



Richland County Council

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

June 26, 2018 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Dalhi Myers, Yvonne McBride, and Norman Jackson

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin Jackson

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Ismail Ozbek, Jennifer Wladischkin, Trenia Bowers, Tim Nielsen, Sandra Yudice, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Michelle Rosenthal, Jamelle Ellis, Michael Byrd, Art Braswell, Chris Eversmann, Melissa Watts, Stacey Hamm, Ashley Powell, Hayden Davis, Stephen Staley, and Synithia Williams

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. May 22, 2018 – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Livingston, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: N. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Council Motion: In 2007, Richland County Council approved Ordinance # 029-07HR, filed with the Clerk of Court on April 12, 2007, Book 010, Page 386. This motion is to direct the Finance Department to provide an accounting for these funds since July 1, 2007 as described so user know how the system currently stands financially [MALINOWSKI] –Mr. Malinowski inquired about how much is currently in escrow for this account.

Ms. Hamm stated it is \$2.8 million in the unrestricted Utilities fund.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is sure he is getting the difference between escrow vs. unrestricted.

Ms. Hamm inquired what Mr. Malinowski meant by escrow.

Mr. Malinowski stated he means by what is in the ordinance where it states an escrow account would be set up for this particular system, so that fees would be put aside, and in the future the rate payers, after a certain amount of time, would begin to get small rebates back.

Ms. Hamm stated then that would be \$0.00. The additional fees that were put in, the increase, and the amount for the increased tap fees, it shows that the amounts collected were about \$12 million, and we paid \$25 million in debt service. So, all of the money was used to pay debt service.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is not sure this particular ordinance is being implemented, according to the way it is written. He inquired as to how it is being implemented, specifically as it relates to Sec. 2(e), which states, "that 25% of the increased revenue from each tap fee shall be placed in an interest bearing escrow account, and utilized for rate stabilization to reduce the frequency, or amount of increases in the monthly user fee rate and tap fee, rate reduction to reduce the monthly user fee rate, rebates to customers, or former customers of the system, for amounts paid as monthly user fees, operations and maintenance, debt service, and capital expenditures, or capital reserves." Then, it says, "The budget approved for the system each year shall contain appropriate provisions regarding the use, or expenditure of funds from the escrow account." He stated he does not know at budget time he has ever seen a statement saying, "We are using escrow account funds." Apparently we are not following it, because at budget time we are not mentioning, if we are using these escrow funds.

Mr. Madden stated you may recall, at our previous committee meeting, there was an item that was on the agenda related to the Utility System that outlined some of the concerns staff had in reviewing the way the system was functioning, including the financial measures that are in place for it. They suggested having a work session, which is projected to be held in September, where they examine some of the issues, including your concerns with the funding mechanisms for our Utility System. Right now we have 2 systems, the Lower Richland and Broad River, which have rates that are different. That results in subsidies provided to those systems. We have policies in place that say otherwise, that an Enterprise System should operate like a business. We have not been doing that. What we are trying to do is correct that. They want to have a comprehensive plan to address this issues, along with the other issues mentioned. They are presenting the information in the September work session. This item can be on this list, as well. In answer to Mr. Malinowski's question, it is not in place. Staff went back and reviewed it. What we have, and were able to find, is what was included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Malinowski stated he understood what Mr. Madden said, and he recalled it being here before, but the fact is we have an ordinance in place. And, if that ordinance is not being followed, he would like to know what the plans are to find a remedy to putting the ordinance back where it belongs. This particular ordinance was for the sale of General Obligation bonds in the amount of \$16,970,000. According to the figures provided in the agenda packet on p. 14, it shows the debt payments totaled over \$25.6 million. We have less than \$17 million in a GO Bond. According to the figures provided, it shows there should be almost \$423,000 in an escrow account somewhere. He stated you can have the work sessions you want. Lower Richland did not come into play when this ordinance was done. He is in favor of Lower Richland, and combining all this, but he also believes we need to correct this problem. The rate payers that paid these amounts need to have this money restored to the escrow account. And, based on the figures provided, the GO Bond should have already been paid off. He

Administration and Finance

June 26, 2018

thinks what you have done is combine a previous GO Bond, that was initially issued for this for approximately \$16 million, which makes it \$32 million total. In his understanding, each one has to stand on its own. We do not combine them and pay them off simultaneously. What was collected for this bond should be paid, or pretty close to paid. Even if it is not, there should be over \$400,000 in an escrow account.

