



Richland County
Administration and Finance Committee
October 26, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Allison Terracio, Cheryl English, Gretchen Barron, Derrek Pugh, Chakisse Newton, Michelle Onley, Tamar Black, Dante Roberts, Dale Welch, Jeff Ruble, Stacey Hamm, Steven Gaither, Michael Byrd, Syndi Castelluccio, Aric Jensen, Leonardo Brown, Lori Thomas, Michael Maloney, Jennifer Wladischkin, John Ansell, Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Justin Landy, Bill Davis, Christine Keefer, John Thompson, Geo Price, Dwight Hanna and Katie Marr

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. **Regular Session: September 28, 2021** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, 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. McBride, to adopt 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. **RCS School Supply/Backpack Grant Approval** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the grant award in the amount of \$5,000 for the school supply/backpack grant program from the Berkshire Hathaway Energy Foundation of the Richland County Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the Sherriff's Department has already received the grant.

Major Polis responded they received a check for \$5,000 for the grant.

Mr. Malinowski noted this is a request after the fact.

**Administration and Finance Committee
October 26, 2021**

Ms. McBride noted they may have the check, but it was not spent.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in the future, we need to get the information to make the approval before final action is taken.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. RCS D Midlands Gang Task Force Grant** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the grant for the continuation of the Midlands Gang Task Force for the salary and fringe benefits for one (1) Task Force Commander to be assigned to the Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was any information on how the program was successful and which other jurisdictions have been involved before this item goes to Council. He noted the contract requires the signed grant award be returned within 30 days from the date of the award, which was October 1st. The next Council meeting is November 9th. He inquired if we will lose the award or if there is a built in grace period.

Mr. Polis responded there is a grace period.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Economic Development – Funding for the repaving of Mauney Drive from the County Transportation Committee (CTC)** – Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's request to seek CTC funds for the repaving of Mauney Drive.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how this item came from the Economic Development Committee to this committee. He also inquired if there are CTC funds available in the County coffer to pay for this project.

Mr. Maloney responded the coffers are drying up, and there is not adequate money for the request being made to the CTC. He noted some of the requests made to the CTC have been put on hold.

Mr. Malinowski noted there was not enough funds to cover this project. He inquired if the project has been bid out yet.

Mr. Maloney responded it has not. He noted the request is for permission to go to the CTC to request the funds.

Ms. Mackey inquired what the CTC funds balance would be after this project.

Mr. Maloney responded they do not carry an account balance. They ask for project specific funds from CTC, as an outside body from the County government. He noted the CTC fund balance is getting low.

Ms. Mackey inquired, if they approve this, it would be placed on with other County projects.

Mr. Maloney responded it could, but it would be up to another body to decide what the priority is.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this project not come out of the Economic Development Committee. She noted CTC funding is not money from Council. She inquired if the County was sending CTC priorities.

Mr. Maloney responded Public Works is sending a road building/reconstruction and pavement maintenance plan annually to the CTC. He noted that some of the requested projects from this year may not be funded.

Ms. McBride inquired if this request was just for CTC funding.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. He noted the request was to ask the CTC if they have funding available that could be used for this project.

Ms. McBride inquired if the CTC denied the funding would the County be obligated to fund the project.

Mr. Brown responded County funding was not a part of the recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the road priority list to be used for CTC funds.

Mr. Maloney responded that was brought to Council last winter. Each year they will come back to Council for approval of the road priority list and what will go to CTC.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this road was on last year's list.

Mr. Maloney responded it was not on last year's list, and we are not prepared to add it to the upcoming list. He noted the road rating was in the 40s and it is likely the road could be coming up on the priority list.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve this road being placed on the priority list of roads that will come under CTC funding, and that it is ranked and considered for repaving.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous

- d. **Utilities Department – Quail Creek Collections system Rehabilitation** – Mr. Davis stated the Quail Creek subdivision transfer area that came from the City of Columbia. It was built in the late 1970s out of clay pipe. The pipe has come to the end of its useful life due to root intrusion and other failures that have been occurring. They did an investigation of all the pipes in the neighborhood, and have been talking about pursuing CDBG funding for this project. If we replace the piping with cured in-place pipe it will basically renew the life so it will be as good as new pipe. It can be done without destroying the yards and driveways. The cost of project is approximately \$754,000.

