



Richland County Council

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

October 23, 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

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Trenia Bowers, Sandra Yudice, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, John Thompson, Ismail Ozbek, James Hayes, Chris Eversmann, Nathaniel Miller, Stephen Staley, Allison Steele, Dale Welch, Michael Byrd, George Rice, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Eden Logan, and Janet Claggett

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. July 24, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as submitted.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Madden stated staff is requesting Item 4(i): “Approval to award Emergency Services Department purchase orders for Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA’s or air packs) purchase to Newton’s Fire & Safety Equipment, Inc.” be deferred to the November committee meeting.

Mr. Malinowski stated he saw information in Item 4(m): “Program Development Team Contract” that relates to Item 4(a): “The Richland Program Development Team (PDT) requests a wage rate increase for Calendar Year (CY) 2018 and retroactive payment for wage rate increases for CYs 2016 and 2017”; therefore, should Item 4(a) be included in Item 4(m) or deferred until after the committee takes up Item 4(m).

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the agenda as amended.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. The Richland Program Development Team (PDT) requests a wage rate increase for Calendar Year (CY) 2018 and retroactive payment for wage rate increases for CYs 2016 and 2017 – Mr. Livingston stated there was a request for what kind of raises staff received, as it relates to the years that were

in question. He stated, on p. 17 of the agenda, it shows that staff received a Countywide raise of 4% in 2017 and 3% raise in 2018.

Mr. Malinowski moved to deny. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to move forward without any particular recommendation.

Ms. McBride stated the last time we discussed this issue we divided it into 2 parts. There were several options we had regarding the rate increase. One was to provide rate increases for both 2016 and 2017. Then, there was another discussion regarding making it consistent with the wage increase for County employees.

Mr. Malinowski stated Sec. 8 of the contract reads, "The contractor shall be eligible for cost of wage increases." The language that says, "eligible for" does not indicate that they are entitled to such increases. They can merely be considered. To him, if you contract someone to do a particular job, within your contract there should be the wherewithal to take care of your employees. That is why you are making a contract with them. The reason he made the motion for denial is because they are guaranteed it. He thinks some of the recent information that has come to light in the media regarding one particular employee being paid \$30,000, yet we had information saying the employee received \$52,000, should raise quite a bit of question as to what is going on with all the other employees for the monies we have been given regarding salaries. That is just one out of the many that they have. And, they have not come back to tell us one way or another if it was accurate or not. To him, there are a lot of questions about the money they are getting, the salaries they are paying, and whether or not we should be considering giving raises until we resolve those matters.

Mr. C. Jackson stated although he, sort of, disagrees with what Mr. Malinowski just said, he does agree with what he what he initially tried to do, which was to have this conversation deferred until after the Executive Session where the specific contract is going to be discussed. In the discussion of the contract, there is the real possibility and potential of this matter being one of the contractual issues that will discussed. He wanted to say, before it got voted up or down, there is a possibility to not do that until after Executive Session, it might prove beneficial.

Ms. Myers inquired if the PDT can choose to, within the current profit that it makes, or bonuses and increases as it chooses, with the administrative costs that it is already being paid. She inquired if there was anything in the contract that precludes them from doing that.

Mr. Smith stated he is not aware of anything that precludes them from doing that.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, they have the flexibility, within the amounts they are already being paid, if they deem this Council has not provided increases in a way that is consistent with what they want their employees paid, they could take less profit and pay increases.

Mr. Smith stated once we have paid them, under the terms and conditions of the contract, in terms of how they use those funds, as it relates to paying their employees, would be up to them.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if their salaries were set in the original contract.

Mr. Livingston stated at 2014 rates.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if they built in anything for inflation.

Mr. Livingston stated that was contingent upon whether or not you get the raises over the time. This is why this is before us now.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his concern is, they have a contract, we gave them so much to do business. What he has seen they are making, compared to the industry, for example, the County employees, SCDOT employees, it is almost twice. When it comes to the Penny Tax money, and the public eyes and how that is spent, he just has some concern.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item until after Executive Session.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Freedom of Information Act Policy Revision – Mr. Madden stated this item is a revision to the County's current FOIA policy. It is an update to the policy, so that it is in compliance with the amendments to the State FOIA law. On p. 22, under Issues section, it outlines what the changes are, then, in the subsequent draft policy the amendments are red-lined. Staff is requesting approval, as presented.