Ms. Myers stated some of this came up at the rate workshop that we had. Are the Broad River repairs what was wrapped into these costs?

Mr. Madden stated he cannot say for certain they were wrapped up in these costs. He does not want to speak to what was done in the past.

Ms. Hamm stated there are 2 bonds. There is a 2003 bond and a 2007 bond for Broad River. The 2003 one was around \$15 million, and the other one is \$16.7 million. The bonds have been refunded.

Ms. Myers stated, what we have practically done, as opposed to what the ordinance says, is there some way we can get a small document that looks at what we actually did, so that Mr. Malinowski, and the rest of Council, can have an accounting that helps us understand when the costs got combined. That seems to be what has happened. The costs have all been conflated. Therefore, there has been no money rolling over. She stated she sees in the note the increase monthly premium was meant to be put in the 1054 Account, but that has not been done. It would be helpful to explain why that has not been done. In anticipation of the work session, if you could give her some detail on the repayment of the bonds, and where we stand. Ms. Hamm earlier said there was \$2.8 million in the account for this system. She inquired if that is proceeds from fees, or bond proceeds.

Ms. Hamm stated that is the excess revenue over the expenditures.

Ms. Myers stated it may just be that something has not been put on the right line item, and it has not been lost. It can be assigned to where it is meant to be. She also stated these rates look very different from the rates that we discussed in the rate session. She would like for the session coming up to have an analysis. Her understanding is once we have a Countywide Enterprise System all of the rates should be a little lower. The flat monthly fee should be \$20 rather \$42.02, and the usage fee will come down. She thinks that answers part of Mr. Malinowski's question, as well. She is sure his constituents, who are currently on a system, want to know what building a bigger system is going to do to their fees.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to hold this item in committee until after the work session in September.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Council Motion: Funding the Senior programs should be distributed equally and fairly. It is not right for one organization to be receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually while other areas received none. All areas pay taxes and all seniors should get the same and equal opportunity in receiving funding. I move that funding for seniors (Seniors Activities) be distributed equally in all eleven districts. [N. JACKSON] –Mr. N. Jackson stated, when he first got on Council, there was an organization that required a one-time \$164,000 allocation to fix something, but it continued year after year, and started increasing. He sees them getting hundreds of thousands of dollars, while other areas got nothing. He does not think it is fair. Sometimes in the unincorporated areas,

Administration and Finance

June 26, 2018

especially the rural areas, they may not have established a way to have this large set up. They have small churches or organizations that help seniors. They do not have these opportunities. They do not apply for the grants, or anything. He thinks we should develop a system that is fair, in each district. Let the Council person, or those that apply, see how it can be shared equally. They paid taxes their entire life and they want to do things also. Get out of the house and have things to do, and it is not available everywhere.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment to give parks and recreation an earmarked amount because most of them do sponsor senior programs. If we were to earmark a specific amount annually to be used exclusively for senior programs.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he has no problem with the amendment because parks and rec are the ones who really goes to their foundation for the different areas. It is just not enough. For example, in the City they get almost \$2 million. It does not matter where it goes, as long as the funding is available for the unincorporated areas, and these senior centers and programs.

Ms. Myers stated maybe we should suggest the Chair establish a committee to work with staff and look at this, and see how the funding has been appropriated. She is troubled by the numbers, as well. She has seen the good work that Senior Resources does, but it does not reach many of the areas that need to be reached. When you have them getting \$500,000 from the Council this year, and other senior programs not having \$5,000 - \$10,000 to support senior programming. She agrees with Mr. N. Jackson that it should be one of our priorities, but she thinks we should look at it, and suggest something to full Council that takes this into consideration and comes up with some holistic suggestion.

