



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
May 23, 2019 – 3:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Dalhi Myers, Vice Chair; Joyce Dickerson, Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Gwen Kennedy, Bill Malinowski, Jim Manning, Yvonne McBride, Chakisse Newton, Allison Terracio and Joe Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Sandra Yudice, Kim Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Tim Nielsen, Stacey Hamm, Quinton Epps, Portia Easter, Wendy Davis, James Hayes, Dwight Hanna, O’Jetta Bryant, Tyler Kirk, Steven Gaither, Nathaniel Miller, Randy Pruitt, David Bertolini, Rokey Sulman, Ismail Ozbek, Dale Welch, Dan Kim, Clayton Voignier, Michael Niermeier, Bryant Davis, Beverly Harris and Shahid Khan

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 PM.
2. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Livingston requested to move the grants portion off the agenda until after the “Debt Service Funds”.

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

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **SECOND READING**

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Recommended: \$15,243,965)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund the Richland County Recreation Commission at \$15,243,965, as recorded on the motions list.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the millage rate for this item is \$13 million.

Mr. Hayes stated the numbers they were given were dollar amounts. They do not have the associated millage.

Mr. Brawley stated, at this point, the cap dollar amount is what the Auditor’s Office has provided to Mr. Hayes. He stated we are not doing the millage rate today.

Mr. Walker stated, for clarification, the \$15,243,965 is representative of taking the millage to the cap.

Mr. Brawley responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Walker made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to fund the Richland County Recreation Commission at \$14,819,565.

Ms. McBride inquired as to the amount of millage the Recreation Commission is entitled to.

Mr. Hayes stated he believes it is 5 mills, and their current millage rate is 13.5 mills.

Ms. McBride stated she has concerns that we have no input. Constituents are having limited input. She has tried to discuss issues with the Recreation Commission about an issue that she has had for a number of years, and nothing has been done. She is really concerned about giving additional money until they are willing to work with Council and addressing some of constituents' needs. Additionally, money was put in the bond for Greenview 7 years ago, and she would like to know where that money is. She stated she has an issue with parking on Shakespeare Road, and she has reached out and no one has contacted her.

Ms. Dickerson stated she got several requests, at her Community Forum this past weekend, from people in the community about their rates to use the parks are increasing significantly.

Ms. Lakita Watson, Recreation Commission Executive Director, stated she stepped into this position in July 2018, and it has been somewhat challenging because she is playing catch up. However, as it relates to the concerns expressed by Ms. McBride, she apologized that they had never had a conversation or scheduled a meeting. She stated she has had an opportunity to speak with many of the Council members about their concerns, and she believes they have been much more responsive than the previous Administration. They presented to the Board, this past week, a full capital improvement budget. That is something that the Commission has never had. It is very difficult for projects to be identified, that are capital projects, when you do not have a plan. The particular site, that Ms. McBride is speaking of, is included in their plan. Council does not have a copy, as of yet, because the approval has to be done by the Board before she can bring it to you. It is not a part of the current operating budget, as operating budget and capital budgets are different budgets, so the budget you have before you does not have any major capital improvements, which would include the requested parking lot. Once they verified the property was that of the Commission, that is when they decided it was important. They recognized the numbers, at that site, and they are moving forward with doing a parking lot at that facility. As it relates to the concerns brought to Ms. Dickerson's attention, they are not increasing fees. They have identified the importance of consistency with all of the citizens that utilize the facilities. The one policy that was just revised was that for independent contracted instructors. They are requiring them to do background checks, to have a business license, as well as their certifications. If you are going to teach the citizens, there may be a slight increase, but that is the price of doing business. It is important to her that they have the right people, who are qualified, and have the right backgrounds, utilizing the facilities. They are working with them, and have identified opportunities for them to continue to be in the facilities, but they have been no increases in fees.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, it is his recollection, in the past, was that Council would discuss the budget, and we would not have people come to the podium to give their input. If there is someone from an organization that disagrees with what was said, they need to make Council aware of it via an email after the fact.

Ms. McBride stated the issues is the budget, the work that is being done, and the constituent needs, regardless of which budget it is in. The issue has not been addressed, and has not been addressed

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

for years. She contacted the Recreation Commission, and it was her understanding, that it would not be in this year's budget. She stated she cannot wait for another 2 – 4 years to have this done.

Ms. Myers noted in the Recreation Commission budget there is a line item that reads bonds. She inquired if those are legacy bonds, and do we know what year they are from.

Mr. Hayes stated he does not know.

Ms. Myers stated her question is whether or not those bonds have been mobilized for the projects for which they were encumbered. Obviously, you cannot hold bonds forever and not use or roll them over into operating expenses. She would like for someone to follow-up and find out what the bonds were procured for, when they were procured, if we have earned interest on them and there is any kind of penalty.

Ms. Kennedy stated she has brought it to the State representative's attention that she resents the idea that we provide funding and have little or no say so in the operations.

Ms. Dickerson stated, with all due respect, she is here for the budget and if she needs a question answered, she does not care where it comes from she needs to be able to get her answer. If the person is here to address it, she wants it.

Mr. Livingston stated Ms. Dickerson's point is well taken. If she, or any other Council member, need an answer, specific to the budget question, we will get it.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Walker, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning and Livingston

The substitute motion failed.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Kennedy, Walker and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

- 2. Columbia Area Mental Health (Recommended: \$2,196,520)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to fund Columbia Area Mental Health at \$2,196,520, as listed on the motions list.

Ms. Myers inquired, if the number, that has been presented, encapsulates mental health treatment specifically targeted at youth in crisis, and, if so, what percentage of the mental health treatment, that we are providing, is going to people under 18.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myer, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 3. Public Library (Recommended: \$29,391,764; Requested: \$29,952,764)** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund the Public Library at \$29,391,764.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

Mr. Jackson inquired, with the funds that are being allocated by the General Assembly, how does that impact the funding for the library.

Ms. Melanie Huggins, Executive Director, stated they do not know exactly what those funds are, to date, so they have an estimate in their revenue sources. There are limited things they can put those to. They try to put those towards books, materials, and people.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if the number, they are requesting from the County, reflective of an estimate.

Ms. Huggins stated it is an estimate, based on historic information.

Mr. Jackson inquired, when they find out the amount, will there be an adjustment downward.

Ms. Huggins responded in the affirmative. The funding comes in installment. They also do not know if they will receive lottery funds. The funding is usually put back into the book budget, since the book budget is cut at the beginning of each budget cycle.

Ms. Myers stated, to the extent that the budget, that has been requested, has a hard and fast number for the current year. The Library, like most agencies, has a fund balance. The fund balance is a little less than half of the fund request. She inquired if they are mobilizing any of the fund balance to offset the request they are making in the current year, and, if so, what amounts.

Ms. Huggins stated they do not use their fund balance for operating funds, and does not impact the operating request. They have used their fund balance, and continue to use it, for capital. In the past, they have replaced all of their lights with energy efficient lighting. They have used some of the fund balance to finish out capital projects. They are using the fund balance to finish the Lower Richland Library currently being built. They do not have a plan, other than they plan to expand the Lower Richland Library, at some point. They are very intentional in spending the money in the year it is give, and not adding to the fund balance, if they can help it. Some of their fund balance is restricted for up to 3 months of emergency operations.

In Favor: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

4. ***Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Recommended: \$2,346,566)*** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to fund the Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens at \$2,346,566.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. ***Midlands Technical College – Operating (Recommended: \$6,395,115)*** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund Midlands Technical College – Operating at \$6,395,115.

In Favor: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

Abstain: Livingston

The vote was in favor with Mr. Livingston abstaining from the vote.

6. **Midlands Technical College – Capital (Recommended: \$3,423,854)** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund Midlands Technical College – Capital at \$3,423,854.

In Favor: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Livingston

The vote was in favor with Mr. Livingston abstaining from the vote.

7. **School District One (Recommended: \$232,915,525; Requested: \$244,161,524)** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to fund School District One at \$244,161,524.

