



Richland County Council

2nd Reading – Budget Meeting
May 27, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Vice Chair, Bill Malinowski, Derrek Pugh, Allison Terracio, Gretchen Barron, Overture Walker, Jesica Mackey, Cheryl English and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Andrea Mathis, Jasmine Crum, Lori Thomas, Bill Davis, Tamar Black, Tyler Kirk, Ojetta O'Bryant, John Thompson, Angela Weathersby, Ashiya Myers, Clayton Voignier, Michael Niermeier, Brittney Hoyle-Terry, Stacey Hamm, Steven Gaither, Terry Graham, Wendy Davis, Randy Pruitt, Denise Teasdell, James Hayes, Marjorie King, Quinton Epps, Judy Carter, Michael Maloney, Dale Welch, Dante Roberts, Sandra Haynes, and Michael Byrd

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. English, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **SECOND READING**

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Recommended: \$16,129,600)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. ***Columbia Area Mental Health (Recommended: \$2,462,500)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Public Library (Recommended: \$30,700,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Recommended: \$2,625,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Midlands Technical College – Operating (Recommended: \$6,993,600)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Midlands Technical College – Capital (Recommended: \$3,630,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **School District One (Recommended: \$238,771,833)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **School District Two (Recommended: \$167,105,055)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund this item at a no mill increase, or less.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

GRANTS

9. ***Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$100,000)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to fund the item at the Administrator’s recommended amount. For those he did not make a recommendation, approve at last year’s funding level, or less, provided a request was made for funding.

Ms. Mackey inquired, if we move forward with the motion, how will it impact the budget?

Mr. Hayes responded, for example, the Administrator is not recommending to use Fund Balance, so if Council opts to fund the groups outside of the Administrator’s recommendation, we will need to use approximately \$1.6M in H-Tax Fund Balance.

Mr. Livingston inquired how the agencies were funded last fiscal year.

Mr. Hayes responded we are using both revenue and fund balance to balance the budget for FY21.

Mr. Livingston noted there is approximately \$15M in H-Tax Fund Balance.

Mr. Hayes stated, because the Accommodations Tax revenue has lessen significantly, we are looking at budgeting \$325,000 in A-Tax. Since the fund has a negative fund balance, we did not have the ability to use all of the projected revenue to fund Accommodations Tax. Therefore, if we fund A-Tax groups at more than \$100,000, it would cause an issue.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center received Accommodations Tax funding last fiscal year.

Mr. Hayes responded the Convention Center was funded \$92,000 in A-Tax last year. The Committee is recommending \$25,000 this year because they did not have as large of a budget to work with because of the dwindling revenue and taking care of the negative fund balance.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if we approve the Accommodations Tax recommendation, will we pay back the negative balance and be in good standing.

Mr. Hayes responded that is the intent. The hope is with COVID lessening the numbers for tourism will start to go up.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if the motion to provide \$92,000 in funding to the Convention Center were approved, would that put us back in the red.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like to amend his motion to accept the Administrator’s recommendation. Ms. Newton accepted the amended motion.

Ms. Mackey stated, for clarification, Mr. Malinowski’s motion is to only approve those items on which the Administrator made a recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

9(a) Accommodations Tax: Motion to fund Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Visitors Bureau (Recommended: \$92,000) – Mr. Livingston stated this was the amount funded last year. One of the primary intents of the Accommodations Tax was for entities like the Convention Center. He believes it is more important to fund the Convention Center, than to divide the \$100,000 among various agencies where we will see little benefit. At some point before 3rd Reading, we need to determine a way to fund the Convention Center.

Ms. Hamm stated the Accommodations Tax brought in \$424,000 in FY20. We projected \$320,000, and we have brought in \$193,000. This means there could be a shortfall of approximately \$120,000.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if we are assuming the economy is not going to pick up, and we are not going to generate more revenue.

Mr. Hayes stated he and Ms. Hamm looked at the projected revenue increase, but we were already in a deficit. The new revenue will have to cover the deficit, which left approximately \$100,000 to be distributed by the committee.