Mr. Livingston stated these entities have different sources of funding. It would be helpful know which source of funding. He would agree to look at what the Recreation Commission is doing.

Mr. Malinowski stated it was a few years ago that we tried to get some information on senior assistance, and how many different programs there were out there. Some of the churches were providing different programs. Staff came up with this information.

Mr. Madden stated he does recall. Staff worked with the CMCOG.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we are talking about all senior programming. He stated we may need to differentiate and show how much is going toward senior programming, other than meals, and what is going toward meals. He would certainly rather see the seniors being fed than worrying about having a square dance.

Ms. McBride inquired if we know how the \$548,000 is being spent, and are there other programs they are providing resources to.

Mr. Madden stated he does not have it in front of him. Senior Resources provides a quarterly report on the programs, who they are serving, and the amount that goes toward those specific programs. He stated he can compile that information and have it for this item.

Ms. McBride inquired if they "sub-grant" or contract out with other programs.

Mr. Madden stated he does not think so, but he does not want say for certain until he has had an opportunity to look. They may have different funding sources, but he thinks it is an in-house operation.

Ms. McBride stated so we are not sure whether they are giving financial resources, or other types of resources.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the Lt. Governor's office manages the senior programs. The Meals on Wheels, through the CMCOG and the Ombudsman's Office handles those programs also. All senior organizations know how to tap into the CMCOG to get the funding for Meals on Wheels. He is talking about what the County is giving out to these communities. If they are short on meals, and they need meals, the organization will know they need meals. As seniors, you do not put them in a category and say, "You do not need any social program. Just eat and go home."

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to have a designated entity to accept the funds and distribute it to the centers that apply.

Ms. Myers stated because it is such an important issue might need a little more refinement before we start divvying up money. She suggested deferring this item to the next meeting, to request staff to provide answers, and give us some guidance about how we might address senior issues across the County, rather than just through one entity. Senior Resources does a good, but it has got about 7 programs under its umbrella, but it does not comprehensively touch the whole county.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to defer this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated, as part of what we are doing here, in addition to just giving the funds out because of the number of bodies requesting it, we may need to see what is required for a person to be able to receive these.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Council Motion: Guidelines for dedications at the Decker Center – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to have staff give Council some guidance, and look for comparable entities to provide guidance on how to move forward with dedications

Mr. Malinowski stated we may want to add to the motion that until that is done we will not be doing any of these requests.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he thought we had already established some protocol or guidelines.

Mr. Livingston stated not that he is aware of.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he remembers in the discussion when we did the first one for Judge Jones we agreed that if someone submits something we can hang their picture and have a ceremony for them.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Approve the purchase of EMS equipment with funding coming from bond proceeds set aside for EMS equipment – Mr. Madden stated the reason this item is before the committee is because the amount exceeds \$100,000.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the purchases of equipment.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Melody Garden Stream/Ditch Stabilization Design Professional Services Contract – Mr. Madden stated this is a stabilization project that was bid out. A request for proposals was submitted, and staff has reviewed the bids. The recommendation is to award the contract to KCI Technologies, Inc. to complete construction management for the Melody Garden Stabilization project.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the award of a contract to KCI Technologies, Inc. to design, permit and complete construction management for the Melody Garden Stabilization project.

Mr. Malinowski stated, prior to this getting to Council, he would like to see all of the bids with dollar amounts.

Mr. Madden stated it was for proposals, so you would not have an actual dollar amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated if we do the proposal first, and say they are the highest ranked, they can come in with whatever bid they want.

Ms. Wladischkin stated, during the Request for Proposal process, we ask for a cost submittal. The cost submittal is evaluated, and is part of the points awarded to the vendors. However, it is a negotiable process, so once we establish the highest ranked offer, we would enter into negotiations. If those are successful, then we would ask for award of the contract.

