



Richland County
 Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee
MINUTES
 February 15, 2022 – 4:00 PM
 Council Chambers
 2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

Paul Livingston District 4	Gretchen Barron - Chair District 7	Chakisse Newton District 11
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------

Committee Members Present: Gretchen Barron, Chair, Paul Livingston, and Chakisse Newton

Others Present: Overture Walker, Jesica Mackey, Bill Malinowski, Allison Terracio, Michelle Onley, Anette Kirylo, Tamar Black, Leonardo Brown, Patrick Wright, Lori Thomas, Aric Jensen, Angela Weathersby, Randy Pruitt, Ashiya Myers, Stacey Hamm, Justin Landy, Kyle Holsclaw, Christine Keefer, Bill Davis, Dale Welch, Abhi Deshpande, Steven Gaither, Melissa Hughey, Karen Pendleton, Dante Roberts, Michael Byrd, Michael Maloney, Dwight Hanna, Allison Steele, John Thompson and Hans Pauling

1. **Call to Order** – Ms. Barron called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00PM.
2. **Election of Chair** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to nominate Ms. Barron as Chair.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to close the floor for nominations.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Approval of Minutes: December 14, 2021** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **Adoption of Agenda** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to adopt the agenda as published.

Ms. Newton inquired if Item 4(c) should be ERA or ERP.

Mr. Brown responded it is related to the ERA/ERP. He noted it could be listed either way. He suggested changing it to ERA for clarity.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as amended.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Barron noted the "Discussion Items" should be "Discussion Items for Action."

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to reconsider the agenda.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to list Items 5(a) –5(d) as "Discussion Items for Action".

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Discussion Items For Action:**

- a. **Grant Management Software** – Mr. Brown noted staff recommends approval to allocate \$687,949.00 in American Rescue Fund and other applicable Federal grant funding and other applicable Federal grant funding sources to purchase comprehensive grant management software to facilitate the process of distributing, tracking and processing both grant funds received and distributed.

Ms. Jensen stated a single software platform for the administration of grant funds was previously discussed by Council. Currently, they use three different platforms that do not necessarily talk to each other, so at times we have to re-enter information in, which put us at risk of errors and is inefficient. The software would be used by all departments, except Finance. The information would be transferred to Finance, so there will not be a potential for someone using the software to get into our financial records. The software will allow for applications to be done online. Then, staff will be able to process the applications and act upon them. Staff's recommendation is to allocate the \$687,949 over 5-year period for the software.

Ms. Newton inquired when the software would be implemented and usable by staff.

Mr. Jensen responded, once the contract is finished, it will take approximately three months.

Ms. Newton inquired what will happen after the 5th year of the software. Would we discontinue the software or pay for maintenance out of a different fund?

Mr. Jensen responded we would have to identify funds at year four to continue the use of the software. They anticipate it will be something that will be ongoing. He noted we are already paying for other software and this would be replacing the cost of what we are paying for three different vendors.

Ms. Newton inquired what category these expenses are allowed under.

Mr. Jensen responded it will be under Administration.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was any discussion with the IT Department.

Mr. Jensen responded in the affirmative. He noted every department that has grants, including IT were involved.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how much we will be paying after year five.

Mr. Jensen responded we would roughly pay \$137,000, plus the 3% yearly increase.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the funding would be coming from the General Fund budget.

Mr. Jensen responded in the affirmative. It would be coming from the same source we use to currently pay for the three different platforms.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if what we are currently paying annually for three platforms could reduce the cost of this one to zero.

Mr. Jensen responded it is possible it could, but he did not know about the other department's software costs.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, the software will be a cost savings for the County, as consolidating the software since everyone in the County will be using the same software.

Mr. Jensen responded everyone utilizing grants will be using the same software thus making them more efficient, with less chance of error. He cannot speak to an exact cost savings.

Ms. Barron stated, if this could save on error, this in itself is a cost savings.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to forward this to Council with a recommendation to allocate \$687,949 in American Rescue Fund and other applicable Federal grant funding sources to purchase comprehensive grant management software to facilitate the process of distributing, tracking and processing both grant funds received and distributed.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Solicitor Data Management** – Mr. Pauling stated the Solicitor's Office has a need for an upgraded data management system. Their previous system is antiquated and requires a lot of workarounds, which could cause mistakes. He requested \$1.2M for a 5-year the system. After the 5-year period, the annual subscription costs will be \$140,000 - \$150,000, not taking into account the cost of cloud storage. They are required, by statute, to retain almost all of their trial records and discovery for a certain amount of time. After the 5-year period, they will need to get an increase in the Solicitor's budget to continue to manage the program.

