on December 10th, the meeting had adjourned and the Administrator indicated there was an item that needed to be reconsidered. Therefore, we reconvened the meeting and reconsidered Item 17(b) “Authorizing the issuance and sale of not to exceed \$175,000,000 General Obligation Bond Anticipation Notes, Series 2020, or such other appropriate series designation, of Richland County, South Carolina; fixing the form and details of the notes; providing for the payment of the notes and the disposition proceeds thereof; and other matters relating thereto”, but it is not reflected in the minutes. He understands the reason it is not reflected is that all of the recording equipment had been turned off; therefore, there is not an audio/video record of the vote(s). He requested the action(s) be added to the minutes prior to the minutes being posted online.

Ms. Myers responded that Mr. Malinowski was correct and that she simply took a voice vote on reconvening the meeting, reconsideration of the item, and adjournment of the meeting.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the votes were unanimous.

Mr. Malinowski responded the votes were not unanimous.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the minutes as amended.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

3. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the agenda as published.

Mr. Malinowski stated we have transferred the entire D&S and A&F agendas to the Special Called Meeting agenda for action. Normally, we have a week, at least, to be able to review what took place at the committee meeting(s). Some people are not even on one or the other committee, and may not have been at the meeting to hear the discussion, and get pertinent information to cast a vote. It seems to him, if these are not time sensitive matters, he does not know why we are rushing to put them on the Council agenda.

Mr. Brown stated during the A&F Committee meeting there were two (2) items that were added to the “Items for Action”; therefore, they need to be added to the Council agenda for action, as well. Those items are as follows:

- a. Approval of Award for Engineering Services – Kneece Road Sidewalk Design
- b. Approval of Award for Engineering Services – Longreen Parkway Sidewalk Design

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, these items were published as items not for action. Then, they were moved to action, in the committee, and now they are being added to the Council agenda. He stated he wanted to echo Mr. Malinowski’s concerns about the other items. He feels like if an item was published for action, and he was not on the committee, but he had an interest in knowing what was going on, particularly when the agenda that was published for tonight’s meeting did not have it. For the record, when he reads the agenda, he can tell whether the item is for action or not.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the agenda as amended.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

4. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS**

- a. Richland County vs. SC Dept. of Revenue

5. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR** – No report was given.

6. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – No report was given.

7. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – No report was given.

8. **REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

- a. Approval to Develop and Advertise CTC Funded Projects – Ms. Terracio stated the committee recommended to direct County staff to proceed with project development, staff design and advertisement for construction of the repair and resurfacing projects of the roads/intersections named herein using the “C” Funds previously approved by the CTC.

Mr. Malinowski noted on p. 29 of the agenda Riverwalk Subdivision is listed as District 1, when it is actually in District 2.

Mr. Manning stated that Mr. Malinowski had brought this to the committee's attention, prior to them taking action on the item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. County Sidewalk Program – This item was held in committee.
- c. I move that Richland County undertake a study regarding the existence/prevalence of PFAS groundwater and soil throughout the County. If desired, the County should coordinate with all municipalities within its boundaries to derive a comprehensive study on these harmful chemicals, and if necessary or warranted, a plan for corporate remediation [MYERS] – This item was held in committee.

9. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

- a. Memorandum of Understanding – COMET – Mapping Services – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to approve the MOU, to correct the name of the entity from COMET to CMRTA/COMET, and include the CMRTA/COMET address on the last page of the MOU.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Approval of Award of Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) funding – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to approve the award HOME funds in the amount of \$528,144.00 to Community Assistance Provider for the construction of a four unit townhouse in the New Castle/Trenholm Acres master plan area.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski

Opposed: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- c. Approval of Award of Southeast Sewer and Water Project – Division 1 & Division 2 – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to approve the awarding of construction of Division I and II of the SE Sewer and Water Project to Tom Brigman Contractors, contingent on the appropriation of bond funds.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- d. Approval to Purchase Mobile Data Routers for Fire Vehicles – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to approve the purchase of Sierra Routers including support equipment, installation and system start-up support in the amount of \$152,626.80 from Simple Com Technologies.

Mr. Malinowski noted in the committee meeting that one of the requirements for sole source procurement states that it must be justified with information on the efforts undertaken to locate alternative suppliers. That was not presented to us; therefore, he is recommending in the future that information is included.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- e. Broad River WWTF Sequential Batch Reactor (SBR) Upgrade – Diffusers replacement – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to approve awarding replacement of diffusers in the sequential batch reactor (SBR) to Republic Contracting Corporation.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Newton and Manning

- f. Intergovernmental Agreement – Municipal Judge – Town of Blythewood – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to accept the Chief Magistrate’s recommendation to enter into an IGA with the Town of Blythewood for the municipal judge.

Mr. Livingston noted there was discussion at the committee meeting about additional language being included in the IGA.

Mr. Smith stated the recommendation was to change the language to ensure that any additional compensation due to the municipal judge that the FICA and all other benefits are paid by the municipality, and not the County.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for the record there are scrivener’s errors, and he will provide the corrections to the Clerk’s Office.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Jackson and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- g. Approval of Award for Engineering Services – Kneece Road Sidewalk Design – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to move forward with the award of Engineering Services for the Kneece Road Project, unless somebody in the awarding entity, be it a subcontractor or whoever, has some type of a lawsuit or claim with the County.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Terracio and Newton

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Terracio and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- h. Approval of Award for Engineering Services – Longreen Parkway Sidewalk Design – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to move forward with the award of Engineering Services for the and Longreen Parkway Sidewalk Project, unless somebody in the awarding entity, be it a subcontractor or whoever, has some type of a lawsuit or claim with the County.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Terracio and Newton

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Terracio and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

10. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Polo Rd. Sidewalk Project – Ms. Steele stated originally Polo Road and Harrison Sidewalk Projects were bid together. The prices that came in were well above the cost estimates; therefore, they were rebid separately. The bids were lower, but they are still over the cost estimate, and the referendum amount. Staff has provided three options: (1) Award the contracts to the lowest bidder; (2) Rebid the projects to attempt to get lower prices; or (3) Attempt to descope the projects.