Ms. Myers stated, it was her understanding, they had modified their request and they were no longer asking for the look back amount, and the request from the School District is \$232 million.

Mr. Ed Carlen, Chief Operations and Budget, and Dr. Craig Witherspoon, Superintendent, addressed the budget request. Mr. Carlen stated they are not looking for the look back, but the numbers did not change.

Ms. Myers inquired, for clarification, if they are asking to go above the cap.

Mr. Carlen stated, they think their mill value will be higher in October.

Ms. Myers inquired, what if the mill value is not higher at that time, what would we do?

Mr. Carlen stated, if they do not get it, they will come back in October, but that is what they need for their budget, at this time.

Ms. Myers stated they are making their estimate based on a projection. She inquired if this is the projection from Mr. Brawley, at this time, or is this the School District's projection.

Mr. Carlen stated that is their projection.

Ms. Myers inquired, for clarification, if the number Mr. Brawley has provided, is the current estimate of what the millage will come in at. She requested Mr. Brawley to explain the difference between the estimate the School District is giving and the numbers he has provided.

Mr. Brawley stated he is not aware of where the School District is getting their numbers. He stated what his office is doing is looking at what the assessed property values are. This year is a reassessment year, and, as a result, the Assessor is having problems with giving him new construction and ATIs. His office has based their projections off of a 5-year trend. Looking at what has happened historically, in School District 1, they believe the cap will be \$232,915,525.

Ms. Myers inquired, for clarification, if Mr. Brawley's estimate has taken into account that this is a reassessment, and he is projecting out for that.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

Mr. Brawley responded in the affirmative. He stated, in a reassessment year, they are reassessing the existing property values, so the property values are going up. As a result of property values going up, to protect the taxpayers, the millage rate will be rolled back, so the school districts will start from an even platform. Then, they will take the millage forward with the CPI and growth.

Ms. Myers inquired as to the correctness of the School District's projection vs. the Auditor's projection.

Mr. Brawley stated, based on the estimates they have, and the 5-year trend analysis, this is what they think the millage rate will generate, based on the mill rate, which equates to an approximately \$5 million - \$6 million increase.

Mr. Manning stated, some of us will recall, that for many years, we would go through this every year with the budget. Then, there was always a motion made that addressed, that if the millage changed and it was a different number, they would get the higher number. If it did not, then they would be left with the lower number. He inquired if there is some reason we could not have that before us to deal with the issues, and questions, being asked now.

Ms. Newton stated, looking at these estimates, one of her questions is, when you look at the FY20 requested budget, is that number including the look back they requested in the document provided to Council.

Mr. Carlen stated they are not requesting look back. They got look back last year, so there is no look back available.

Ms. McBride stated Mr. Manning addressed her concern. If we did not have the money, they could not get the requested amount anyway. Mr. Manning's recommendation would address that issue.

Ms. Newton stated, she understands, if we fund based on the revenues we are expecting. But, if we fund at a higher number, and, then say, if less money comes, they get less money, how does that work from a payment perspective. This seems like a complicated transaction.

Mr. Hayes stated the Treasurer will remit the funding that millage rate brings in. The issue would be, if they base their budget on a higher number, would be take a gamble. They would be budgeting expenditures at a rate higher than those revenues would generate.

Ms. Terracio stated she is a proud Richland I parent, and she is exciting about funding the School District this year. She stated, when she thinks about the budget for the School District, she is thinking about money that is going directly into the benefit of students and teachers. She would like to know a little more detail about how much money is being spent on technological platforms and products (i.e. Parent Portal, School Messenger, etc.). She is currently working with a robust platform, and learning all of its bells and whistles, so she knows how these things go. She wondered if there is any kind of duplication of function across the platforms, and if there could be any efficiencies found.

Mr. Carlen stated, based on what they spend on the student's laptops and software, it is a large number, but the exact number they would have to provide back to you.

Dr. Witherspoon stated they have student software, remediation programs, but there are other software technologies that support that from the backend and network sides.

Ms. Newton stated, while they are providing that additional information to address Ms. Terracio's question, she would be interested in seeing a more granular look at the budget, and where things are going. She is particularly interested in how the budget tracks to the strategic plan.

Dr. Witherspoon stated the Board just approved a revised strategic plan, and they are officially rolling that out in the Fall. There will be dashboards and platforms that can measure. He would argue everything they do in the district is aligned to their strategic plan, in terms of student options, opportunities and outcomes, as well as supporting the teachers and staff.

Ms. McBride stated, we speak of the "digital divide", and we say in the rural areas there is no internet. Right here in the city, we have students going home that cannot use their computers when they get home because they do not have internet access. She would like to see the ability for students, that do not have internet services, to have that built in.

Dr. Witherspoon stated they are working on that, and has been a concern. Their IT and Partnership Office has been working with some wireless providers that would assist with hotspots in several areas. They have put them on over 100 buses. Some of the providers are bringing their prices down. Right now, it is a significant cost, but they are trying to work to bring some of that cost down so they can provide internet access.

Mr. Jackson stated, last year, in October, we got a request from Richland I, which reflected the new numbers. As a result of the new rates, we made the appropriate adjustment. He certainly would understand, if Council would consider that this year. It would not harm the School District because it would not cause them to gamble with the future of education, based upon funding they may or may not get, and we could move this conversation along.

Ms. Dickerson stated she wanted to piggyback on what Mr. Jackson said. Her concern is approving \$244 million, and then us only get \$230 million. She stated she does not have a problem with them coming back and adjusting the budget, if necessary.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, Mr. Jackson is suggesting that approving the cap, per the Auditor, with the understanding that, if the number is higher, we will make that adjustment, at that time.

Mr. Jackson stated he would issue that in the form of a substitute motion, and approve \$232,915,525 in funding. Ms. Dickerson seconded the substitute motion.

Ms. Myers requested the total number of students.

Mr. Carlen stated there are 24,000 students.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the motion is that we will fund at the current cap, but if the millage number comes in higher, we will revisit it.

Mr. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Livingston

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

The vote was in favor with Mr. Livingston abstaining from the vote.

- 8. School District Two (Recommended: \$158,482,974)** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to fund School District Two at \$158,482,974.

Ms. Myers inquired as to the total enrollment.

Mr. Miley, Chief Financial Officer, stated it is 28,565, and they are currently growing by about 300 – 350 students per year.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that their budget request does not ask for the cap.

Mr. Miley stated they are requesting the cap, which is the Auditor’s estimate.

Ms. McBride inquired about the percentage of students that receive free lunch.

Mr. Miley stated it is approximately 48 – 49%.

Ms. McBride inquired what the percentage of students receive free lunch in School District I.

Dr. Witherspoon stated it is approximately 75%.

In Favor: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Jackson

The vote was in favor, with Mr. Jackson abstaining from the vote.

GRANTS

- 9. Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$560,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the A-Tax Committee recommendation of \$560,000.

Ms. McBride inquired if the \$560,000 is the amount budgeted for this program.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers inquired if there are 2 line items for the CVB. One for \$250,000 and one for \$50,000.

Mr. Hayes stated they have 2 arms. They have the Convention Center, itself; then, they have the Columbia Regional Sports Council (dba Experience Columbia).

Mr. Jackson stated this is the document that he was referencing earlier when he talked about having the multiple funding sources be made available. He stated, if he is reading this correctly, the Columbia City Ballet and the Columbia Classic Ballet, both are asking for \$100,000 and \$125,000, respectively, and the recommendation is \$0.00.

Mr. Hayes stated the Accommodations Tax Committee did not recommend for them to get any A-Tax funding.

Mr. Jackson stated he knows that several Council members contribute to both of those organizations, so he wants to make sure that is noted, and that we know. If, in fact, they are not going to be getting any A-Tax funds, it would be good to know what other funds they are getting. He would challenge the committee, going forward, that if an organization received funding one year and was getting zero the next year, that we are made aware of what other dollars they are receiving.

Mr. Livingston stated he had the same concern with the Columbia Music Festival.

Ms. Myers inquired who was on the committee.

