



Richland County Council

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

December 19, 2017 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Pearce, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Paul Livingston, Jim Manning and Norman Jackson

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Larry Smith, Shane Kitchens, Tracy Hegler, Ismail Ozbek, Jamelle Ellis, Sandra Yudice, Tim Nielsen, Dale Welch, Stacey Hamm, James Hayes, Kecia Lara, Dwight Hanna, and Kimberly Williams-Roberts

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. November 16, 2017 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Pearce, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Madden stated staff is requesting the removal of Item 4.b. “Restructuring Ordinance: Phase II” until the January committee meeting.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to remove Item 4.b. from the agenda.

In Favor: Pearce, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as amended.

In Favor: Pearce, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Richland School District 2 (RSD2) FY17-18 Budget request to County Council: Amend Official Records and FY 2018 Budget Proviso – Mr. Pearce stated this item pertains to the Richland School District II budget. There was apparently an error in the funding and staff has recommended a corrective

action, which is to adopt the conformed June 8, 2017 minutes and approve a budget proviso that states, "If the School District 2 millage generates the amount requested in the District's June 7, 2017, letter (which is \$148,781,556), its budget shall automatically be adjusted upward by \$427,203."

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to adopt the conformed June 8, 2017 minutes and approve the budget proviso.

Mr. Manning inquired if a budget proviso is different than a budget ordinance.

Mr. Madden stated it is not different than a budget ordinance. There are different provisos within an ordinance; therefore, it would be an additional proviso of the current ordinance.

Mr. Manning stated he was not aware there was an ordinance and there were provisos within the ordinance.

Mr. Pearce stated he did not recall the County using a proviso in the past. He is aware that the State House uses them frequently.

Mr. Livingston stated the County has used them in the past. The County used a proviso in relation to the Recreation Commission in the past.

Mr. Manning inquired as to why this would be a proviso as opposed to going through the process of three readings and a public hearing. And why did other budget revisions we made not be a proviso. He stated he was curious as to why this was used a decade ago and has not been used again and we are now using it again.

Mr. Madden stated the proviso is simply a part of the solution that staff prepared. Staff discussed this with School District II in a meeting earlier this month. They agreed with the proposed funding plan and corrective action. Staff will proceed at the discretion of Council.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion to amend the official records for the FY18 budget ordinance.

The motion died for a lack of a second.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if staff's proposal fixes the problem or would it have an adverse effect.

Mr. Madden stated it would not have an adverse effect. Essentially it will allow for an adjustment if what is drawn in from the collection of taxes exceeds what was listed in the budget ordinance.

Mr. Hayes stated the County used a budget proviso in FY12 and FY13. Last year Richland District II realized a surplus of \$1.7 million, which we used to fund current year budget. The budget proviso essentially says, if tax receipts exceed the targeted budget of \$148.7 million, the budget proviso will kick in so their budget will be amended upward to meet that amount. If it does not it will not be. In other words, It is a failsafe.

In Favor: Pearce, N. Jackson, Livingston and Manning

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- b. Award of Rivers Station Subdivision Road Repair and Paving Project – Mr. Pearce stated this item has been before the committee in the past. The developer was not willing to accept the agreement, but it is his understanding this has now been worked out.

Ms. Hegler stated staff has reached a verbal agreement with the developer to accept the changes recommended to the agreement. She believes the developer will be willing to sign the agreement should this item go forward.

The request is to approve the amendments to the agreement and selection of the contractor, pending execution of the agreement. The two changes are: the removal of the 2nd subdivision and removal of the final accounting clause since we have an estimate for the work, which is within the range.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski stated originally the bid amount was a little over \$211,000. Yet the total in the agreement is \$200,000. He inquired if the \$211,000 total is for both subdivisions.

Ms. Hegler responded \$211,000 is the estimate they received for this project. They will either experience some savings or it would be an \$11,000 difference, which could be added to the contract.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like to add the \$11,000 to contract, so that all of the funding is reimbursed on this item. Otherwise, we are telling other citizens, in the same situation, that we are going to put a little in for this group even though yours was there first you have to wait. He also requested staff to review the contract thoroughly as there are inconsistencies in the document.

Mr. Pearce requested Ms. Hegler to restate staff's recommendation.

Ms. Hegler stated: "It is recommended Council approve the proposed agreement amendments with Rivers Station LLC and award a construction contract to CR Jackson for the repairs and paving of roads in Rivers Station subdivision contingent upon the full execution of the proposed agreement as stipulated by Council."

In Favor: Pearce, Malinowski, N. Jackson, Livingston, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

- a. Council Motion: Any entity placing a person in the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center will be responsible for paying the daily fee as determined by Richland County, as well as all medical costs incurred to include mental needs [MALINOWSKI and MYERS] – Mr. Malinowski stated the motion is that whoever is responsible for placing someone in the detention center will also be responsible for not just the daily fee the County charges, but also all medical costs above and beyond normal costs, including mental needs. Now we have a status update that says the detention center is working with the financial staff to perform a detailed analysis of medical costs incurred over the last 10 years. He stated he does not care about the last 10 years of what happened. We are moving forward.

No action was taken.

- b. Council Motion: Have the Administrator and EMS Director explore the possibility of a public/private relationship for EMS services in Richland County [MALINOWSKI] – No action was taken.
 - c. Council Motion: Determine if a cost savings can be obtained by leasing certain technical equipment versus purchase [MALINOWSKI] – No action was taken.
 - d. Council Motion: I move that Council get specific answers regarding the PDT's past performance and the current status of projects before moving forward with the bonding [N. JACKSON] – No action was taken.
 - e. Funding Request for Little Lake Katherine – No action was taken.
6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:18 PM.