Ms. Myers stated on p. 22, bullet #3 states, "Convicted prisoners do not have the right to request records under FOIA." Do you mean convicted felons? Do you mean incarcerated people? Who are we talking about there?

Mr. Madden stated he thinks the wording can be adjusted. He stated they are referring to individuals that are incarcerated.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, so prisoners.

Mr. Smith stated he believes they have to be convicted, as opposed to just being detainees. There is a presumption that you are innocent.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are referring to convicted felons, who are serving time, or do you mean convicted felons who have served their time. Technically, once they have served their time, this would be another burden on their rights. And, while she has been the subject of many of unwanted FOIA, for foolishness, she still does not want to infringe on people's constitutional rights and make them even further suspect, once they have served their time. Therefore, her question is, are we talking about people who have been convicted of felonies, and are vexatious because they are behind bars and have unlimited free time, or are you talking about people who have served their time and are out roaming free and harassing us because they do not like one or the other of us.

Mr. Smith stated he does not know that the current changes explicitly say that, but we can go back and make sure we get some clarification of exactly who they are talking about, as it relates to the prisoners.

Ms. Myers stated she is for as much freedom to harass elected officials, as is warranted, just so we get the right language.

Mr. Malinowski stated he has to agree with Ms. Myers on that. He stated he may be in prison even, but if he has a home and is paying his taxes, you mean he does not have the right as anyone else to make a request for information. Especially, if he is paying for it. In addition to that, on p. 26 of the

agenda, it says, “excluding weekends and ~~County holidays~~ legal public holidays)”. What if the County has some holidays that are not legal holidays? We are still not here. The staff cannot do the work and we are cutting into the days. Something else that is not mentioned in here, and we all very recently participated in, is time given off for natural disasters. If you get a couple days off in there for something like that, you are going to be in violation of your own ordinance. The last thing, is under (B) “A fee shall not be charged if the total cost to produce the record(s) is \$20.00 or less.” If you have 1,000 people coming in, and it is \$20, that’s \$20,000. It just seems that if you make the request, you pay the price regardless of what that amount is. You are taking staff time, which is taxpayers’ monies to do this for you, or whoever is making the request. Therefore, they should reimburse whatever that fee is.

Ms. McBride stated she definitely supports Ms. Myers’ comments. She inquired if this is totally different from the State law, or did you adopt it. How did we come up with this language?

Mr. Madden stated it is updating our policy so that it is compliant with State law.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, the verbiage that was used was from State law, or is the verbiage what we decided to put in.

Mr. Madden stated the additional language is similar to what was used in State law. It is essentially trying to make sure that we are compliant with the amendments the State approved.

Mr. Smith stated, if you take a look on p. 24, this is the language right out of the change, in terms of what Ms. Myers was asking about. He stated if you look at the 1st bullet, it says, “This right does not extend to individuals serving a sentence of imprisonment in a state or county correctional facility. Pre-trial detainees not yet sentenced or other persons not yet sentenced detained in a state or county correctional facility have the right to inspect or copy any public record of a public body.” That is why he indicated that he thought they were talking about people convicted, as opposed to detainees.

Ms. Myers stated, if you read that bullet, in harmony with the one on the front page, it still does not tell you what happens once someone has served their sentence. Her question is, are we adding a burden onto people who have done their time, and now are just like you and me, or is this just for people who are presently incarcerated.

Mr. Smith stated he would read it to say that you actually have to be serving a sentence.

Ms. Myers stated, so if you have already done your time, you are free to harass at will.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the revised FOIA policy and procedures, with the clarification to Sec. IV(ii) regarding holidays and the inclusion of language to cover natural disasters/storms notated by Mr. Malinowski.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Council Motion: Requesting Palmetto Health and Providence to proceed with their proposals to build a free standing emergency room facility to include an ER and outpatient care, pharmacy, clinic and other preventive healthcare services – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to allow staff to continue to entertain the proposals being put forth by Palmetto Health and Providence.

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

Mr. Livingston inquired if we know what those proposals are.

Ms. Myers stated she knows we have been asked by one or both of these groups to sign a non-disclosure agreement, so they can put together a proposal for us. Because no one has the authority to sign such a document, we cannot get the information because, obviously, people want some confidentiality to present anything to Richland County. She would think this would allow them to open discussions.

Mr. Livingston stated he thought there were already proposals.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, the last time he spoke, Mr. Pearce said there was a proposal by Palmetto Health, but they have not gotten to us yet. Mr. Pearce said they were working on something, and he had spoken to Vince Ford, and they wanted to present it to us.