Mr. Livingston inquired how much Accommodations Tax was generated prior to COVID.

Ms. Hamm responded for FY20 \$424,000 was generated.

Mr. Livingston stated he will bring back a recommendation at 3rd Reading.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the Convention Center is recommended to receive \$25,000 in Accommodations Tax.

10. Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, Township Auditorium, and EdVenture; \$1,921,186) – Mr. Hayes stated the County has an ordinance for those entities. This year there is no recommendation from the Administrator.

Ms. Terracio requested a breakdown of the funding for each entity.

Mr. Hayes stated the breakdown is as follows: Columbia Museum of Art (\$765,872); Historic Columbia (\$385,143); EdVenture (\$400,000) and Township Auditorium (\$370,171).

Ms. Terracio inquired if that was the minimum requirement.

Mr. Hayes responded this is the amount the entities were approved for in FY21.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, according to the ordinance, where does the County stand with funding of the ordinance agencies.

Mr. Hayes responded he would have to review the ordinance and provide Council an answer prior to 3rd Reading.

Ms. McBride inquired why the Administrator is not recommending a funding amount for the ordinance agencies.

Mr. Brown responded, for items that were not contractual or statutory, but originated out of Council motions, he did not make recommendations on. This is in the purview of Council.

Ms. McBride inquired if the ordinance agencies are receiving additional funding from other sources in the budget.

Mr. Brown responded the ordinance agencies receive the amount Council traditionally recommends for them.

Mr. Hayes responded the ordinance agencies may also receive funding through the H-Tax Committee. In addition, Councilmembers could allocate funding to the agencies.

Mr. Hayes noted, if Council approves Ms. Newton's motion, it will require using approximately \$1.6M of H-Tax Fund Balance.

Mr. Livingston stated these agencies were historically funded out of the General Fund prior to the Hospitality Tax. When the Hospitality Tax was established, Council began funding these agencies with H-Tax funds.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the reason there was no request for the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project and Historical Corridor was because they have already received their funding.

Mr. Hayes responded the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project is not the Gateway to the Army from a few years ago. This originated under the former Administrator to address blight. The funds have been budgeted annually, but have not been expended. The Historical Corridor also originated under the former Administrator.

Mr. Malinowski requested a friendly amendment that the ordinance be reviewed to ensure the ordinance agencies receive the correct amount, based on the ordinance.

Mr. Brown noted the ordinance states, "...in an amount, as determined by County Council annually, during the budget process." He noted there is not a formula/breakdown included in the ordinance for the ordinance agencies.

Ms. McBride inquired, in regard to the Hospitality Tax Fund, how does the County stand.

Mr. Hayes responded Hospitality Tax has been trending well, which is why the fund balance is healthy.

Ms. Hamm responded this fiscal year the County has brought in \$400,000 more than what was budgeted.

Ms. Terracio inquired if it would be appropriate to fund the Convention Center from Hospitality Tax.

Mr. Livingston responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired how much Hospitality Tax is allocated to the Convention Center.

Mr. Hayes responded \$104,091.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the Convention Center would run a deficit with the combined Accommodations Tax (\$25,000) and Hospitality Tax (\$104,091) funding.

Mr. Hayes indicated the Hospitality Tax allocation will remain the same, but the Accommodations Tax allocation will be less than in the FY21 budget.

Ms. Barron inquired, in regards to the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project and the Historical Corridor, if the amount that was rolled over was the balance of what has not been used for these projects.

Mr. Hayes responded the County has not used the funding. When expenditures are not used, the funds go back to that funds fund balance. These are projects that were instituted under the previous Administrator; therefore, there are no groups requesting funds.

Ms. Barron inquired if the funds allocated are for projects that have not happened, or have not been billed.

Mr. Hayes responded these are projects that have been on the table, which were deferred because they were associated with the Renaissance.

Ms. Barron stated she would like to hear from someone on what these funds are for, and if we plan to finalize any projects. If we are not planning to finalize these projects, we need to move the funds somewhere else.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Ms. Newton's motion included the Gateway Pocket Parks/Blight Removal Project and the Historical Corridor.