Mr. Malinowski requested the figures submitted with the requests for proposals.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. An Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Richland County (the County) Government Office of Small Business Opportunity (OSBO) and the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) – Mr. Madden stated, for clarification, it is not an IGA, it is a Strategic Alliance Memorandum, so it is a mutual understanding the OSBO and SBA will have.

Mr. Smith stated Legal has reviewed the document. It basically outlines a collaborative effort between the SBA and the Small Business Administration, in terms of moving small businesses forward. There are no financial obligations from either one of the entities. It is an exchange of information and collaboration between the two.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if a certified business with the OSBO Office would be able to access programs through the SBA. What benefit would a business have with the Small Business Administration to access capital through them.

Mr. Madden stated, on p. 30 of the agenda packet, there is a section that outlines OSBO's undertakings. Essentially, this will allow the people that work with the OSBO Office would have access to resources, information, as it relates to their relationship with SBA.

Administration and Finance

June 26, 2018

Mr. N. Jackson stated the frustration he has seen with a lot of small businesses is they get all certification, training, but what they really need is to get the capital to move them forward. The OSBO Office has tried to have classes and certification, and only 2 or 3 people show up. The businesses hear the opportunity they are supposed to have, but they are still not getting what they want. He stated we should have a work session, or call an OSBO meeting, to find out what they want or need to move forward. They want to contracts, access to capital, and bonding, but is it really happening. The SBA is saying they will partner with us. He hates when someone partners any entity, but it does not really help.

Ms. Myers inquired if this is something the OSBO Office desired to help move the office along.

Dr. Ellis responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers inquired if OSBO sought this agreement out.

Dr. Ellis stated OSBO staff has been working a number of stakeholders in the area to increase visibility of opportunities across the board, and this is just one of those opportunities. It has come as a result of going out a meeting with different organizations. As a part of the discussion with SBA, this is a standard form they present to their stakeholders when they are working in collaborative relationships. In order for us to engage, this is a part of our reciprocation.

Ms. Myers inquired if the County is guaranteeing any payments to anybody. Are there any contracts for money, or is this just to engage in additional training and assistance?

Dr. Ellis stated there are no financial obligations or commitments.

Ms. Myers inquired if there were to arise financial obligations or commitments, the OSBO Office would have the right to bring this back.

Dr. Ellis responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if most of the obstacles are financial. Is the office supposed to help them qualify financially for loans?

Ms. Myers stated she believes Ms. Dickerson is right. The issue, as it pertains to small businesses, is always access to capital, contracts, and bonding. Usually the SBA partners with local governments to do training and facilitate seminars. There are things that will provide them insight in to how you go about making your business ready to get bonded.

Ms. Dickerson stated with all of the training, if you had 10 companies, on a scale of 1 – 10 how many will have the ability to achieve their goals. From what she is hearing, it is not very successful.

Dr. Ellis stated historically the success rate has not been high at all. Mr. N. Jackson and Ms. Myers' points are valid. One of the things we are trying to do, and that is the reason for this agreement, is to increase visibility of opportunities, both within the County, and across the board for those small businesses. Last week, they had a "Why Get Certified" workshop. They had 35 participants in the workshop. They had SCDOT, Federal presence, the City of Columbia, and the Minority State Office were in attendance at the workshop. One of the point that they stressed with the participants is that the end goal is not to just become certified. The reason for this alliance is so that the County has more of a presence, and more involvement with those organizations so we can expand the exposure to the small business community.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is not sure why this is in this committee. We have an OSBO Ad Hoc Committee. It seems that should have went there, and all of the discussion should have been there before being brought to Council. Is there a reason it came to this committee, and not the OSBO Committee?

Mr. Madden stated there was not a specific reason. This is the committee meeting that reviews agreements or memorandums of understanding regularly. But, if it is referred to that committee, staff will present to that committee, as well.

