



Richland County Council  
Coronavirus AD Hoc Committee Meeting  
**MINUTES**  
May 19, 2022 – 4:30 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

---

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Gretchen Barron, Chair, Paul Livingston and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Bill Malinowski, Derrek Pugh, Jesica Mackey, Cheryl English, Angela Weathersby, Justin Martin, Justin Landy, Michelle Onley, Anette Kirylo, Leonardo Brown, Lori Thomas, Steven Gaither, Byron Gipson, Karen Pendleton, Patrick Wright, Ashiya Myers, Tamar Black, Dale Welch, Abhijit Deshpande, Randy Pruitt, Stacey Hamm and Geo Price

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairwoman Barron called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. April 6, 2022 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron, and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Newton moved, second by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron, and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/ACTION**

a. **County Administrator’s American Rescue Plan Act Funding Considerations/Recommendations/Administrator’s Executive Summary** – Mr. Brown stated “Richland County is committed to ethical, equitable and transparent use of State Local Fiscal Recovery Funds to assist residents, non-profit organizations, and businesses recovering from the negative impacts of COVID-19. These funds will be used to improve the quality of life in Richland County. All uses of these funds must receive approval from County Council. County Administration presents all planned uses for the funds to the Coronavirus Ad hoc Committee for evaluation. The Committee then considers input from

County Administration, the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Community Survey conducted by Richland County, as well as other sources of information. The Committee then determines if the planned uses need to be held in committee for further evaluation before forwarding to Council with a recommendation to approve or deny the planned use.” The previous, and following list of County Administrator recommendations reflect consideration of historical facilities’ needs, equipment, infrastructure, and personnel needs of Richland County government. Additionally, the list considers feedback received from a Richland County residents’ survey, input from members of Council and other Elected Officials, community partners and Richland County strategic initiatives. Furthermore, it considers US Treasury guidance for the use of ARP funds. While the list is not exhaustive, it represents areas where Richland County can make significant community impact by supporting public health response, replacing public sector revenue loss, offering additional support to essential workers, investing in water, sewer, broadband and cybersecurity infrastructure, addressing the negative economic impacts of COVID-19, and providing services to the disproportionately impacted communities.

Remaining Balance of Richland County Allotment to Date		<b>\$60,962,694</b>
	Planned Uses Submitted to Coronavirus Ad hoc Committee	
Expense Category		
	Fifth Judicial Circuit-Solicitors Data Management System	(\$618,585.20)
	Construction/Renovation of Family Services Center – DSS	(\$15,000,000)
	Third-Party Partner(s) for Community ARP Grant Management	(\$1,000,000)
	Lenco BearCat Armored Vehicle – Sheriff’s Department	(\$305,800)
	Deferred Maintenance of Cessna Plane – Sheriff’s Department	(\$140,207)
	ShotSpotter Technology Solution – Sheriff’s Department	(\$2,050,200)
	Cyber Security Upgrades – Information Technology Department	
	RCSD server hardware, software and switching equipment	(\$410,000)
	Replacement of older unsupported desktop phones	(\$550,000)
	Replacement of unsupported/unsecure data switches/routers	(\$1,100,000)
	Multi Factor Authentication	(\$150,000)
	Mobile Wireless Microphone and Speaker System	(\$15,000)
	Mobile Multi Camera Conference System	(\$15,000)
	Secondary Web Application Firewall	(\$90,000)
	Internet Load Balancing Appliance	(\$30,000)
	Increase Computing Power/Storage of Hyper Converged Server	(\$330,000)
	New Database Server Software for County Financial System	(\$100,000)
	New Fault Tolerant Virtual Private Network	(\$120,000)
	Upgrade Virtualization Hardware/Software in Detention Center	(\$130,000)
	Replace Storage Area Network	(\$800,000)
	County Website Redesign and Enhancement	(\$350,000)
	Geospatial Infrastructure Improvements and Enhancements	
	Server Software Licenses	(\$105,000)
	Update Aerial Mapping	(\$270,000)
	Replace Retiring Drone Equipment	(\$130,000)
	EMS Vehicle and Equipment Replacements	
	Ambulance Vehicles	(\$2,000,000)
	Fire Pumpers	(\$1,400,000)
	LP EKG Monitor/Defibrillators	(\$400,000)
	Automatic External Defibrillators	(\$180,000)
	Lucas CPR Machines	(\$990,000)