Ms. Newton responded, it is her recollection, Council approved moving forward with the Historical Corridor, but the project had just not started yet. She would be amenable to remove the Gateway Pocket Parks because she is not sure where they stand.

Ms. McBride responded the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project and Historical Corridor were included in the Renaissance Plan, which was deferred. She noted Council brought part of the plan out of deferral; however, these projects are still included in the overall plan. She inquired if Council could come back, at a later date, and get the funds if needed.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated her recollection is that the Historical Corridor was removed from the Renaissance Plan, so it could proceed. She requested confirmation prior to 3rd Reading.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

10(a) Motion to fund Ordinance Agencies at the FY21 Level – This motion was addressed in Item #10.

11. Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations; \$500,000) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 12. Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY21 level; \$255,091)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how the International Festival became a part of Special Promotions.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

- 12(a) Hospitality Tax: Motion to fund Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Columbia International Festival (Recommended: \$351,000)** – Ms. Terracio requested a breakdown of the funding for the entities.

Mr. Hayes responded the breakdown is as follows: Columbia International Festival (\$151,000) and the Convention Center (\$200,000).

- 13. Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level; \$67,895)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how the International Festival became a part of Special Promotions.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

- 14. Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project (\$250,000)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how the International Festival became a part of Special Promotions.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

- 15. *Approval of Historical Corridor funding level (\$372,715)*** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how the International Festival became a part of Special Promotions.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

- 16. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level; \$75,000)*** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to fund this item at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how the International Festival became a part of Special Promotions.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Present but Not Voting: J. Walker (due to technical difficulties)

The vote was in favor.

- 16(a) *Hospitality Tax: Motion to fund Famously Hot New Year (Recommended: \$75,000)*** – This motion was addressed in Item #10.

- 17. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level; \$906,675)*** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund this item at the FY21 level.

Ms. Terracio stated, one of the reasons, she moved last year to reduce the amount was because her preference would be to have the entities that come to Council over and over to go through the funding process. She also would like to utilize more of the funds for some of the larger projects.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey and English

Opposed: Newton

Abstain: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 18. *Hospitality Tax (Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level; \$150,000)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 19. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level/Cost Allocation; \$4,487,750)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 20. Hospitality Tax (RC Volley Ball Complex; \$3,950,000)** – Mr. Pugh moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to refer this item to committee for further vetting.

Mr. J. Walker stated he believes there needs to be one point of coordination to facilitate a capital project using H-Tax funds for travel recreation facility that could encompass of the various aspects presented. He believes the point of coordination, thus far, has been the Recreation Commission. He inquired if there was a way to move this onto the Recreation Commission’s plate to allow them to vet suitors, and have them present a recommendation to Council.

Ms. Newton made a friendly amendment to broaden the conversation to determine the best use of travel recreation sports.

Mr. Pugh and Mr. Malinowski accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. McBride inquired how the recommendation was placed on the motions list.

Mr. Livingston responded, if someone contacts him about a project that has to go through the budget process, he requests them to contact Mr. Hayes to place it on the motions list for consideration.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, anyone can submit a letter/request and it does not have to come from a Councilmember or Administration.

Mr. Livingston responded he did send it to Administration, so the request could be considered during the budget process by Council.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, any entity can request to be on the motion list, and the Administrator can put it on there. The request does not have to come directly from a Councilmember.

Mr. Livingston responded that is the current process.

Ms. McBride noted it seems a motion would come from a Councilmember or the Administrator, so this appears out of syn.

Ms. Barron stated, if there is not a process or rule, we should consider one. She is interested in looking at a general way of establishing travel sports, and being a destination place for Richland County.

Mr. Livingston noted he has not decided which committee should vet these items.

Mr. Malinowski stated, when something similar happened at a Council meeting, he made a motion that all future motions had to be sponsored by a Councilmember. He requested the Clerk's Office to research the outcome of his motion.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, Mr. Livingston received this documentation, which was then turned over to Administration.