Mr. N. Jackson stated we can have this lengthy discussion in this committee, or inside the proper committee. His point is that we have the mentor protégé and sheltered market programs, which he is not sure where they are going. What is the decision on those programs, and how does it affect those organizations that participate in those markets. So, it is a more in depth discussion with the OSBO Committee. Those are some of the things on the agenda. Where we are? Is it working? When we have an agreement like this, will it benefit those organizations? The mentor protégé? What needs to be done? The staff involved in a committee meeting is more detailed and you have more input. Then you have people from the small business that comes to those meetings to give their input. Usually when we have OSBO meetings, small business people come to tell us what they like, dislike or need. He recommended sending this to the OSBO Ad Hoc Committee for more detailed information. If we move it forward to Council, he is still going to put it on the OSBO Ad Hoc Committee agenda to receive input from the community.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to enter into a Strategic Alliance Memorandum with the SBA South Carolina District Office (Columbia) to collaborate on increasing business development, outreach opportunities, and exposure for Richland County certified small businesses and small business candidates for certification with the OSBO Small Local Business Enterprise program. Anything else that needs to be discussed should be taken up in the OSBO Ad Hoc Committee.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. This is a request for Council to award a contract for the construction of a landfill gas control system to include perimeter and in-waste active landfill gas extraction wells connected by piping to a vacuum blower system, along with ancillary systems – Mr. Braswell stated this is a request to approve a contract to construct a landfill gas control system. The County has operated a landfill off of Caughman Road since 1975. The site stopped accepting waste in 1995. It was an unlined landfill, so the groundwater beneath has been contaminated by chemical waste placed in the landfill over the years. The levels in the groundwater are above regulatory limits. The County, over the years, has tried several measures to address the groundwater issue, including passive gas venting, capping the landfill, chemical injection, pump and treat, and natural continuation. The concentrations of the volatile organic compounds and gas have decreased, but they are still above regulatory limits. In 2016, CEC conducted a landfill gas study. That indicated the landfill gas was probably impacting the groundwater, and DHEC concurred with the findings. In 2017, CEC designed a landfill gas control system and had it approved by DHEC. A public meeting was held at the Upper Richland County Community Center in December 2017, at the direction of DHEC, to discuss corrective measures at the landfill. On March 8th the County issued solicitation to hire a vendor to construct the landfill gas system. Four vendors submitted bids. The County's engineering firm, CEC, reviewed the bids, and recommended Tric Con Works, LLC. They were the lowest, responsive, responsible bidder. The bid is high. It is \$714,074.34, along with a contingency of 5%, which totals \$749,778.06. Staff recommends award of the contract for construction.

Administration and Finance

June 26, 2018

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to award the contract to Tri Con Works, LLC.

Mr. Pearce stated the capture of these gases has been one of his areas of interest for years. He inquired, once the capture system is installed, where would the gas then go?

Mr. Braswell stated it would be vented. It would be under pressure. The levels right now are not high enough to flare the gas, so DHEC has said we can vent it to the atmosphere. If we start having issues about odors in the future, we may put a flare in the system.

Mr. Pearce stated there is enough natural gas on the big landfill to power a manufacturing operation. He just wanted to see how much we were getting out of this, and if we wanted to capture that and potentially do something with it.

Ms. Myers stated in the briefing document it talks about the levels being higher than what DHEC allows. There has been the migration of methane and non-methane VOCs. And, moving the primary source of groundwater contamination at the landfill. She inquired if it had contaminated anything outside of it.

Mr. Braswell stated the contamination has moved a little bit off property onto DNR property to the south of the landfill, and it has migrated just across the property land onto some private property to the north. That is why DHEC is pushing us to put a system in to mitigate the groundwater issues.

Ms. Myers inquired if those property owners are aware.

Mr. Braswell responded in the affirmative. They had the public meeting, and discussed it with the owners.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, with the specific owners, not just the people that showed up at the meeting. She inquired if they are happy with the mitigation plan.

Mr. Braswell stated they did not comment one way or the other. Once we held the meeting, everyone seemed pleased with it in the area. We did not ask them specifically, but they can address that with them.