Mr. Kirk stated the A-Tax Committee consists of 5 citizens appointed by County Council. Those individuals are involved in the accommodations industry.

Ms. Myers inquired what the fund balance would be, if Council took the recommendations of the A-Tax Committee.

Mr. Hayes stated A-Tax has a limited fund balance. Typically, all of the A-Tax funding is used, but it currently has \$31,000.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, this is the anticipated revenue, and the recommendation would be for the \$560,000.

Ms. McBride inquired if these grant funds are competitive.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride stated, when you do a grant, and its competitive, the groups come in and they evaluate them. We have authorized them to evaluate, and decide on the funding for the grants, so that was the decision made, based on the competitive grant funding. She did recognize, in the Hospitality Tax, these same organizations receive some funding.

Mr. Jackson stated that is why it is important to find out how many sources they are receiving funding from, which was his question.

Mr. Hayes stated they will send the matrix out again tomorrow, so Council can take a look at it.

Mr. Jackson stated he questions the matrix that was sent out because, for example, it shows the Auntie Karen Foundation received \$9,000 in H-Tax Grant funding. He knows they got far more than that because he gave them money.

Mr. Hayes stated the document list the FY20 funding numbers. For clarification, Mr. Jackson wants the funding numbers for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Jackson responded in the affirmative. He stated, that way, when he looks at the sheet, and we see that the Columbia City Ballet is not getting any money, but he sees they received "X" number of dollars across the funding source, he does not feel as bad.

Mr. Hayes stated they set up based off of the budget process. They will provide the same information, but do it for FY19.

In Favor: Terracio, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson and Myers

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to provide \$10,000 each for the Columbia City Ballet and Columbia Classic Ballet out of the Accommodations Tax fund balance.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment to provide \$10,000 to the Black Pages out of the Accommodations Tax fund balance.

Mr. Manning accepted the friendly amendment.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and Livingston

Opposed: Malinowski

Abstain: McBride

The vote was in favor.

- 10. Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies; \$2,001,743) NOTE: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, EdVenture and Township** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund the Ordinance Agencies at \$2,001,743.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment to fund EdVenture at the requested amount of \$400,000.

Ms. Dickerson inquired about how much we go up on the Ordinance Agencies.

Mr. Hayes stated they kept the funding at the same level as in FY19.

Ms. Newton inquired what the H-Tax fund balance is.

Mr. Hayes stated it is \$14.9 million.

Ms. McBride stated this is similar to the other issues that were discussed, in terms of the additional funding that they get. She knows all these agencies get H-Tax funds from the Council, so we are back to a similar situation.

Mr. Jackson stated, under Hospitality Tax, Mr. Manning sponsored a motion to rollover the remaining unallocated H-Tax funds from District 8. He inquired if we should all be doing that.

Mr. Livingston stated that is what we did last time.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning and Livingston

Opposed: Malinowski

Abstain: Dickerson and McBride

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

The vote was in favor.

- 11. Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations; \$500,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the \$50,000 in H-Tax Committee recommendations.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 12. Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY18 level; \$255,091) NOTE: Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Visitor's Bureau & Columbia International Festival** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$255,091 for the Special Promotions Agencies; \$67,895 for SERCO and \$75,000 for Famously Hot New Year.

Ms. Myers stated, when you got the same amount that is with the H-Tax Committee, and then all the same groups take up all the money, the small groups are left with no access. She stated we might need to consider, in the future, that if it is H-Tax you collect once from H-Tax and not every time H-Tax is allocated.

Mr. Hayes stated it would require a policy change by Council, so that a group that gets full Council approval is not eligible to get money from the committee.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Livingston made a good point that may be less than half of what they are getting from other places. She stated her point would be that we need to consider whether or not we want to fully fund them at the level other places are funding them. But to allow them to dip several times from the same "pot" makes the allowable grants to other agencies that do not have the might of the CVB to put together that application.

Mr. Jackson stated a small non-profit that is only asking for a little bit of money gets zero because all the money is taken up. If we were continuing to give, for example, EdVenture \$400,000, they would not need to get any more money from Council members individually. It would then open up the door for Ridgewood Baptist Church's Non-Profit entity to get the \$1,500 they need to help with their Summer Camp.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Manning stated maybe this is something A&F Committee can do. The way the Budget Committee got established was, we would have discussions like this. Great discussions about a way to go through and figure out all these little pots of money for the CVB, and put it all in here because they are Special Promotions. There are only 2 things that have made that category. It never happened, but the attempt was for that committee to meet before the August recess, while it was still fresh in everybody's mind. What happens is, we get here and we do not remember what we talked about last year, and more than likely, we are going to be here again next

year, and we will never have gotten this addressed. Most organizations, when they have something really big, they do an after action meeting and they talk about what were lessons learned; what will we do different next time, but they do not have the after action meeting in the middle of the event next year.

- 13. Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level; \$67,895)** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.
- 14. Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project (\$250,000)** – Mr. Manning stated this goes back to the earlier question about the Renaissance. He thinks this blight removal is part of Renaissance. We have funded it for the past 2 years, and last Fall there was a motion about moving forward with this. He does not know if any monies have been spent, but he is favorable for us to move ahead with this.

Mr. Hayes stated Council approved a pot of money for this during the last Biennium, but none of those funds were expended in FY19.

Mr. Manning, moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$250,000 for the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project.

Mr. Manning requested staff to research the prior action(s) on this matter.

Ms. Dickerson suggested tracking the motions that are made, so they know the status of them.

Mr. Jackson suggested adding a column to the document that will allow staff to track the motions throughout the year.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment that requires, within 60 days of the approval of the budget, that staff bring Council back a plan to mobilize the funds and immediately begin to remediate blight across the County.

Mr. Hayes requested clarification on Mr. Jackson's suggestion for tracking the motions.

Mr. Jackson stated he was trying to simplify it for staff, so as we go through the budget motions, as each item is voted on it is notated the action that was taken.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 15. Approval of Historical Corridor funding level (\$372,715)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$372,715 for the Historical Corridor, and that within 60 days of the approval of the budget, that staff bring Council back a plan to mobilize the funds.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level; \$75,000) – This item was incorporated into the motion on Item #12.

17. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level; \$1,813,350) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$1,813,350 for the Councilmember H-Tax allocations.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote was in favor.

18. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Conservation Commission funding level) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the Conservation Commission funding level.

Mr. Jackson stated he noted the Conservation Commission has not asked for the \$75,000 that we previously gave them for Pinewood Lake, and there was such a controversy over the administration of. Nor is there any allocation for the Pinewood Lake Property.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote was in favor.

19. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level; \$150,000) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$150,000 in contingency reserve funding.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote was in favor.

20. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level/Cost Allocation; \$4,485,000) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$4,485,000 for the Transfer Out/Cost Allocations.

Mr. Hayes stated there are 2 parts to this. One part is cost allocation that goes to the General Fund, and the other part is transferred to the Debt Service Fund to repay the 2013 Refunding Bond.

Ms. Hamm stated the 2013 Refunding Bond that refunded 2007A and 2007B Hospitality Bonds, which were used to purchase the Farmer's Market, \$9 Million for Recreation land, and other land purchases. Some were repaid, and the rest was refunded.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote was in favor.

- 21. Hospitality Tax (Move to rollover remaining unallocated funds from H-Tax District 8; \$9,000) [MANNING]** – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to rollover remaining unallocated fund from H-Tax for all Council districts.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, this would also apply to all funds that were not claimed. If you have notified an agency, and they have not spent it, we are rolling those funds over as well.