Mr. Livingston responded in the affirmative. He stated, it could be said, he sponsored the motion since he forwarded the documentation to Administration for Council to consider.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 21. Hospitality Tax (SC Kings Foundation Nexx Level Sports Center; \$9,500,000)** – Mr. Pugh moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to refer this item to committee for further vetting. In addition, to broaden the conversation to determine the best use of travel recreation sports.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 22. Richland County Conservation Commission (RCCC Community Conservation Grants and Historic Preservation Grants; \$250,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 22(a) Richland County Conservation Commission (Rollover of Conservation Grant; \$6,500)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 23. Richland County Neighborhood Redevelopment (Neighborhood Improvement Match Grants; \$37,388)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator's recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 24. Grants (Approve grants departments are applying for FY22; \$28,212,127)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

GENERAL FUND

- 25. County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions; \$179,413,664)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

Ms. Terracio inquired, out of Items 25 – 27, which items allocate funding to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Brown responded the General Fund amount is the salaries associated with the positions within the Richland Soil and Water Conservation District, and not the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Terracio inquired if there are overlaps between the salaried positions.

Mr. Brown responded there are some overlaps. He noted he has a meeting scheduled for next with the Richland Soil and Water Conservation District and the Conservation Commission. The information from the meeting will be provided to Council prior to 3rd Reading of the budget.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 25(a) Transfer Out (Approve as presented in Budget Work Session; \$8,517,112)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 26. Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 27. Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; \$848,326)** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

28. LumpSum Allocations (Base amount approved FY21; \$2,310,364)

28(a). Lump Sum Allocations (Move to allocate \$75K to St. John Community Development Corporation; \$75,000) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to approve this item.

Ms. McBride stated the three (3) programs (St. Johns Community Development Corporation, Wiley Kennedy Foundation and Greenview Swim Team) are in different areas of Richland County, but they reside in the highest crime areas in the County. These programs are recommended to bring the community back to the community. This will be a strategic, collaborative approach in dealing with crime and rebuilding the community.

Ms. Newton stated she would like to request the agencies report back to the County on how the funds were used, and what the metrics were for success.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the St. John Community Development Corporation submitted a funding request.

Ms. McBride responded the Wiley Kennedy Foundation and Greenview Swim Team submitted applications, but the programs were expanded this year.

Mr. Hayes responded staff did not receive an application from the St. John Community Development Corporation.

Mr. Malinowski stated the policy is individuals wanting funds should be submitting applications.

Ms. McBride responded this is a motion from her and the detailed applications will be submitted.

Mr. J. Walker inquired if this is the appropriate source or manner of funding for community and 501(c)(3)

programs from the County.

Mr. Brown responded, to the extent that the Councilmember has communicated the importance, he knows Councilmembers have a discretionary item they could address items they want to put forth their energy and effort.

Mr. J. Walker stated, for clarification, Mr. Brown would suggest individual Councilmembers utilizing their discretionary funding instead of lump sum.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride noted this would not be appropriate for Hospitality Tax.

Ms. Barron requested additional information regarding the entities.

Ms. Newton inquired if the County receives a report back on what the funds were used for.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Barron made a friendly amendment to fund the Wiley Kennedy Foundation at \$30,000; the Greenview Swim Team at \$15,000 and \$75,000 for the St. John Community Development Corporation.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker and English

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker, Mackey and Newton

The vote was in favor.

28(b) Lump Sum Allocations (Move to allocate \$60K to Wiley Kennedy Foundation; \$60,000) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to approve this item.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker and English

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker, Mackey and Newton

The vote was in favor.

28(c) Lump Sum Allocations (Move to allocate an additional \$10K to Greenview Swim Team; \$10,000) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to approve this item.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker and English

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker, Mackey and Newton

The vote was in favor.