Ms. Myers inquired if it would be prudent, given that this is a contaminant that is on the ground, that is owned by someone else, to speak specifically with those property owners to obtain a waiver and release.

Mr. Smith responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated her concern is that once we have gone in and done this, that if they later come back and somebody says, "you know your land was part this." Then we have someone that thinks they are in position to claim against the County. She is concerned with the specific landowners who are impacted by this, whose land has been contaminated. She knows it is probably it is de minimis. She is sure that you are trying to prevent a great contamination, but we probably need some form of a release. So, that once we remediate the problem, the property owners have the assurance the land is restored back to what it was before this incident, and that they get to ask all of their specific questions, given it is their specific land that is impacted. She requested Mr. Braswell to work with the Legal Department to ensure that is done.

Mr. Braswell stated he will do so.

Administration and Finance

June 26, 2018

Ms. Myers stated she would like that part done before we approve expending the funds. If we have issues that arise with those land owners, we might have to revisit this.

Mr. Malinowski withdrew his motion.

Ms. Myers inquired if that would get us in a penalty phase with DHEC.

Mr. Braswell stated we are not in a penalty phase yet with DHEC. When we explain to them that we are going to talk to the property owners, they should give us additional time to address this.

Ms. Myers inquired if we can put this on the agenda for the next A&F meeting, so we can get the property owners to agree to this so that once we have done it all the money that has to be spent. We do not have a revisiting. They could later come back and claim against us, if we do not get them in it.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if they have ever explored a plasma plant.

Mr. Braswell stated they have not. Right now we have a long-term contract with Waste Management to send out waste to them. That would have to be something down the road. For a plasma facility, or an incinerator, you would need a large volume of waste. More than what the County itself generates.

Mr. N. Jackson stated some states are using it now, and the byproduct can be used for paving. The pollution is less than 1%. It is great deal, it just costs a lot.

Mr. Braswell stated the capital expense is high, but on the back end you do eliminate your environmental issues.

Mr. Livingston inquired if all of the current landfills have linings.

Mr. Braswell stated all the landfills built since 1993 that manage household waste, are required to have liners.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to how long the closure time is for a landfill.

Mr. Braswell stated regulations require 30 years, at a minimum. If you have groundwater issues, like this, DHEC is allow to extend the post closure time.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what a plasma plant is.

Mr. Braswell stated you have a plasma arc, which you expose the waste to. The plasma arc breaks it down into its basic component. You end up with a slag type material, which is like glass. You burn off all your carbon waste.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded Ms. McBride, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Livingston, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- h. Approval to negotiate and enter into a contract for the modernization of the six (6) Judicial Center elevators located at 1701 Main St. – Mr. Madden stated this is staff’s attempt to correct the 6

Administration and Finance

June26, 2018

-10-

elevators in the Judicial Center. They are older elevators, and are constantly needing to be repaired. Instead of repairing them, this is an attempt to just replace them. Mr. Hayden Davis can provide a more bird's eye view of the details of this request. There was a solicitation issued, and the request is to enter into a contract with the firm to replace the 6 elevators.

Mr. Pearce stated he thought we did this a year ago.

Mr. Davis stated we have done some repairs to the elevators, but this would be a major modernization of the elevators.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with entering into a contract with Carolina Elevator, Inc., the recommended contractor to supply and install all required equipment, material, and labor to modernize six (6) elevators at the Judicial Center. The total project cost is in the amount of \$1,060,350.79, with a contract amount of \$922,050.79, and a reserved contingency amount of \$138,300.00.

Mr. Malinowski stated the agenda packet says, "With the development of a new Judicial Center several years away." Prior to deferring the Renaissance, it seemed like that was the first thing, after Administration moving out. We need to get more of a definitive answer on the timeframe here before we invest over a \$1 million into something that is ultimately is going to be gone.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to defer this to the next committee meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- i. FY18-19 Annual Action Plan budgets for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) federal funds – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward without a recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:59 PM.