Mr. Hayes stated Mr. Manning's motion was for Council's unallocated H-Tax funding. Council can amend it to say that any funds that are left over from a group that did not spend it, like was done in FY18.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment to include funds that were allocated, but unspent, so they can be reallocated.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, that what we are referring to is rolling over either unused and unallocated or allocated and unclaimed discretionary H-Tax dollars.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 22. Community Conservation Grants (RCCC Community Conservation Grants; \$80,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$80,000 for the RCCC Community Conservation Grants.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 23. Historic Grants (RCCC Recommended Historic Preservation Grants; \$170,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$170,000 for the RCCC Historic Preservation Grants.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 24. *Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants Committee; \$55,184)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve \$55,184 for the Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants. In addition, to approve the funding for the following neighborhood associations that made it far enough to get in the book, and on the page, but did not have everything exactly right in their application: \$1,500 – Atlas Road Community Organization; \$1,500 – Denny Terrace; \$1,492.48 – Folkstone Community Association; \$1,497.83 – Greater Woodfield Community Association; and \$1,500 – Washington Park Association. The County will receive all required grant application information for the organization, prior to disbursement of the funds.

Mr. Malinowski stated we go through this every year where Council members come up and add items afterward. Regardless of the reason why they did not make it, there is a process to be followed. If they did not qualify through the process, then what reward or benefit is there to all of those that did follow the process and qualify.

Ms. Newton inquired what the financial implication be if Mr. Manning’s motion were passed.

Mr. Hayes stated it would pull from funds that have not been allocated, but would not increase the budget.

Ms. Newton inquired if there are funds available because enough people apply for them.

Mr. Hayes stated, he was told, prior to Ms. Hamm and himself coming on board, the Neighborhood staff were not told how much money was available.

Ms. Terracio stated, she assumes, if these neighborhood associations are awarded these funds that they will proceed with doing everything they need to do to qualify for the funds before the funds are transferred.

Mr. Manning stated that is a part of the motion, and he hopes that staff would follow the motion.

Mr. Livingston inquired if these neighborhoods submitted applications.

Mr. Voignier stated the neighborhoods did submit applications, but they were missing some documentation. Staff will ensure that they provide whatever documentation needed.

In Favor: Terracio, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: Jackson

The vote was in favor.

- 25. *Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (I move that the following neighborhoods be funded as reflected by the requested amounts printed in the Budget Book for FY20 Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants with the understanding that the County receives all required grant application information: Atlas Road Community Organization - \$1,500; Denny Terrace - \$1,500; Folkstone Community Association - \$1,492.48; Greater Woodfield Community Association -***

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

\$1,497.83; and Washington Park Association - \$1,500) [MANNING] – This item was incorporated into the previous motion.

Mr. Hayes stated there were 3 organizations that were a part of LumpSum Appropriations, in different funds, that he wanted to be sure was on the record. Keep the Midlands Beautiful and the Congaree Riverkeeper were already discussed, but the Chamber of Commerce BRAC, which is funded in Non-Department, for \$53,000 was not discussed. The funding was approved in the General Fund, but he wanted to make sure Council was aware.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve \$53,000 for the Chamber of Commerce – BRAC.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

GENERAL FUND

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Manning inquired as to what time the meeting was called to order.

Mr. Livingston stated it was called to order at 3:00 PM.

Mr. Manning stated he was in receipt of Council Memo 5-2, dated today, May 23, 2019, sent at 3:04 PM regarding the Biennial Budget II – General Fund and Conservative Projections, which was sent to Elected and Appointed Officials. He expressed concern, that after we initiate this meeting, that we are receiving a Council Memorandum and that Elected and Appointed Officials are receiving are receiving this same communication, after we have called to order the 2nd Reading of the Budget.

26. County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions; FY20 - \$172,670,127; FY1 - \$176,268,522) – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to fund Council Services at \$811,406,000.

Mr. Jackson stated he is struggling, after last week's meeting, when we got the information regarding some other issues with fund balance. His challenge is, there is a requested amount, in almost every case, that is greater than the Administration's recommendation. The question is, is Administration's recommendation based upon a balanced budget.

Mr. Hayes stated Council typically votes the General Fund as a total, and not each department. To answer Mr. Jackson's question, the recommendation is based off what the General Fund would be able to support. As he mentioned during the work session, because we were facing some challenges, and we tried to make employee compensation an issue, we were not able to entertain any additional operating requests. No department suffered an operating loss. In most cases, you will find that department's personnel budget increased to account for making the budget whole, from a personnel standpoint. Council can certainly make motions to increase a department's budget, but the line item total is for the General Fund, as a whole.

Mr. Jackson made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Newton, to fund the County Departments at \$172,670,127.

Mr. Walker requested a friendly amendment to the motion, to allow the Sheriff to rollover unused FY19 funding to FY 20 and FY21, to cover additional expenditures, so long as it does not represent a staffing increase.

Mr. Jackson accepted Mr. Walker's friendly amendment.

Ms. Myers stated, at the last meeting, she asked questions about the fund balance. The information was provided, as requested. She noticed in the General Fund Fund Balance, assuming that we adopt, for this year, Council's recommendation, for where the fund balance should be (i.e. 35%), that would put us at \$49 million. We are over that by a reasonable amount of \$3 million.

Ms. Hamm stated the General Fund Fund Balance is projected to be approximately \$45 million. The target is 25%, which equates to approximately \$39 million.

Ms. Myers stated we have, in many of the departments, as well, fund balance that almost equal the department's request for the next year.

Ms. Hamm stated all of the Special Revenue Funds have fund balance.

Ms. Myers stated she is support of the Administrator's recommendation, but she would add a caveat that, for the funds where the fund balance itself is more than the recommended balance, that those funds be mobilized for what they were taken for.

Mr. Hayes stated, during the first budget work session, we were facing a roughly \$4.3 million deficit. They went back and adjusted the revenue projections where they felt comfortable enough, because of some non-tax-based revenue growth, to increase the base revenue projection by a \$1 million, which left a \$3.3 million shortfall in FY20 and FY21. They worked with the Finance Director, and she provided what we felt would be available in fund balance, over and above the 25%, to balance the budget. They are using some additional fund balance dollars to balance the budget.

Ms. Myers inquired as to what will be remaining, after we balance the budget, and set aside the percentage approved by Council.

Mr. Hayes stated it would be roughly \$1.5 million.

Ms. Myers stated the reason she is asking this on the record is that this is all the public's money, and the public should know what the numbers are, just like Council knows.

Ms. Hamm stated they will not know the precise number until the books are closed.

Ms. Myers inquired about how closely we are tracking it.

Mr. Hayes stated, if we are currently \$5 million above the 25%...

Ms. Myers stated she would suggest that amount be mobilized to reduce the actual cost that we are asking taxpayers to contribute in the tax year. So, if there is a way to begin to look at the millage coming down, that we can do that. She would suggest that that number be factored in as an active part of next year's budget, and not just held in fund balance.

Mr. Hayes stated, of the \$5 million, they are using \$3.5 million to balance the budget, but if we can use more...

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

Ms. Myers stated, not to balance budget, but to put into the ask that we are making of taxpayers. What she is saying is, if there is money left after we have put aside our fund balance, and we have cleared what this Council has approved to hold, of taxpayer money, for a rainy day, that that money not be held, but be put back in the budget to reduce what taxpayers are being asked to contribute in the next tax year.

Mr. Hayes stated, any amount that is remaining after they cover the \$3.5 million deficit, they can use to draw down the millage rate.

Ms. Dickerson inquired, if Council Services needs the additional funds to make up the \$811 million, how would we go back and address that.

Mr. Hayes stated you could make a motion if you wanted to adjust the total.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, the Sheriff requested the rollover funds, but no other agency has requested it.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning inquired, for clarification, if this for the total General Fund or the General Fund for County Departments.

Mr. Hayes stated it would be for every aspect of the County's General Fund. There is an additional layer, on the next line item, that addresses the rest of the General Fund budget. When they say "County Departments" they are referring to every line item that is funded in the General Fund.

Mr. Manning stated he will vote "No" on that because that is going to cover a lot of your budget book.

Mr. Hayes stated it is just General Fund, not Special Revenue or Enterprise Funds. He stated, if you look at pp.50-53, it lists every County Department.

Mr. Manning stated the motion will also cover pp.10-13; 15-16; 18; and 48.

Mr. Jackson restated the motion, as follows: to approve the General Fund for those items listed on pp. 50-53.

Ms. Myers stated the document Mr. Hayes provided has a section called "General Fund" and that is the section he is referring to.