28(d) Lump Sum Allocations (Move to fund the following groups at the FY21 level: Capitol Senior Center, Clemson University Extension, Columbia Urban League, Communities in School, Engenuity, Greater Columbia Community Relations, Palmetto Aids Life Support, SC HIV Aids Council, Senior Resources, Transitions Homeless Shelter; \$1,451,439) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to fund the aforementioned entities at the FY21 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for the record, at least one of these entities was funded as a one-time funding request. He cannot support continuing to fund agencies that came in as a one-time funding request.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the County has a formal relationship with Transitions Homeless Shelter, in terms of funding.

Ms. McBride requested to review the applications for these agencies.

Mr. J. Walker stated our practice of giving away tax dollars to 501(c)(3)'s, regardless of their imperativeness in the community, needs to be reviewed.

Mr. Livingston responded he does not see it as giving away money, but investing in the community. He noted, if the Administrator had made a recommendation on these agencies, he would not be making a recommendation himself.

Ms. McBride inquired about the amount of funding being requested.

Mr. Livingston responded it is \$1,451,439.

Mr. Hayes noted, because the Administrator did not make a recommendation, it will cause the use of General Fund Fund Balance.

Ms. Mackey inquired about the impact on the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes responded the amount will be \$1,596,439.

Ms. Barron requested the amount in the General Fund Fund Balance.

Ms. Hamm responded the Fund Balance is \$43.5M, which is 27% of the prior year expenditures.

Mr. Livingston inquired how much was allocated from the General Fund for lump sum appropriations in the last fiscal year.

Mr. Hayes responded it was \$2.3M. He noted Administration has recommended funding the budget using \$5.7M from the Fund Balance.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the Administrator's recommended use of \$5.7M and the approximate \$1.6M being request were accounted for in Ms. Hamm's earlier response.

Ms. Hamm responded it did not. If you take into account those amounts, the Fund Balance would be approximately 22.5%.

Ms. Newton inquired if we ever funded these entities in the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes responded the lump sum allocations are in the General Fund.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey and English

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker and Newton

The vote was in favor.

28(e) Lump Sum Allocations (Move to fund United Way at amount requested; \$281,445) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to fund United Way at \$281,445.

Ms. Terracio stated she did not know how deeply we would be dipping into the Fund Balance. She supports the initiative and the work, but this is a large amount for one entity.

Ms. McBride noted she sponsored this pilot project two years ago. Once the pilot project was done, it was her understanding the school districts would pick it up. The request before Council is for the County to continue to support the pilot projects and an additional project. She supports the concept, but the projects should have been picked up by the school districts.

Ms. Terracio requested Administration to provide information regarding the American Rescue Plan.

Mr. Brown stated staff is actively looking into this plan. We will not have definitive treasury guidance until after the budget is adopted, based on the treasury's timeline.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if we will a chance to consider other funding opportunities, once the guidance is received.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, we can switch the funds we are paying out (i.e. General Fund/American Rescue Funds).

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, Council, at any time, can make an amendment to the budget with Three Readings and Public Hearing.

Ms. McBride noted the State Department of Education will also be receiving funding, which will give another opportunity for the school districts to step in.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the approximate dollar amount the County will receive from the American Rescue Plan.

Mr. Brown responded the County is expected to receive \$80M, which the County will receive in two tranches. The funds can be used for a multiplicity of programs, as outlined by the American Rescue Plan. For example, sewer infrastructure.

In Favor: Livingston, O. Walker and English

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron

Abstain: Mackey – currently serves on the United Way Board

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The motion failed.

Ms. Barron stated, for the record, she would like to see Council fund them at a different level. She would support the new “pilot” program.

29. *Various (To allocate Lump sum funding to various groups that have historically been funded in multiple funds: \$53,000 Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 for Congaree River Keeper, \$42,900 Keep the Midlands Beautiful; \$53,000 River Alliance; \$168,900)* – Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, these entities used to be funded in other places, but for this year we are moving them to lump sum appropriations.

Mr. Hayes responded these entities are not funded out of the General Fund Lump Sum Appropriation. The entities are funded in other funds (i.e. Keep the Midlands Beautiful: Solid Waste Fund; Congaree Riverkeeper: Stormwater Fund; and River Alliance: Temporary Alcohol Fund). The Chamber of Commerce for BRAC is funded out of the Non-Departmental General Fund.