	Stair Chairs	(\$125,000)
	Portable Radios	(\$400,000)
	Mobile Radios	(\$600,000)
	Rugged EMS Computers	(\$250,000)
	Fire Services Bunker Gear	(\$791,580)
	Gear Extractor	(\$83,268)
	Gear Dryer	(\$113,373)
	Design and Construction of Water Tank – Lower Richland	(\$2,000,000)
	Information Technology Replacement of Outdated:	
	Human Capital and Financial Management System	(\$5,000,000)
	Community Grants and Public Private Partnerships	
	Funding for Small Businesses	(\$1,000,000)
	Funding for Non-Profits	(\$1,000,000)
	Funding for Workforce Training	(\$1,000,000)
	Funding for Education Assistance	(\$1,000,000)
	Funding for Home Repairs for Seniors	(\$1,000,000)
	Funding to Address Food Insecurity	(\$2,000,000)
	Funding for Broadband Services in Underserved Areas	(\$2,000,000)
	Funding for Affordable Housing	(\$2,000,000)
	Funding for Services for Unhoused Persons	(\$2,000,000)
	Total of Recommendations/Planned Uses of Funds	(\$51,143,013.20)
	Remaining Balance of Richland County Allotment if Approved by Committee/Council	<b>\$9,819,680.8</b>

He noted the items under the Solicitor’s Office, the Sheriff’s Department, and Emergency Medical Services represent Public Safety in the amount of \$10,448,013. The Family Services Center encompasses a number of community services associated with community health in the amount of \$15,000,000 (29%). He indicated for community investment they are requesting approximately \$16,000,000. At this time, they have not selected any particular organization. The next step would be to determine what private partnership we can utilize to leverage these dollars. Overtime, Richland County did make some investments in its technology infrastructure, but throughout the years we have not kept up with the investments and the equipment became obsolete and outdated. Systems are no longer able to keep with the current demand, so there is a decreased efficiency. With outdated equipment and services, we are not able to do certain things because people are no longer supporting them.

Mr. Livingston inquired which items will require recurring charges.

Mr. Brown responded some items will be recurring in a period of 4-5 years, which will give those departments time to absorb the costs, and the County to plan for the future.

Mr. Livingston inquired, as it relates to community grants and public/private partnerships, will individuals be able to apply for funds from different categories.

Mr. Brown responded, if they are approved for funds from a non-profit standpoint, they would not be approved from a small business standpoint. This is prevent the US Treasury from viewing them as double dipping.

Ms. Newton indicated she would like to have funds allocated to areas where recreation and youth services relate to health and wellness. She inquired if there were funds set aside for mental health or if it was included in other categories.

Mr. Brown responded both of those items were included in the public health section with the Family Services Center. There are a lot agencies the County provides support for that would be included in the center. He noted we gave funds to the Recreation Commission, but there was nothing else specifically for recreation.

Ms. Newton requested the committee to consider additional funding for recreation and youth services. She inquired if there were funds for retaining housing for individuals that have mortgages.

Mr. Brown responded the reason the categories are broken out the way they are is because that is the way Treasury breaks them out. What we learned from the Rental Assistance Program is, once Richland County stepped in, and received money directly from the Treasury, Richland County residents were not eligible to receive State funds. We are not sure if the same scenario would apply to mortgage assistance, which is why we did not recommend it.

Mr. Livingston is not sure about providing services to unhoused persons, as the State will also be providing services to individuals.

Mr. Brown stated we are talking about homeless persons, and how to support agencies that are already established, not creating a new one.

Ms. Barron noted if there is an opportunity for a public/private organization already doing the work, the County could provide them additional support. The committee is making recommendations to Council and the details will come later.

Mr. Livingston stated he wants to advocate for affordable housing.

Mr. Brown inquired how Mr. Livingston wants to address this issue.

Mr. Livingston responded he would like to increase the affordable housing fund from \$2M to \$4M.

Ms. Newton stated Council needs to have a broader conversation about affordable housing apart from allocating these funds.

Mr. Brown stated, if they add an additional \$2M for affordable housing, it would reduce the remaining \$8.6M to \$6.6M. He suggested allocating \$500,000 for recreation/youth services.

Ms. Newton stated she would like to increase the amount, but she wants to state the motion as "up to" amount would allow us to reallocate the funds as needed. She also would like to see a broader category for senior assistance rather than having them broken down to specific titles.

Ms. Barron stated she would support a senior assistance category.

Ms. Mackey inquired if other infrastructure needs were addressed besides broadband.

Mr. Brown responded the gear dryer and construction of a water tank for Lower Richland are projects we could potentially fund that would create clean water for the area. He noted they have other projects, which cost \$7M - \$15M; therefore, they are looking into other funding sources for those projects.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the funds have to be allocated by 2026.

Mr. Brown responded the funds have to be allocated by 2024, and spent by 2026.

Ms. Newton inquired if we could allocate an additional \$1M for youth services.

Ms. Barron indicated she would support Ms. Newton's request.

Ms. Newton inquired if there is a list of projects within the County that could be done, but not with ARP funding.

Mr. Brown responded he did not create a list, as it could be confusing.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation with the following changes: (1) Change "Funding for Home Repairs for Seniors" to "Funding for Senior Assistance"; (2) Change the funding amount for affordable housing from \$2M to \$4M; (3) Add an additional \$1M for Recreation/Youth Services; and (4) Add clarifying language that all ARPA funding allocated is approved as "up to".

In Favor: Livingston, Barron and Newton

The motion in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Newton moved, second by Barron, to adjourn.

In Favor: Livingston, Barron, and Newton

The motion in favor was unanimous.