Ms. Myers stated she knows that Providence has an interest as well. She would like hear all of the proposals.

Mr. Malinowski stated, like his colleagues are saying, "proceed with their proposals." He would like to know what their proposals are so we can discuss them. If it is their proposal, he is thinking, they are ones that are going to be funding the placement of this. He does not know that we should forward it to Council until we get all of this information.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to hold it in committee and request that all of this information be brought back to us at the November committee meeting.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, there is a group very interested in providing information, but they cannot without someone signing a non-disclosure agreement.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if there is a non-disclosure agreement that needs to be signed, we have to do it to get what they are proposing.

Ms. Myers made a second substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to allow staff to sign whatever non-disclosure agreement is necessary, so we can get the information to present to full Council.

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

The vote in favor of the second substitute motion was unanimous.

- d. Council Motion: Completion of an ISO study to give the County guidance on the need for and potential recommended locations of new fire stations and the proper use of/mix of volunteer and paid fire department employees in all areas of Richland County – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Myers noted that staff said the fire consultant is already putting together something, so they want us to come back after.

Mr. Madden stated the current consultant is already performing this, and that will be included in the report they present to us. He stated it is a 90-day process to complete the report.

Ms. Myers withdrew her motion. She stated the staff's analysis says they have already undertaken this, based on our prior instructions. If they have already done it, telling them to do it again is kind of a waste of time.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to hold in committee until the report is available.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Council Motion: Use of HA5 asphalt sealant to increase the life of all roads new and existing – Mr. N. Jackson stated Council was invited to look at a demonstration, at the Owens Field Airport, where they used this product on part of the road. It is very inexpensive and extends the life of the road by 10 – 15 years. A staff member called him and told him that it takes about a day or 2 to dry. He stated it would save us money because the roads last longer. It seals the road, so the cracks and the potholes do not happen in the winter when the water gets in.

Mr. Livingston stated he would have liked to have advantages or disadvantages of it, or one of the professionals would have said something about it.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to direct staff to research the use, present a cost comparison of this versus the way we are doing it now, the life spans, and bring back.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. 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 receive none. All areas pay taxes and all seniors should get the same and equal opportunity in receiving funding. I move that funding for seniors (Senior Activities) be distributed equally in all eleven districts – Mr. N. Jackson stated over the years he has seen where some senior organizations receive hundreds of thousands of dollars while others, in some areas, receive nothing. He wanted Council to be aware, so we can, at least, look for equal and fair distribution of these funds. It is not fair for one area to constantly get funds. There is one area in the City, but when you look into unincorporated and rural areas, they receive nothing. If we could come up with a formula or something so it can be equally or fairly distributed so everyone could have that opportunity, he thinks it would be a good thing. At least, we are looking for everyone and not neglecting some. He just wants staff to explore it, so we have an idea how to distribute everything to our seniors. There is one organization that started off as a one-time funding request for \$160,000, and they have been getting that for the last 10 years.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the organization services other senior organizations.

Mr. N. Jackson stated they service a certain area. He just wants it to be fair distribution, or look into it for recommendations. He is constantly told it was a one-time, but we are constantly giving them more.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Mr. N. Jackson is asking for them to apply.

Mr. N. Jackson stated they would have to apply. We are not just giving funding to organizations. There is a formula that would help us on how we distribute funds.

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, Mr. N. Jackson is asking for an evaluation of the County's distribution of funding to senior programs.

Ms. McBride stated the County needs to look at possibly providing enough funding to ensure adequate all of the districts. She supports Mr. N. Jackson motion to look at overall funding.

Mr. N. Jackson stated they would have to apply. We would not just give it to them.

Ms. McBride stated her concern is giving adequate funding for all of the entities involved with senior services that are interested.

Ms. Dickerson stated she would like to know the services. Are we talking about a comprehensive service like Meal on Wheels? Some of these organizations do not have the capacity do some of that. Her concern would be how they could partner with the one that we are talking about, and then help the others to distribute these services. She thinks if each one of these start doing Meal on Wheels, then this other organization's service to a particular area may be affected.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the COG provides funding to a lot of people.

Mr. Livingston stated we are not asking staff to make any decision, but to simply get us some information to evaluate it. Senior Resources used to be the Council on Aging for the County, and it became Senior Resources to provide service throughout this County. It is not just one little agency. They are all treated rather differently, in terms of what they do.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to direct staff to conduct an evaluation of the County's distribution of funding to senior programs and bring back the Council Retreat.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. County Council is requested to provide guidance to the staff on paving/construction of Willow Wind Road – Ms. Dickerson inquired if this item was forwarded to committee, or is it a staff initiated request.