Ms. Newton inquired if anything ever came of the conversation in regards to litter in the County.

Mr. Brown responded not as yet. The funds are not tied to a specific project or use.

Mr. Hayes responded funding for this particular grant is in Solid Waste, but it is not tied to a particular program. It is at the pleasure of Council. If Council decides not to fund the grant program, the funds will remain in Solid Waste and the funds can be reprogrammed.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to fund the Congaree Riverkeeper (\$20,000) from the Stormwater Fund; to fund Keep the Midlands Beautiful (\$42,900) from the Solid Waste Fund; and to fund River Alliance (\$53,000) from the Temporary Alcohol Fund.

Mr. J. Walker inquired if the Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC request has been excluded from the motion.

Mr. Livingston responded the request would be funded from the General Fund, and he is getting “beat up” about funding from the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes stated, because it is not a part of lump sum appropriations, the \$53,000 is already accounted for in Non-Departmental.

Mr. Livingston stated he will include the Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC (\$53,000) from the Non-Departmental fund.

Ms. Terracio stated the Gills Creek Watershed Association is another entity that is historically funded from Stormwater. She inquired if that is included in the budget.

Mr. Hayes responded it may be a part of the Conservation Commission funding, but it is not a part of the lump sum appropriations.

Ms. Terracio inquired how the River Alliance came to be funded out of the Temporary Alcohol Fund.

Mr. Hayes responded he will provide an answer prior to 3rd Reading.

Ms. McBride inquired if all of the entities are nonprofits.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if the request is for each of them to receive County funds.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride inquired if it is left up to the departments where the groups are located to determine whether they want to be funded, if we do not pass the motion.

Mr. Hayes responded, if Council chooses not to fund them, the entities will not be funding. Council approves all grant funding.

Ms. McBride noted she believes Council needs to know what all nonprofits are doing. Therefore, the nonprofits should submit applications.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, these funds are accounted for in other departments, which are a part of the Administrator’s budget. It seems by approving this item, we are approving it a second time.

Mr. Hayes responded the dollar amount are a part of the Non-Departmental Professional Services. Historically, the BRAC funding has been funded out of it. If Council opts not to spend the \$53,000, then the funding would be re-programmed for another use.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why the funding is being taken out here a 2nd time.

Mr. Hayes responded the Administrator recommended a funding level for the General Fund. Any organization that is receiving County funds has to be approved by Council. Even though the funding level was approved, you still have to have the specifics of the organization approved.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey and English

Opposed: J. Walker and Newton

The vote was in favor.

29(a) Various (Move to Fund the River Alliance at the FY21 Level; \$53,000) – This motion was included in Item #29.

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

30. Victim's Rights (Allocate funding to approve Victims Assistance Budget; FY21 - \$1,094,789)

– Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator's recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

31. Tourism Development (Allocate funding to approve Tourism Development Budget;

\$1,000,000) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator's recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

32. Temporary Alcohol Permits (Allocate funding to approve Temporary Alcohol Permits

Budget; \$170,000) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator's recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

33. Emergency Telephone System (Allocate funding to approve Emergency Telephone System

Budget; \$6,943,223) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator's recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

34. Fire Service (Allocate funding to approve Fire Service Budget; \$29,794,288) – Mr.

Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator's recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 35. Stormwater Management (Allocate funding to approve Stormwater Management Budget; \$3,511,977)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 36. Conservation Commission Fund (Allocate funding to approve Conservation Commission Fund Budget; \$1,033,470)** – Ms. Terracio inquired if this is the ½ mill.

Mr. Hayes responded the ½ mill is \$891,500. The remaining funding would come from the Conservation Commission Fund Balance.