Ms. McBride inquired how this project became a priority.

Mr. Davis stated they had a lot of projects that needed to be done, but this neighborhood has a history of sanitary sewer overflows. As part of the continuous improvement program, we want to make sure we are replacing areas with large SSOS to protect the community and environment. He noted this community runs close to Goose Creek, which runs down to the river, so it is a big source of potential pollution for the Lower Richland Corridor.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the document stating it would rehabilitate and eliminate a pump station because it appears to be a conflict.

Mr. Davis responded it does at first glance, but does not. He noted they could add a short gravity sewer line to eliminate the pump station, which would provide a cost savings in maintenance, as well as long-term capital improvements.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why we would not start construction to eliminate the current cost.

Administration and Finance Committee

October 26, 2021

Mr. Davis responded the funding is tied to the environmental work. In this case, we are digging alongside the creek. If we are digging we have to have Phase I and other environmental permitting that we do not have to have as a part of the rehabilitation work.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how long it will be before you get the gravity line installed.

Mr. Davis responded it would be between 18 months and 2 years.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if there were any other bids. If so, how many, and how many were local. In addition, is Vortex a local or national provider?

Mr. Davis responded no one that he knows with a CIPP company are headquartered in Columbia. He noted that Vortex was located in Greenville, South Carolina.

Ms. Wladischkin noted Vortex is under a cooperative agreement, meaning there was a governmental entity who solicits for the project and allows other governmental entities to participate in the award. She stated one of the reasons they picked Vortex was because of the time, and the federal funding encourages the use of such agreements to eliminate some of the administrative fees to do the bid ourselves.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if Vortex will be subcontracting the work out.

Ms. Wladischkin responded, to her knowledge, Vortex will be performing the work.

Mr. O. Walker inquired how many bids were received.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the cooperative received many bids, but the County chose Vortex because they had the cured in-place pipe that was preferred.

Ms. McBride inquired about the amount of the CDBG grant.

Mr. Davis responded the grant is \$754,626.32.

Ms. Scheirer stated the total CDBG funds received was approximately \$1.6M.

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Quail Creek Collection System Rehabilitation Work and award the rehabilitation phase to Vortex Companies.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. **Utilities Department –Rabbit Run Sewer Line – Southeast Sewer Project Flow Increase** – O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve funding to upsize an existing 8-inch gravity sewer line to a 15-inch gravity sewer line. The line is located at the Rabbit Run and is needed to accommodate additional sewer flow and eliminate the Quail Creek pump station from the City of Columbia transfer area.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. **Utilities Department – Request for Approval of willingness to serve letter for the Point at Chestnut Planation Development(TMS # R05211-01-01)** – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Willingness to Serve Letter for the development.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the cost to build the new infrastructure.

Mr. Davis responded they will not have that amount until they get a bid, but we will not have to pay for it.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why not.

Mr. Davis responded the developer builds those infrastructure lines so they can put the houses in, but the County gets the lines to maintain and own.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we would be charging tap fees.

Mr. Davis responded in the affirmative.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous

- g. **Community Planning & Development – TetraTech Change Order 14** – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the contract extension for the agreement between Richland County and Tetra Tech.

Mr. Brown stated, in his meeting with HUD, Richland County was given the opportunity to improve the timeliness of spending funding received. He noted he would recommend approval to show we are improving our timeliness and spend the funding for these projects.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if finding a new company would take more time and expense.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. He stated it would not comply with the graciousness HUD has provided.

Ms. McBride inquired who we contracted with to expend the funds.

Mr. Brown responded we contracted with Tetra Tech. The County did not have the internal staff to move the project forward, and we are still working to build that staff.

Mr. O. Walker inquired what Tetra Tech did for the County.

Mr. Brown responded Tetra Tech manages and implements projects for the County. He noted Richland County was taking steps to have staff manage the projects and allow contractors to implement.

Mr. O. Walker inquired what other projects, besides the Emergency Rental Assistance Fund, was Tetra Tech assisting with.

Mr. Brown responded he would have to ask the Community Planning Development staff to be more holistic, but some of the housing projects relate to the 2015 floods. He stated there were more than one program, but the funding was mostly HUD funding.

Ms. Barron inquired if Tetra Tech was a sole source contractor.