Mr. Hayes stated the General Fund has 2 components. It has the expenditures of the General Fund, which is the \$172.6 million for FY20 and \$176 million for FY21. Then, there is the funds that supports other departments/funds.

Mr. Jackson stated he does not remember when we did the Biennial budget before that we went through line item, and talked about the Central Garage and Animal Care. His intent was to take all of those categories, and approve the recommendation of the Administration, not based upon requests, which would exceed the budget, but based upon their ability to balance the budget.

Ms. Newton inquired about the relationship between the motion that Mr. Jackson made, which is for pp. 50 – 53 of the PowerPoint handout, and the handout. Does approving Mr. Jackson’s motion approve the things on the motions list.

Mr. Hayes stated, if you look at p. 2 of the motions list, it says, “Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions.” Every department in the General Fund total comes back to \$172.6 million.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, that is just one line in the motions list, but at the top of p. 53 it has LumpSum Agencies, which he would not think is not a County department.

Mr. Hayes stated the funds that are appropriated are in the General Fund. In that case, it would just be the dollar amounts. You could change the groups that are funded, but the funds that Council approves are situated in the General Fund.

Mr. Manning stated all of the lines in yellow, and the FY20 requested, we were given on p. 73, has a figure of \$1.8 million. The number on p. 53, of the PowerPoint, has \$3.447 million, so he assumes that covers all the LumpSum Agencies requests, plus all that is in yellow.

Mr. Hayes responded anything in yellow is a Council motion. What the motion does is approve the dollar amount available, based on what has been budgeted to fund the General Fund LumpSum appropriation. As you recall during the work session, he told Council there was 3 types of LumpSum appropriations in the General Fund. There is the discretionary committee, which is \$200,000; the C&S Agencies and the discretionary LumpSum groups. What you would be doing, is approving a dollar amount, based on what is in the budget. If you have subsequent motions, you can increase the dollar amounts of the things in yellow. This would just be approving the dollar amount currently set aside for motions.

Mr. Manning stated, then when we went through the yellow, would that override and add to what we are passing on this motion.

Mr. Hayes stated all you are doing is passing a dollar amount that has been set aside to fund the groups. This has nothing to do with funding a specific group(s).

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Abstain: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous, with Mr. Manning abstaining from the vote.

27. Transfer Out (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; FY20 - \$8,058,159; FY21 - \$8,058,159) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to fund the Transfers Out in the amount of \$8,058,159.

Mr. Hayes stated he would be happy before 3rd Reading to show you the breakdown of what departments fund that.

Mr. Jackson stated he understands the need to transfer funds out in order to balance the budget. As long as there is money to transfer out it makes sense, but he is not sure that is the most fiscally prudent way to continue to balance the budget. He thinks we need to revisit and rethink the way we do that going forward, and not always depending on the ability to have money to transfer.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

19

Mr. Hayes thinks there was an effort in funds that were falling short (i.e. Victim's Assistance and Public Defender) to use the General Fund to support them.

Mr. Jackson stated, if he always knew there would be a transfer of fund to cover the shortfall if he ran over, he is not sure his level of accountability and managing his budget would be as high as if he knew he may not be able to be bailed out.

Ms. Newton inquired who is recording these budget questions, so as we look at the process moving forward, we make sure to address those questions.

Mr. Hayes stated his staff always goes back and looks at the video the next day.

Ms. Newton suggested we share those questions as we look at streamlining the budget process for next year.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Abstain: Jackson

Present but Not Voting: Myers

The vote in favor was unanimous, with Mr. Jackson abstaining from the vote.

28. Computer Technology Replacement (To allocate Transfer In to Technology Fund; FY20 - \$350,000; FY21 - \$350,000) – This item was a part of the "Transfer Out" line item.

Mr. Hayes stated, during Biennium Budget I, we undertook the leasing of computers. Employee computers are replaced every 3 years, so we have a special fund set aside to do that. The funds are transferred from the General Fund to the Computer Technology Replacement Fund. There is also a Vehicle Replacement Fund. Both of the funds were approved at the beginning of Biennium Budget I.

29. Vehicle Replacement (Allocate Transfer In to Vehicle Replacement Fund; FY20 - \$500,000; FY21 - \$500,000) – This item was a part of the "Transfer Out" line item.

Ms. Myers inquired as to which vehicles are being replaced, and are we talking about replacing all of the cars that on the rooftop in the garage.

Dr. Thompson requested to allow Fleet Management to provide their report to Council at the 3rd Reading of the Budget.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the vehicle replacement policy been established or are we handing out cars when people request them.

Dr. Thompson stated, the conversations he has had with Fleet Management, if a vehicle has so many miles on it, we have to decide if we are going to continue to invest in those vehicles or replace them.

30. Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations \$146,000 in new recommendations, and \$54,000 in multi-year grants approved in prior years)

31. Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; \$825,392)

32. LumpSum Allocations (Base amount approved FY19; \$2,083,668) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the LumpSum Allocations at the FY20 requested amount of \$1,802,979; plus the \$130,063 for the United Way of the Midlands and \$20,000 for the Harriett Hancock Center, as reflected on the original motions list. The total amount of \$1,953,042 is under the \$2,083,668 base amount. He noted that this would be for both years of the Biennium, with the exception that the \$20,000 for the Harriet Hancock is only for the FY20 portion of the Biennium II Budget. The motion would leave approximately \$60,000 available.

Ms. Dickerson stated the COC Military Affairs numbers seem to be off. She stated last year they received \$4,450 and they are requesting \$45,540 for FY20.

Mr. Hayes stated Council approved the organization to receive \$4,450 in FY19.

Mr. Manning stated he would be happy to accept a friendly amendment from Ms. Dickerson, if she would like to lower the amount.

Ms. Dickerson responded that she did want to lower the amount to \$5,000.

Mr. Livingston inquired, for clarification, if that amount was already included in the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated Mr. Manning's motion is for less than what has been appropriated to fund LumpSum appropriations. The base amount available to fund LumpSum appropriations is \$2,083,668. Obviously, through motions, can increase that amount.

Ms. McBride stated she supports the agencies that Mr. Manning mentioned, but she has several motions that are LumpSum and she feels like they are being left out. She does not want to select 2, when there are 7 – 8 agencies.

Mr. Manning stated he would be fine with Ms. McBride offering a friendly amendment. After Ms. Dickerson's friendly amendment, there is about \$100,000 available, that is still under the base. Then, Council can go above the base, as they did last year, with the \$1.5 million available in the General Fund.

Ms. McBride requested to include the LumpSum allocations of \$50,000 for CityLight Community Development Corporation; \$10,000 for Greenview Swim Team; \$25,000 for Wiley Kennedy Foundation; \$150,000 to establish a Richland County Development Work Force Development and Outreach Program; and \$35,000 for the Randolph Cemetery.

Mr. Manning stated he accepted Ms. McBride's friendly amendment, but he believes we need to add the caveat that the difference between the base, that we have already approved, will come out of the General Fund.

Ms. Dickerson stated, if any adjustments need to be made, they can be done on 3rd Reading.

Mr. Malinowski stated the majority of the motions he sees highlighted seem like they should be motions that are sent to one of our committees for vetting to get staff input. He has no idea what the "Resilient Richland Initiative" is that is supposed to take place at the Jackson Creek Elementary School. Its possible school funds should be covering something like that. There is work to be done at

the Harriett Hancock Center. He does not know if this a private or public place. Out of the percentages given, only 45% of the people attending the location are from Richland County. He inquired if anyone has inquired if the other municipalities are willing to assist. It seems to him, if Council members would have asked staff that funding could be coming from CDBG or Neighborhood Redevelopment funds, rather than the General Fund. He does not see that these motions, and projects we are asking funds for, have been fully vetted to find out if it is something that we should be taking from the General Fund, or there is some other funding area to get it from. He inquired if the \$9,375 the Randolph Cemetery is receiving from Hospitality Tax was taken into consideration when the motion was made, and is that a private cemetery.