Mr. Brown stated this is not the final budget, and he will be meeting with the Conservation Commission and Richland Soil and Water Conservation District.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 37. Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund (Allocate funding to approve Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund Budget; \$850,792)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 38. Hospitality Tax (Allocate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget; \$7,400,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 39. Accommodation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Accommodation Tax Budget; \$325,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 40. Title IVD - Sheriff's Fund (Allocate funding to approve Title IVD - Sheriff's Fund Budget; \$55,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 41. Road Maintenance Fee (Allocate funding to approve Road Maintenance Fee Budget; \$8,051,033)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 42. Public Defender (Allocate funding to approve Public Defender Budget; \$5,191,765)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 43. Transportation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget; \$73,000,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 44. School Resource Officers (Allocate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget; \$6,795,405)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 45. Economic Development (Allocate funding to approve Economic Development Budget; \$1,857,915)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommended amount.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

DEBT SERVICE

- 46. General Debt Service (\$15,335,648)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 47. Fire Service (\$549,000)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 48. Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S (\$1,486,550)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 49. RFC-IP Revenue Bond 2019 (\$1,604,590)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 50. East Richland Public Svc Dist (FY21 - \$1,438,560)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 51. Recreation Commission Debt Svc (\$3,240,125)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 52. Riverbanks Zoo Debt Service (\$2,529,374)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 53. School District 1 Debt Service (\$41,891,138)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 54. School District 2 Debt Service (\$65,822,488)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 55. Transportation Bonds (\$31,832,222)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

- 56. Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Allocate funding to approve Solid Waste Budget; \$37,067,254)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 57. *Richland County Utilities (Allocate funding to approve Richland County Utilities Budget; \$10,850,000)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 58. *Hamilton-Owens Airport Operations (Allocate funding to approve Airport Budget; 577,446)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation.

Ms. Newton inquired about the amount of funding being transferred from the General Fund. She noted she looks forward to seeing a plan where the airport is more self-sustaining or where we have a conversation that says we will always transfer funds from the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes responded the airport has its own revenue, but the General Fund supplements it. The transfer out assists with balancing the budget. The amount being transferred out this fiscal year is \$270,846.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 1(a) *Richland County Recreation Commission: Additional amount to cover Capital Project at Tennis Facility (Recommended: \$325,000)*** – Mr. Livingston suggested moving this item to 3rd Reading in order to find a funding source.

Mr. Malinowski noted the Recreation Commission has a debt service of \$3.2M. He suggested the County inquire about what the debt service is for, and potentially rearrange their capital projects list to accommodate this request.

Ms. English inquired if putting an organization over the cap would raise taxes.

Mr. Hayes responded, according to State statute, you cannot take an organization. If you give an organization anything more than a no mill increase, it would raise the taxes.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, if we take the Recreation Commission to the cap, there is not a tax increase.

Mr. Hayes responded there would be an increase. Anything more than a no mill increase would raise taxes.

Ms. Barron inquired if we could look at using Hospitality Tax dollars.

Mr. Hayes responded typically we do not fund recreation with Hospitality Tax funds, but if the organization had a project that complies with H-Tax guidelines we could use those funds.

Mr. Livingston requested an explanation of why the General Fund Balance amount he was given earlier is different than the amount shared tonight.

Ms. Hamm responded the amount shared tonight is from the CAFR. She noted the unassigned Fund Balance is \$43M, with an overall total of \$68.4M.

Ms. Newton requested the Recreation Commission's maintenance plan.

Ms. McBride noted the County funds the Recreation Commission more than the base amount required by ordinance. She stated we may have to prioritize the needs, and have the Recreation Commission to fund some of these needs.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if we go to the cap, what would be the impact on the taxpayer(s).

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to bring this item back at 3rd Reading.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker and English

The vote was in favor.

SECOND READING: ORDINANCES

An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations and adopt an Annual Budget (FY22) for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June 30, 2022, so as to raise revenue, make appropriations and adopt the General Fund, Millage Agencies, Special Revenue Funds, Enterprise Funds, and Debt Service Funds Budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June 30, 2022 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Mr. J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

An Ordinance authorizing the levying of ad valorem property taxes which together with the prior year's carryover and other State levies and any additional amount appropriated by the Richland County Council prior to July 1, 2021 will provide sufficient revenues for the operation of Richland County Government during the period from July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Mr. J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

4. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:37 PM.