Mr. Brown responded the County bid out for these services, so they would not be a sole source.

Ms. Barron stated Tetra Tech has become a catchall for the County. She inquired if we are losing opportunities for small business owners and other entities to come to the table. She questioned if the procurement process was a fair and equitable opportunity because it appears the County is recycling the same businesses. Ms. Barron inquired about the length of the extension.

Mr. Brown responded it would be a year, but we anticipate the close out of the program would be before that.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- h. Government & Community Services – “Seed to Engage” Small Business Grant Program** – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the proposed grant.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the program was part of the annual CBDG request.

Ms. Scheirer responded in the affirmative.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- i. Department of Public Works- Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Residential Curbside Collections Services, Area 1 – Contract Award recommendation** – Mr. Maloney stated on July 20th they received approval for an RFP for three (3) areas that were coming up on March 1, 2022. The RFP process looked at the background, experience, approach to service to be provided, the contractor’s performance history and the proposed equipment list. He noted they also weighted the unit price. Coastal Waste and Recycling was recommended by staff. Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, for discussion.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to forward to Council with a recommendation to award the contract for residential curbside solid waste collection services in Area 1 (Northwest Richland County – north of Interstate 20 and west of the Broad River including the Ballantine and Irmo areas) to Coastal Waste & Recycling.

Mr. O. Walker inquired where the company is based.

Mr. Maloney responded the company is based out of Florida.

Mr. O. Walker inquired about their professional reputation and work product.

Mr. Ansell stated Coastal Waste and Recycling employed a little less than 500 people and are in the residential, commercial and industrial collection arena. He provided positive reviews about Coastal Waste and Recycling.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if there were any negative reviews because he personally does not just look at the positive reviews in order to get a more balance approached.

Mr. Ansell responded he did not have any other reviews.

Ms. English noted she had some concerns about an out-of-state vendor versus one that in in-state, particularly with some of the current concerns with Waste Management in areas that are strained.

Administration and Finance Committee

October 26, 2021

Mr. Ansell responded the proposal indicated the approach to the services and it seemed to be a very thorough and comprehensive approach. The company has a lot of experience transitioning into new contracts.

Ms. McBride inquired about the other vendors that applied.

Ms. Wladischkin responded it was in the supplemental information provided to the committee.

Mr. Malinowski noted that was confidential information. If there was something they would like to discuss it would be contractual in nature and would have to be taken up in Executive Session.

Ms. McBride inquired if the company had an office in Richland County.

Ms. Wladischkin responded they did not, but they were proposing to have an office and local staff.

Ms. Terracio inquired if other vendors were given the opportunity to negotiate terms after they submitted their RFPs.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the RFP process allowed for negotiations with the highest ranked offeror. Should negotiations fail with the highest ranked they would move to the 2nd highest ranked offeror and so on.

Ms. Terracio inquired if there was special consideration for local providers.

Ms. Wladischkin responded the County has a local vendor preference; however the tap on the preference is considerably less than the dollar amount these contracts are being offered at.

Ms. Barron stated it does not seem like a fair process for a vendor that has been with us for a number of years to not have an advantage by being an incumbent. She inquired about the transition period for the vendor to be prepared to work on the 1st day of the proposed contract.

Ms. Ansell responded the service provider has a local representative based out of Columbia that will be a transition piece for them.

Ms. Barron inquired when the contract would be scheduled to start.

Mr. Ansell responded March 1, 2022 is the anticipated start date, but there could be supply chain issues involved, so the start date is not firm yet.

Ms. Barron stated she was concerned, since there is no certainty regarding the transition period. The County has existing collection issues and the new company is not locally based.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the company serves any other states besides Florida.

Mr. Ansell responded they do not.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer the remaining items.

In Favor: Malinowski and McBride

Opposed: O. Walker and Mackey

Not Present: J. Walker

The motion for deferral failed.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to deny the request to award the contract.

In Favor: McBride, O. Walker and Mackey

**Administration and Finance Committee
October 26, 2021**

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Malinowski stated the last two items need to be addressed first at the next committee meeting.

- j. **Department of Public Works- Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Residential Curbside Collections Services, Area 3 – Contract Award recommendation** – No Action was taken
- k. **Department of Public Works- Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Residential Curbside Collections Services, Area 6 – Contract Award recommendation** – No action was taken

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.