Mr. Madden stated this is a staff initiated request.

Mr. Livingston stated staff is requesting guidance on where we are with Willow Wind Road.

Ms. Myers stated her question is the same that she always asks, for all of these dirt roads that are on our list with the Penny Project. It would shock her that we have \$500,000 to dedicate this project when we have a list of dirt roads that have been organized. And, she believes it would be blatantly unfair to select this one out, and put it ahead of all those roads on that list. She stated it is in her district. She would love to see it paved, but she would love to see it done in order, so she can honestly say to the citizens who ask her about this that we are doing this fairly and equitably. She just thinks it is surprising to have \$500,000 drawn out of the project, and assigned to a road.

Ms. Dickerson stated this is a very strong concern of hers that Mr. Eversmann could bring this before this Council, and have staff bring this before this Council, when she remembers looking at that dirt road list and this road was way down on that list. She does not know how it is going to jump ahead of all...

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

Mr. Ozbek stated we are not asking to have this in front of any other project. This is currently on the list. We do have some information to share between the Penny and the Public Works Department. We have already met with Administration and Legal, and there are some requests made. We wanted to share some information. This is not a new request. Or, it is not a request to put it up on the top. There is no time limit. It is a commitment that the County made.

Mr. Eversmann stated it is a unique situation, in which we require guidance. As Mr. Ozbek said, we are not looking jump in front of any established priority. We merely have a situation in which a particular road has, for whatever reason, has fallen through the cracks, and despite an earlier commitment by Richland County to pave it, and the continuation of that commitment, by virtue of it being included, and a budget assigned under the Penny Transportation Program. We are looking for a way to bring together past effort, current efforts, as well as ongoing development, that would be impacted by the possible negotiation of a public-private partnership to get the road paved. That is the unique situation that we are bringing before you, and asking for some guidance. It has been discussed at the Administration level. The consensus was that bringing it before Council would be the appropriate thing.

Mr. Livingston inquired Mr. Eversmann had a recommendation.

Mr. Eversmann stated they do have a recommendation from the standpoint that we believe that an improved, engineered alignment of the road is the way to go forward, which is a little bit in conflict with the procedures that are followed by the Transportation Penny Department. However, we are talking about the use of existing funds, at some time, in the future, that have already been programmed within the Transportation Penny Program.

Ms. Dickerson stated she has looked at the list of those roads. She has been working from its inception, and she cannot understand how this one, of all the roads, gets pulled out to even be brought to Council, with Mr. Eversmann's explanation. She stated this road should stay just like everybody else's road, and go right down and follow the procedures like everybody else's road. She cannot see why, if you were going to single out one road... She stated she was not voting on this committee, but she has a serious problem with that.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he can understand some concern with staff. He is not sure why it is here before us, and the reason for staff to have it here. He remembers this road well. At one time, they did not want it paved because people had horses, and it was turned down in 2006.

Mr. Eversmann stated he thinks it was earlier than that, but he knows what Mr. N Jackson is saying.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he was on the Planning Commission, and then when he got on Council in 2007, it had moved from #160 to #1. Since then there is a criteria/ranking for these roads. It depends on commercial, # of houses on the road, and as these roads grow, then it moves up the list. He is not sure if more houses have been built, or are being built on that road for it to increase in the ranking. He knows the entrance on Old Hopkins Road may be a safety concern. He does not know if that is what staff is talking about.

Mr. Eversmann stated that is part of their concern. What we are looking at, and what we, as engineers, advocate is an improved alignment to that road. That appears to be somewhat in conflict with the proceeds followed by the Transportation Penny Program of staying within the existing prescriptive easement alignment. That is one of the issues that we are seeking to address. He wants to reiterate, what Mr. Ozbek referenced, nowhere in the briefing document will you see any sort of a hint of a staff recommendation of bumping up the priority, or anything like that. In fact, to the

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

contrary we actually stated that there is no time constraint associated with the existing granting of the right of way, with regards to improvements.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the reason he came to that conclusion, as a retired highway design engineer, he knows in the area that is where he has concern. And, staff is saying that is part of theirs. When it comes to safety, he always supports those situations because he does not want anyone to die or get involved in an accident because we neglect safety procedures. Once it has been discussed, that there is a safety issue, and we decide not to do it then we are potentially liable because we knew about the situation and did not correct it. At that point, at that intersection, he has concerns, but the rest of the road paving should go with the criteria.