Ms. Myers inquired if staff has a preferred way forward, which makes the most sense for the project to be completed efficiently, quickly and honors the request from Council.

Mr. Brown stated these projects were within the communication Council received about 50 of 56 sidewalks. Since there was a separate discussion to ensure that we were approving projects within a certain amount, questions came up regarding these projects. The communication from Council was to approve these projects, but we wanted to make sure, in approving these projects, it was consistent with Council's understanding of moving forward with 50 of the 56 sidewalks.

Ms. Myers inquired if it was relevant that they are, or are not, within the referendum.

Mr. Brown stated it is a communication to make sure that we are clear. There were a lot of questions that came up, and we wanted to ensure that these are the 50 of 56 you previously wanted to approve.

Ms. Myers inquired if this was a duplicative vote.

Mr. Brown responded it is not a duplicative vote. It is a clarity vote to make sure that staff is clear because there were questions that came up about projects that are under the referendum, and projects that are not. These two (2), by themselves, may not meet the guidelines to be under the referendum. However, when you took a vote to say 50 of the 56, these were included. Staff wants to make sure they do not get a follow-up conversation as to how these projects got approve, when they did not individually fall under the referendum amount.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, these two (2) will be over the referendum, but will they be over the referendum amount for the category.

Mr. Brown stated the category will still be under the referendum.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, in total we will be under the referendum amount. These two (2) were scoped over the referendum amount, but because we have taken five (5) off the list we have the funding to do these.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the other six (6) sidewalk projects, and why we are not moving forward with them.

Mr. Brown stated Council approved, prior to tonight, to do 50 of 56 sidewalk projects. To which, at that time, it was communicated you could do these 50 and be under the category's referendum amount. During the course of these conversations, some questions came up related to specific projects, and whether or not they were approved individually, and were individually over the referendum amount. Because staff is trying to make sure they are doing a better job of carrying out what Council's directive are, they wanted to clarify, and make sure you were aware, that individually, these specific projects may be over the referendum amount, by themselves, but in total it is consistent with what you have already approved.

Mr. Malinowski stated he understood that, but he would like to know what happened to the other six (6) projects.

Mr. Brown stated nothing happened to the projects.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, there are six (6) other projects that could be funded, if funding were available.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what happens if there is an excess amount of funding, or the funding is not totally used within a particular category.

Mr. Brown stated you would have the opportunity, within that category, to address additional projects that were not addressed. The funds will remain in the specific category until Council decides how the funds will be expended.

Mr. Jackson requested Dr. Thompson to make sure the public, and Council, are fully aware of what happened with the other six (6) projects.

Dr. Thompson stated we have enough money to do 50 of the 56 sidewalk projects. Should we have additional funding, then we will be able to work on the remaining six (6) projects. He stated staff will provide Council a list of the remaining six (6) projects, as well as the projected amount to complete those projects.

Ms. McBride stated these projects have been voted on several times. They have been vetted through the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee, and Council has previously voted on it.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski and Newton

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton and Myers

Opposed: Jackson, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Harrison Rd. Sidewalk Project – This item was approved in the previous item.
- c. Approval of Grants for Blythewood Industrial Park – Mr. Ruble stated we are eligible to receive \$2.37M in grants to kick start the Blythewood Industrial Park. The approvals were not received prior to the last Council meeting, and Council has to vote to receive the grant before a budget can be set up. Once the budget is set up, then they can begin the procurement process to hire an Engineer to design the site. After the Engineer designs the site, they have to go through a 2nd procurement process to hire the contractor to do the work. All of this has to be accomplished in a 18-month period, which puts a tight time constraint on getting this accomplished.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve this item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the proper zoning has been received for this property.

Mr. Ruble responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski requested Mr. Ruble to explain what is meant by “The SC DOC and SC PowerTeam grants are reimbursable.”

Mr. Ruble stated they do the work and submit documentation the money was spent, and we are reimbursed those funds.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Jackson stated, as Chair of the Economic Development Committee, this is a tremendous opportunity for the County, in terms of the funding we are going to receive to move the Blythewood Industrial Park forward. One of the main issues in insuring that it is occupied quickly is to have this infrastructure work done. In identifying funds, from other partners, to make that happen, sooner than later, is why this is such a big deal.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

11. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson and Manning

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 7:57 PM and came out at approximately 8:25 PM

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- a. Richland County vs. SC Dept. of Revenue – No action was taken.

19. **MOTION PERIOD** –

- a. In my continued decade long battle for accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness., I move that all County Council standing committees, ad hoc committees and one time/short term committee meetings be held in Council Chambers, as is the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee, with votes recorded in like fashion [MANNING] – This item was referred to the Rules and Appointments Committee.
- b. Consider moving the Horizon meeting to Tuesday and have delivery of finished agendas to Council members by Thursday close of business [MALINOWSKI, McBRIDE, MYERS, NEWTON and TERRACIO]
– Staff was directed to bring back a recommendation at the next Council meeting.
- c. Resolution Honoring Dutch Fork High School Football team on winning their 4th straight championship [MALINOWSKI] – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to adopt the resolution honoring Dutch Fork High School Football team on winning their 4th straight championship.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Malinowski thanked Ms. Roberts for the holiday decorations in Chambers.

20. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:29 PM