Mr. Jackson stated he thought we were going to get a composite list to show where every source of funding was coming from, so we could answer the question Mr. Malinowski just raised. At the last meeting, it was stated there were agencies/groups that get different pots of money, and we do not have a handle on that. So, maybe someone submitted a motion to request some funding for Randolph Cemetery without knowing all of the available funding. He thinks that is a critical missing piece, that was requested.

Mr. Hayes stated that information was provided a couple weeks ago, in a companion document, but we would be happy to provide it again.

On the friendly amendment that was made, with regard to the Military Affairs funding, which they use to do BRAC, Ms. Myers inquired if we know which number is correct.

Mr. Hayes stated they receive funding in another fund for BRAC.

Ms. Myers withdrew her question.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the County will receive any type of budget for these entities.

Mr. Hayes stated the entities applications had what they intended to use the funding for.

In Favor: Terracio, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Manning

The vote was in favor, with Mr. Jackson, Ms. Myers and Mr. Manning abstaining from the vote.

33. LumpSum (Allocate \$130,063 to the United Way of the Midlands to partially fund a Resiliency Team pilot program at Jackson Creek Elementary School as part of the Resilient Richland initiative. This funding is for both years of the Biennium II. The funding is to be designated as a Lump Sum Outside Agency Appropriation; FY20 - \$130,063; FY21 - \$130,063) – This item was incorporated in the previous motion

34. LumpSum (I move to approve a request from the Harriet Hancock Center in the amount of \$20,000 to assist the Center in upgrading their aging electrical systems and rebuilding the property's retaining wall. The Harriet Hancock Center serves on average 2,500 persons in the LGBTQ+ community each year. Approximately 35% of these persons are from the City of Columbia, 45% are from the greater Richland County area, and 20% are from out of County; \$20,000) [TERRACIO] – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

22

35. **LumpSum (Allocate \$50,000 to CityLight Community Development Corporation to pilot a summer educational, cultural and empowerment experience for youth residing at North Point Estate [also known as Bethel Bishop]. North Point Estate has more violent crime than any other block in Columbia/Richland County [State Newspaper/August 2018]; \$50,000) [McBRIDE]** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.
36. **LumpSum (Allocate \$10,000 to Greenview Swim Team to offer free swimming lessons to youth from low income families throughout Richland County during summer months and on weekends during school year where feasible with indoor swimming pools. Swimming accommodations will be coordinated with both Richland County and the City of Columbia Parks and Recreation program. Program cost includes assistance for special transportation for students not living in walking distance and have no means of transportation to swimming lesson; \$10,000) [McBRIDE]** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.
37. **LumpSum (Allocate \$25,000 for the Wiley Kennedy Foundation to provide and expand services to underserved residents, youth and senior citizens residing in zip code 29203. The foundation has an excellent reputation in the community works to address needs of community through: feeding the homeless, providing food packages to sustain children from low income families for the weekend, health programs, summer enrichment activities for youth, programs for senior citizens and other community engagement activities; \$25,000) [McBRIDE]** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion
38. **LumpSum (Allocate \$150,000 to establish a Richland County Work Force Development and Outreach Program that will address employment and training opportunities and outreach for citizens from disadvantaged and underserved communities in Richland County; and to establish a Richland County Summer Youth Employment and Leadership training program. This program can be funded in-house or can be outsourced in collaboration with Midland Tech or another entity; \$150,000) [McBRIDE]** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.
39. **LumpSum (I move to provide \$35,000 for Randolph Cemetery for needed repairs, including grave fill in, brick border repairs, road maintenance (inside the cemetery), and long grass cutting. Randolph Cemetery was created in 1871 by a committee of African-American men in honor of Benjamin Randolph, a senator who was assassinated in 1868 and contains at least 13 Reconstruction-era African-American legislators; \$35,000) [TERRACIO]** – This item was incorporated in the previous motion.

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

40. **Victim's Rights (Allocate funding to approve Victims Assistance Budget; FY20 - \$921,021; FY21 - \$931,021)** – Mr. Hayes noted the revenue sources are less than what the expenditures are. The total revenue is \$921,021; but the expenditures is estimated to be \$1,209,964. The total funds that need to be transferred from the General Fund is \$686,021.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, Victim's Assistance is managed out of the Solicitor's Office, Sheriff's Department and the Detention Center.

Mr. Hayes stated Victim's Assistance is a part of 4 departments: Solicitor's Office, Sheriff's Department, Detention Center and Court Administration.

Ms. Myers stated it consistently runs at a deficit, correct.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers inquired if those 4 departments harmonizing the budget. If it is consistently running at a deficit, we need to figure out why and try to get it to the point where it is not run that way. She is not disagreeing that they need more money, but it should not be every year that we are looking at a deficit balance and figuring out where the money comes from. We ought to be looking at the budget on the frontend and adequately providing what should be in the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated we have seen a drop in the fees and fines over the last few years; therefore, the revenue has not come in. Subsequently, the General Fund portion that was used to supplement it was not enough because they have not been pulling in enough revenue.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are servicing the same number of people, few people, etc. In other words, is the money is being mobilized in the same way or different ways, and, if we actually need more money or less money, rather than looking at it as a LumpSum that constantly runs at a deficit.

Mr. Hayes stated he would have to have each department to speak specifically to this because he does not have all that information. The only thing he can concretely tell Council is that the last couple years they have suffered a loss in revenue, which has mitigated the impact of the transfer in to the General Fund not being enough.

Ms. Newton inquired if the departments had to submit that as part of the budget request process, or would this be new information.

Mr. Hayes stated they submitted their budget request with justification for why they wanted an increase in funding. For clarification, this is not to increase their budget, but to make their budget whole. They fall short on their personnel expenditures, so it could be a situation where it was not budgeted correctly, according to position control, or is there some other situation.

Ms. Newton stated she inquiring if this was a justification or analysis they had already provided as a part of the traditional budget request process, or if we would be going back and requesting new information.

Mr. Hayes stated it was a request for new information. It would simply be to find out why they are consistently running above the budgeted expenditures.

Ms. Newton stated, from the perspective of moving forward, if there is a department that consistently running deficits, and pulling money from the General Fund, that we should explore procedures or policies to make sure they make a clear case for why that is happening.

Ms. Dickerson stated she has a serious problem with this, and she need the information that Ms. Myers is requesting. When she came on Council, this was about \$200,000 and now were at \$1 million. She thought, at some point, we were not going to go back into the General Fund to subsidize the Victim's Assistance. She inquired if they receive State funding.

Mr. Hayes stated they did not exceed the cap amount for the transfer in.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to fund Victim's Assistance at \$1,209,964.

In Favor: Kennedy, Livingston and McBride

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

24

Opposed: Malinowski

Abstain: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

41. Tourism Development (Allocate funding to approve Tourism Development Budget; FY20 - \$1,288,000; FY21 - \$1,293,500) – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to fund Tourism Development at \$1,288,000.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to recess until after the D&S Committee.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Livingston

Council recessed at approximately 5:00 PM and reconvened at approximately 5:24 PM

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to reconvene the meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Terracio, Newton, Manning and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

42. Temporary Alcohol Permits (Allocate funding to approve Temporary Alcohol Permits Budget; FY20 - \$165,000; FY21 - \$170,000) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund the remaining Special Revenue fund items, as the amount reflected on the motions list.

Ms. Myers made a friendly amendment to take up the Road Maintenance Fee item separately.

Mr. Manning accepted the amendment.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Myers, Manning and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Dickerson

The vote in favor was unanimous.