Ms. Myers stated we have a Transportation Ad Hoc Committee for just this kind of thing. She thinks this is properly before that committee, and not this one. She thinks it is asking a lot for us to make a decision on the Transportation Penny budget, that Mr. C. Jackson is charged to bring out of committee for recommendation to Council. Somehow this road found its way onto someone's desk. For every issue that Mr. N. Jackson points out, in terms of roads needing assistance, she could give you 100 with little old ladies, over 80 years old, living on them. She thinks it is patently unfair to be taking this one...for this to be before us, given the magnitude of what we know we have to do with the Penny, and the sparse nature of the funding that is left, she thinks it is galling to even be looking at making sure that we segregate this money out, whenever this road comes up. So this \$500,000 will be sitting and waiting on it. Segregate money out for all the little old ladies that need their roads paved. She has said this repeatedly; she is real exercised over this dirt road paving project because there are a lot of people who were promised that their roads were going to get paved through this penny. We have gotten through 1/100th of the list, if that many. For us to be looking at this road, as separate and apart from everybody else's road, in her opinion, is very unfair.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to forward the matter to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee, and that the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee take this matter up with the list of the other roads that we want paved.

Mr. Malinowski stated, while Mr. Eversmann gave a very eloquent and diplomatic opening statement, the fact of the matter to him is, when you look at the maps provided on pp. 64 – 65, leaving Willow Wind Road where it currently is does not allow for the development of numerous lots of the planned development, but if you relocate the road, as you are saying, all of a sudden we have about 15 additional lots that can be built by a developer. So who is this really benefitting, the residents currently there or a developer?

Mr. Eversmann stated, he understands the point, he does not think that the question of benefit is exclusive to a developer or the public, at large, in this case. He would point out that the alignment of the road, in the plans that were developed by the Public Works Department, under the "C-Fund" program in the early 2000s, determined what a good alignment for the road should be, and based on that the developer subsequently designed around.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many dollars on the Penny Tax Referendum were allocated for this road.

Mr. Eversmann stated, his understanding from Dr. Thompson, is \$491,000.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

- h. Richland County Coroner's Request for Generator – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the pursuit of the grant by the Coroner's Department and acceptance of the grant, if awarded.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- i. Approval to award Emergency Services Department purchase orders for Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA's or air packs) purchase to Newton Fire & Safety Equipment, Inc. – This item was deferred to the November committee meeting.
- j. Approval to award Emergency Services Department open purchase orders for supplies and services needed for the operations of the Emergency Services Department. Funds are available in the FY 2018-2019 budget. No additional funds are needed. – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Purchase Orders and Contracts for equipment and services.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- k. Use of existing capital bond proceeds for fund architectural, engineering and design studies and to purchase equipment for the County's GIS (geographic information systems) program – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve a Resolution authorizing the expenditure of \$1,869,668 of the unspent proceeds remaining from the pursuit of Richland Renaissance for the purchase GIS program servers (\$350,000), the design of the revised Lower Richland Sewer Plan (up to \$750,000), the architectural and engineering evaluation of the County's Columbia Place Mall properties (up to \$400,000) and the body worn cameras (\$369,668).

Mr. Malinowski stated somewhere in here it said there was \$2 million remaining from bonds proceeds, but are those strictly for these things, or is \$2 million for a lot of other things in here. There was more than one item that keep saying we are going to use the capital bond proceeds. He stated we are going to run out of the \$2 million.

Mr. Madden stated there was \$2.2 million remaining in the bond proceeds, that were originally set aside for Richland Renaissance.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we don't need dollars to upfit these buildings that we are going to be using over at the mall. He inquired about the cost we have there.

Mr. Madden stated, pursuant to the bond ordinance, it was dedicated specifically for Richland Renaissance, to use it for another purpose, if it is unspent proceeds, it has to come back to Council. If you look at the items we are looking at spending the funds, particularly the architectural and engineering evaluation of the County's Columbia Place Mall properties, that funding is tied to that, so we want to use the remaining funds for that purpose, along with the other three.

Mr. Malinowski inquired what happens when the architectural and engineering evaluation, for that property, comes back and its says you need \$500,000 to put it where it needs to be. We do not have it now because we are spending it on this other stuff.