Ms. Barron noted the Solicitor's Office serves multiple counties, and inquired if the cost reflects the employees serving Richland County.

Mr. Pauling responded they would be looking at an 80/20 cost split with Richland and Kershaw counties, based on the case numbers pending in each county.

Ms. Barron inquired if the \$1.2 million dollars reflected the cost split.

Mr. Pauling responded the 80%, or Richland County's portion, would be \$1.2M.

Ms. Barron stated she would like to have clarity on Richland County's portion.

Ms. Newton inquired how this item is before them as it did not originate from a Council member. There are many agencies and departments and it could be chaotic if everyone could present a request at any time.

Mr. Brown stated this item is before the committee, without originating with a Council member, as a request from an elected official. Said request is being presented to the appropriate body.

Ms. Newton inquired if there are other funding sources, outside of Kershaw County, the Solicitor's Office is pursuing.

Mr. Pauling stated, from Kershaw County, they are expecting about \$240,000 over the next 5 years. He noted they have also applied for a technology grant of \$340,000.

Ms. Newton noted the Solicitor's current system did not interface with the Richland County Sheriff's Department. She inquired if this system would interface with the Sheriff's Department and other appropriate bodies.

Mr. Pauling responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like to know what other entities will be getting involved, and any additional cost from becoming involved with the other agencies. He requested a definition or explanation the diversion program.

Mr. Pauling responded the diversion program is pre-trial intervention, alcohol treatment, drug treatment, traffic enforcement programs, traffic education programs, and juvenile PTI. The revenue from those programs have dropped from \$740,000 to \$480,000.

Mr. Malinowski noted the Solicitor's Office sent requests to two companies, but only received a response from one. He inquired when the requests were sent out.

Mr. Pauling responded they started working on it last year. From personal knowledge, he knew Matrix would be about \$30k - \$40k more expensive. Karpel offered the same features at a lower price. The main difference is Matrix is web-based and Karpel is software-based.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the support contract services is the costs shown in the agenda as "annual support".

Ms. Pauling responded they will have to pay a subscription rate.

Mr. Malinowski requested a more detailed request, as the numbers do not add up to \$1.2M. He inquired about the travel expenses and clarification on the annual support numbers.

Ms. Barron requested, in the future, we get the true costs to Richland County. She requested to hold this item in committee.

- c. **ERA Vendor** – Mr. Brown stated Richland County qualified to receive additional Emergency Rental Assistance funds. In anticipation of receiving these funds, we want to make sure we can move forward with the program and get the funds into the community. Staff believes the best step moving forward would be to continue to utilize TetraTech. He noted there were other

options, but they believe those other options would delay the ability to get the funding out.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve an extension of the existing agreement with TetraTech to administer the distribution of any reallocated Emergency Rental Assistance funds.

Ms. Newton stated, when we receive the funds, we will not be able to reopen the application process. Instead they are going to be following up with persons who have already applied. She noted she hopes they are efficient and expeditious in their communication with those persons.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. **Non-profit Application Process** – Mr. Brown stated there was discussion about a process in which an application could be received by the County for entities and interested parties who are trying to request American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds. The draft application would allow citizens too quickly and readily access funds from Richland County. He not sub-recipients and recipients of ARP funds have more stringent reporting requirements than if Richland County were giving away the funds. They will need to have all the information to be accountable.
- i. **Application Update** – The application process could be an opportunity for the County to allow people interested in funds to complete the process. When a large amount is requested, it could potentially go before the committee for review through the application process and make a recommendation to the body. He stated, on a smaller scale, they could set aside a portion of funds for non-profits or small businesses to have access to help recover costs or help the community. Through the process of prioritization, from the committee, Council and survey standpoint, to have the information vetted through the committee process with community partners to disperse the funds.
- Ms. Newton inquired if there should be a work session to discuss these ideas in more detail. She stated, from a Council perspective, she would like to see a prioritization guidelines and criteria used to vet the requests.
- Ms. Barron stated they need to have a strong process in place when it comes to distributing the funds as they would need to be held accountable for every dollar spent. She noted she is open to a work session.
- ii. **Committee Selection** – No action was taken.
- iii. **Funding Priority** – No action was taken.
6. **Other Topics** – Mr. Brown noted that at 4PM there was a conservation drop in.
7. **Adjournment** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:04 PM.