43. Emergency Telephone System (To allocate funding to approve ETS Budget; FY20 - \$6,345,314; FY21 - \$6,405.101) – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

25

44. **Fire Service (To approve downward adjustment to Fire Services Budget; \$28,193,956; FY21 - \$28,281,245)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
45. **Stormwater Management (Allocate funding to approve Stormwater Management Budget; FY20 - \$4,528,787; FY21 - \$4,181,441)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
46. **Conservation Commission Fund (Allocate funding to approve Conservation Commission Fund Budget; FY20 - \$977,991; FY21 - \$997,991)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
47. **Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund (Allocate funding to approve Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund Budget; FY20 - \$834,003; FY21 - \$854,003)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
48. **Hospitality Tax (Allocate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget; FY20 - \$9,970,794; FY21 - \$9,970,794)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
49. **Accommodations Tax (Allocate funding to approve Accommodation Tax Budget; FY20 - \$560,300; FY21 - \$565,300)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
50. **Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund (Allocate funding to approve Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund Budget; FY20 – \$51,000; FY21 - \$55,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
51. **Road Maintenance Fee (Allocate funding to approve Road Maintenance Fee Budget; FY20 - \$7,663,934; FY21 - \$6,991,540)** – Ms. Myers stated the current Road Maintenance Fee is \$20.00 per year. It was approved at \$15.00 per year in 1992, and then increased a few years later. Currently, the fund balance is almost equal to the request they are making. In fact, the Road Maintenance Fee fund balance at \$9.8 million exceeds the request. The request for this fiscal year is \$7.6 million and \$6.9 for FY21. She would like to shift the Road Maintenance Fee fund balance to active use, so taxpayers can receive some relief in the Road Maintenance Fee they are paying.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Road Maintenance Fee budget, but that the budget be compromised of their current fund balance of \$9,803,994; and the difference be made up by Road Maintenance Fee. In addition, to reduce the Road Maintenance Fee back to \$15.00 per year. The overage, and new money collected, be mobilized by the Administrative staff to come up with a mechanism for funding projects, and creating a way to use the fee for bonds, rather than allowing that money to sit and taxpayers being constantly billed.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, we are going to fund them from the \$9.8 million, which will leave them a fund balance of \$2.2 million, and reduce the fee to \$15.00 per year.

Ms. Myers suggested coupling the fund balance with the new money, and use the funding to create a source from which we could bond road projects.

Mr. Malinowski stated he thinks we need to keep the fund balance until we see what happens with the reduce of the fee to \$15.00.

Ms. Myers stated staff has said there is no real reason for there to be a Road Maintenance Fund Balance. When we got the numbers, she met with staff because it troubled her that the numbers were so big, and we were constantly going back to the taxpayers for new money and not mobilizing the existing money. The response she got was, that in the Road Maintenance Fee, that a fund balance is not a necessary...

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, you would like to keep some funds. Maybe not \$9 million, but you do want to have some funds in case there is a downturn.

Mr. Manning stated he hears complaints all the time. He is asked, "Is the Penny going to do this? Is the Penny going to do that?" And the answer is, that is under road maintenance. He stated we voted to create the RCDOT a couple months ago. If everything is maintained, then we certainly do not need this fund balance. He would like someone to explain to him, so he can explain to the citizens, that their roads are really fine, and we have them all maintained like they need to be maintained, so he is going to give them \$5.00 back. He does not think the citizens are going to be happy to save \$5.00 and the answer be, "We were looking at the budget and we did not have a reason for the fund balance." He would like to know, if we have maintenance that needs to be done, or do we get the PIO Office to tell people to stop complaining because the roads are maintained. He is more interested in a fund balance, but why do we have that fund balance. If it was because we did not have enough Transportation Department, now we have created our RCDOT, so we probably have a department to spend the money down, and get some things done for the citizens. At whatever point, they let us know that they feel like the roads are all nicely maintained, and we are ahead of the game, then we look at saving \$5.00 a year.

Ms. Myers stated, at the last meeting, when this came up, we had come out of a meeting where we were told that Richland County was no longer in the road paving business, and that all the road maintenance fee was being used for sidewalks. We then requested an accounting of how much, over the last 5 years, had come in in road maintenance fees, which is approximately \$42 million. An accounting of what projects had been supported by that funding was also requested. The biggest piece of it was pothole repair. If we repair \$42 million in potholes, she would like to see them. The reason that she put forward that motion was because of what Mr. Manning said about all the complaints. She stated we are sitting on \$10 million, and we are asking for another \$7.5 million. She stated we have yet to receive, which we asked for in that meeting, a plan for what roads have been paved, what roads are going to be paved by the County, and what the dates are.

Mr. Manning stated the first thing he heard Ms. Myers say was, "We are not maintaining roads anymore." He thinks Council needs to make that statement, and not whoever told you. If the County's position is the roads are maintained, and we are not maintaining roads anymore, he thinks Council needs to be the one to tell the people, and vote on that.

Ms. Dickerson stated when it came to her that the County was not in the road business anymore, she was floored. She does not remember us ever changing our road maintenance fee to sidewalk maintenance fee. If we have only been paving and taking care of sidewalks with the funds we took in, she has a serious problem. She does not recall anyone bringing that to Council for us to change the road maintenance fee to sidewalk maintenance. She stated we have roads that are not being paved. She is getting beat up every day about a dirt road or a road that needs to be paved. If we got \$10 million, and they tell her, "You can pave a road for approximately \$700,000 per mile." She stated she cannot continue to go to her communities and tell them that we have \$10 million sitting in a fund balance, and we cannot pave their roads.

Ms. Terracio inquired how the \$20.00 is assessed.

Ms. Myers responded it is assessed through vehicle property tax every year.

Mr. Malinowski stated he heard someone say that the County was no longer going to scrape dirt roads.

Dr. Thompson stated that is not true.

Mr. Malinowski stated we have all these roads that have been abandoned because of bonds elapsing. We talked about it at the Retreat, and before that. We need to address this issue. Ms. Hegler, when she was here, had 3 buckets of how we could address them, and some approximate dollar amounts. Maybe this where we should use these funds. Bring it back to Council, with some recommendations, and get these things done before they all fall apart and we need millions and millions of dollars to fix them all.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund the Road Maintenance Fee in the amount of \$7,663,934 for FY20, and reevaluate the Road Maintenance Fee for FY21.

Mr. Jackson stated, as you know, when the Transportation project rolls in house in October, there is road maintenance in that budget as well. He thinks we will have a much better, and clearer picture, of what the true dollars are going to look like after October.

Ms. Dickerson inquired as to when Public Works decided not to pave roads.

Mr. Ozbek stated, for clarification, there was some misinformation by his staff while he was on vacation in April. Regardless of the Penny, Public Works has maintained, and continues to maintain about 600 miles of paved roads, and 217 miles of dirt road. The Penny fund does not do maintenance, but projects.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning and Dickerson

Abstain: Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous with Mr. Livingston abstaining from the vote.

- 52. Public Defender (Allocate funding to approve Public Defender Budget; FY20 - \$4,000,448; FY21 - \$4,000,448)** – This item was taken up with the motion on Item #42.
- 53. Transportation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget; FY20 - \$68,500,000; FY21 - \$69,000,000)** – This item was taken up with the motion on Item #42.
- 54. School Resource Officers (Allocate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget; FY20 - \$6,148,303; FY21 - \$6,148,303)** – This item was taken up with the motion on Item #42.
- 55. Economic Development (Allocate funding to approve Economic Development Budget; FY20 - \$1,905,000; FY21 - \$2,030,000)** – This item was taken up with the motion on Item #42.

DEBT SERVICE

- 56. General Debt Service (FY20 - \$14,408,304; FY21 - \$13,902,465)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve all of the debt service items.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 57. **Fire Bonds 2018B - \$1,500,000 (FY20 - \$585,846)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 58. **Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S (FY20 - \$1,486,600; FY21 - \$1,486,400)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 59. **Broad River Sewer 2011A (FY20 - \$2,138,113; FY21 - \$2,135,563)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 60. **East Richland Public Svc Dist (FY20 - \$1,438,560; FY21 - \$1,43,560)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 61. **Recreation Commission Debt Svc (FY20 - \$3,235,525; FY21 - \$3,236,125)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 62. **Riverbanks Zoo Debt Service (FY20 - \$2,640,381; FY21 - \$2,663,381)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 63. **School District 1 Debt Service (FY20 - \$61,026,893; FY21 - \$43,661,505)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 64. **School District 2 Debt Service (FY20 - \$59,777,979; FY21 - \$58,236,629)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 65. **Transportation (FY20 - \$180,250,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.