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

Mr. Maddens stated, as he understands it, the staff's intent, once the studies are completed, is to come back with our financial advisor, bond counsel and our internal financial team, and present an overall funding mechanism to fund it completely.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the body worn cameras, which are a yearly expense. He thought when we approved those they were approved for the entire 5-year contract.

Mr. Madden stated, typically, we use existing funds that were already budgeted. This would allow us to use the remaining funds, and free up those budgeted funds to serve other needs that the County may have throughout the fiscal year. It is just reusing funds that are just sitting there for capital purchases.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we can get any specifics regarding these body worn cameras. How many times, from that camera, it has been used for a court situation?

Mr. Madden stated this is a part of a contractual obligation that we entered into. This is year 3.

In Favor: Myers, N. Jackson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- i. Sheriff's Purchase of Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs) and In-Car Cameras – Mr. Madden stated, as you may recall, during the last Council meeting, Council approved assigning a specific amount of dollars for this purpose. It was in the assigned fund balance. What we are asking now, is to allocate those dollars to actually purchase these items.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the allocation and expenditure of the assigned funds for the purchase of mobile data terminals (MDTs) and in-car cameras for the Sheriff's Department vehicles.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many cars the Sheriff's Department has.

Staff responded there are 650 cars.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- m. Program Development Team Contract [Executive Session] – Ms. Dickerson stated this item may take some time. You might want to adjourn and then reconvene.

Mr. Livingston stated the agenda does not say the meeting is going to last until a certain time. It says it is going to start at 6:00. We should be okay going into Executive Session.

Ms. Dickerson stated, but if you go until 7:00, you will be into another meeting.

Ms. Myers stated the meeting was cancelled.

Ms. Dickerson stated the meeting was cancelled, but, the fact of the matter, is that is the allotted time.

Mr. Livingston stated our agenda says our meeting starts at 6:00. It does not say it ends at a certain time, so we can stop whenever we want to stop.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if that is correct.

Mr. Livingston stated if we do not have another meeting to interfere with it.

Ms. Dickerson stated Mr. Livingston probably needs to clarify that because she is not sure.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he thought each committee was allocated an hour.

Mr. Smith stated the Council's committees are allocated an hour, based on the fact that you had Zoning Public Hearing at 7:00. It is his understanding that Zoning Public Hearing for this evening has been cancelled. He was looking at the Rules. The Rules, while it has a starting time, as Mr. Livingston said, there is not a time that it says it ends. However, it has customarily been an hour because you had another meeting. What he would simply suggest that we go forward with the last item on the agenda, and finish that item.

Mr. Malinowski stated, when he got word that the Zoning Public Hearing was cancelled, he made an appointment for 7:15, knowing that this always ended at 7:00, so he will not be here.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he did also.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if the Executive Session item, is an essential item that has to be taken up tonight. He stated he has 2 committee members that say they are not going to be here.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there will still be a quorum.

Mr. Livingston stated this is an important item, and he would rather have the full committee, if possible. He inquired as to when the next meeting is.

Ms. Dickerson stated November 13th.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there are any suggestions.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to go into Executive Session.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to adjourn.

In Favor: Malinowski and N. Jackson

Opposed: Myers, Livingston and McBride

The substitute motion failed.

In Favor: Myers, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and N. Jackson

The vote was in favor of going into Executive Session.

Administration and Finance

October 23, 2018

-12-

***The Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 7:02 PM
and came out at approximately 7:53 PM***

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Myers, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor of coming out of Executive Session was unanimous.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to allow staff to move forward with mediation, as previously agreed and discussed in Executive Session.

Mr. Livingston stated, he thinks, there was one thing incorporated that was not before, and that was someone from staff.

Mr. Smith stated, what we talked about, was to get with them to ensure that, if they were requesting the presence of anyone, other than the attorneys, that we agree upon who would be appropriate.

In Favor: Myers, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to reduce, within the confines of the current PDT contract, the minority participation percentage from 51% to 39%, which would work, by operation, relief from the penalty. This only applies to the duration of the current contract.

In Favor: Myers, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation to increase the salaries, consistent with the contract, and consistent with the County's raises for FY 17 - 18.

In Favor: Myers, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED**

- a. Council Motion: The Lourie Center recently lost funding from United Way necessary to continue operating a program that transports seniors to medical appointments and essential shopping. They are requesting Council provide \$12K in additional funding so that this program can continue [PEARCE] – No action was taken on this item.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:57 p.m.