Ms. Myers requested clarification on this item.

Mr. Hayes stated this is to repay the \$175 million BAN, but we do have funds in debt service to offset this.

Ms. Myers inquired if we arbitrated the money, or is \$5 million less in the Transportation budget.

Ms. Hamm stated the prior BAN we had we had enough to cover the payments, and it only cost about \$75,000. This one, we have \$3.6 million that came in as premium toward the \$5 million. We will probably have interest that is going to offset the additional amount interest owed.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

- 66. **Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Allocate funding to approve Solid Waste Budget; FY20 - \$35,057,991; FY21 - \$35,057,991)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve all of the enterprise fund items.

Mr. Hayes stated, as a part of Solid Waste, there is a LumpSum appropriation to the Keep the Midlands Beautiful for \$20,000, which will be included on the updated motions list.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

67. Richland County Utilities (Allocate funding to approve Richland County Utilities Budget; FY20 - \$9,923,142; FY21 - \$9,923,142) – This item was taken up in the previous item.

68. Hamilton-Owens Airport (Allocate funding to approve Airport Budget; FY20 - \$613,896; FY21 - \$579,396) – This item was taken up in the previous item.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)

Mr. Hayes stated the Capital Improvement Projects are typically not a part of the Budget Ordinance itself, but you approve a dollar amount for the projects. The CIP book details the CIP over the next 10 years. What is before you, is the recommendations for the next Biennium that Administration felt like were important to be funded. Of course, it is up to Council to decide a dollar amount that will be set aside the projects. The CIP is separated into 2 aspects: Utilities and Other CIP Needs.

Ms. Myers stated the CIP plan was done before Council voted to revitalize the Richland Renaissance Program, and that many of these projects might be called into question because of the revitalized plan. She inquired if they are requesting approval of a LumpSum amount. It seems to her that a lot of the money will be redundant.

Mr. Hayes stated, in the Fall 2017, Council voted to do a redirection of some budget funds. Included in that was the initial plan for Richland Renaissance. At the time, there were a lot of projects that were deemed to be done, but were supposed to be caught up into the Renaissance Plan. When the plan went into defer state, those projects were revitalized because Operational Services were piecemealing the building together. Traditionally, Council has not approved the CIP dollar amount. Council has issued bond funding, in the Fall of the year, to go toward certain projects. Obviously, Council can decide on a dollar amount, or those projects that they deem important for the County to move forward with. In speaking with Operational Services, because many of the buildings were piecemealed together, they wanted to put before Council their recommendation on fixing up some of the projects that were not able to be finished before.

Ms. Myers stated we could almost buy a building for the cost of replacing the roof on the Probation, Pardon and Parole building. She inquired if it would be wiser to approve an amount for Capital Improvement Projects, and then select projects throughout the year, or are you clear that these projects are the wisest ways to spend the money.

Dr. Thompson stated he thinks the wisest decision is to approve a LumpSum.

Mr. Jackson stated one of the things that we need to consider is the order in which this occurs. He thinks the dollar amount that is going to be available for CIP should be determined first by Council. Secondly, the requests coming in from the departments, based upon the dollar amount in prioritized order, so that staff is not making the decision for EMS, Sheriff, etc. Thirdly, then it would come back to Council for approval. It seems that is not necessarily the order, and why we are having heartburn with it.

Mr. Malinowski inquired what CAMA stands for.

Mr. Hayes stated he does not know what the acronym stands for, but it is the CAMA System for the Assessor's Office.

Ms. McBride inquired if we had any money allocated or reserved for the Renaissance.

Dr. Thompson responded there is no funding allocated for the Renaissance.

Mr. Hayes stated he thinks, in one of the Capital Projects, there is some remaining funds. Earlier this year, Council did approve moving some of those funds to fund the Southeast Sewer Project and the GIS servers.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the fund amount for Capital Improvement, and to approve projects, as Mr. Jackson has suggested.

Mr. Hayes inquired, for clarification, if this would be for both Utilities and Non-Utility Capital Projects.

Ms. Myers stated it would be for Non-Utility Capital Improvement Projects.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

69. Administration & Health Chiller Replacement (3), Cooling Tower Replacements, & Rooftop ERV Replacements (FY20 - \$2,950,000) – See item above.

70. Probation, Pardon & Parole Roof Replacement (FY20 - \$625,000) – See item above.

71. Coroner's Office Emergency Generator (FY20 - \$205,700) – See item above.

72. Administration & Health Complex Roof Replacement (FY20 - \$2,250,000) – See item above.

73. DSS Warehouse Upfit & Roof Replacement (FY20 - \$3,200,000) – See item above.

74. Detention Center Cooling Tower Replacements (FY20 - \$230,000) – See item above.

75. Township Auditorium LED Lighting Upgrade (FY20 - \$225,000) – See item above.

76. Township Auditorium Boiler Replacement (FY20 - \$200,000) – See item above.

77. Sheriff's Headquarters IT Server Room HVAC Replacement (FY21 - \$60,000) – See item above.

78. Sheriff's Headquarters IT Room Flooring Replacement (FY21 - \$67,000) – See item above.

79. Judicial Center Rooftop HVAC Unit Replacement (FY21 - \$250,000) – See item above.

80. DSS Parking Lot Resurfacing (FY21 - \$1,300,000) – See item above.

81. Laurens St. Garage Rejuvenation Project –Phase 5 (FY21 - \$180,000) – See item above.

82. Central Services Upgrade Printing Process to Digital (FY21 - \$350,000) – See item above.

83. Administration Building Electrical/Generator Upgrade (FY21 - \$495,000) – See item above.

84. EMS Headquarters Chiller Replacement (FY21 - \$255,000) – See item above.

85. Public Works Complex Multiple Roof Replacements (\$900,000) – See item above.

Special Called Meeting

May 23, 2019

31

86. *Sheriff's Headquarters Emergency Generator Replacement (\$195,000)* – See item above.
87. *Sheriff's Headquarters Electrical/Switchgear Replacement (\$750,000)* – See item above.
88. *Pineview Public Safety HVAC Replacements (\$145,000)* – See item above.
89. *New Magistrate Facilities (FY20 - \$3,359,434; FY21 - \$3,359,434)* – See item above.
90. *RCSD Vehicles (FY20 - \$2,500,000; FY21 - \$2,500,000)* – See item above.
91. *In-Car Cameras (FY20 - \$354,000; FY21 - \$354,000)* – See item above.
92. *Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs) (FY20-\$258,000; FY21 - \$258,000)* – See item above.
93. *Body- Worn Cameras (FY20 - \$480,000; FY21 - \$480,000)* – See item above.
94. *CAMA System (FY20 - \$1,700,000)* – See item above.
95. *Dickerson: would like to make a motion consider funding for lights to be included in BRRC plan (FY20 - \$240,000 Est.; FY21 - \$240,000 Est.)*
96. *Dickerson: Motion to study the Dutch Fork Magistrate office located on Beatty Road to be included in the Revivification of the county. It is not ADA compliance. Move that County Council would highly consider the blighted Ole Antique Mall for the Dutch Fork Magistrates to be shared with the Sherriff Department (TBD)* – See item above.
97. *Broad River Wastwater Treatment Plant (BRWWTP) (FY20 - \$4,315,000; FY21 - \$2,680,000)* – See item above.
98. *Broad River Sewer Collection System (FY20 - \$4,805,000; FY21 - \$2,520,000)* – See item above.
99. *Lower Richland Sewer Collection System and Treatment Plant (FY20 - \$790,000; FY21 - \$420,000)* – See item above.
100. *South Region Sewer Expansion (FY20 - \$16,409,500)* – See item above.
101. *South Region Water Expansion (FY21 - \$9,450,000)* – See item above.
102. *Northwest Region Sewer Expansion* – See item above.
103. *Northwest Region Water Expansion* – See item above.
104. *North Region Sewer Expansion* – See item above.
105. *North Region Water Expansion* – See item above.
4. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:27 PM.