



Richland County Council

2nd Reading – BUDGET MEETING

June 4, 2020 – 5:00 PM

Zoom Meeting

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Tommy DeLage, Brad Farrar, Allen Brown, Ashiya Myers, Ashley Powell, Marjorie King, James Hayes, Ojetta O’Bryant, Quinton Epps, Tariq Hussain, Stacey Hamm, Steven Gaither, Michael Niermeier, Leonardo Brown, Clayton Voignier, Hayden Davis, John Thompson, Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Dale Welch, Michelle Onley and Kimberly Williams-Roberts

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 PM.
2. **SECOND READING:**

Mr. Hayes stated Council will be addressing the millage agencies, recommendations for County grants, Special Revenue Funds, Transportation Tax Projects, Debt Service, and Capital Improvement Projects. The original Budget Book will be utilized. In addition, there were some revised documents sent to Council, and he will be very specific as they go through each line item as to which documents he is referring to. The millage agencies did as Council instructed, and you were provided updated budget request last week.

Ms. Terracio stated, before we go down the list, she had a question about the Richland Library. She thinks we are obligated to fund no less than a certain amount, which she believes is the budget from the year before. She wants to ensure the FY20-21 request meets our legal obligation to fund the library.

Mr. Hayes responded, when he spoke with the Auditor, the only millage agencies that had a minimum amount to be funded was the Recreation Commission and the school districts.

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Recommended: \$14,833,254)*** – Mr. Manning moved to approve Items #1-8.

The motion died for a lack of a second.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in the companion document, we have question #10, from Ms. McBride, and Mr. Hayes just answered about agencies, besides the Recreation Commission, the County is required to fund at a certain level. Ms. McBride also requested to see the difference between the minimum amount required, and the Cap amount we are funded, but he did not see that information.

Mr. Hayes responded that he will have to get that information from the Auditor. He will provide that to Council before Third Reading.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if this takes into consideration the 10% reduction.

Mr. Livingston responded a letter was sent out to the various millage agencies. He inquired if Ms. Dickerson is referring to the total amount before us.

Ms. Dickerson stated she wants to know if they considered a 10% reduction in their request for funding this year, based on where we are. She does not know if she has all of the information in front of her.

Mr. Livingston responded they received a new request from each agency.

Mr. Hayes responded, each millage agency, with the exception of Midlands Tech, did submit a revised request.

Ms. McBride inquired if the figures reflect the 10% reduction.

Mr. Hayes responded he cannot say the requests are exactly 10%, but he does know that each of the millage agencies requested a lower amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, with the exception of Midlands Tech.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated she is looking in her original Budget Book on p. 123, and then, she is looking at the revised documents (p. 124), and it appears, to her, that most of the numbers are the same. She inquired if she is reading this incorrectly.

Mr. Hayes responded, in the original packet, the entities did not have a submission. We submitted something in the companion document that showed what their original amount were. Each of the entities has a submission that is lower than previous one.

Ms. D. Myers stated she would like some clarity on the percentage of reduction, if it is not 10%, given that was a clear request.

Mr. Hayes responded the submission was as follows: original - \$16,482,237; revised - \$14,833, 254.

Ms. D. Myers stated, for clarification, in this case, it is greater than 10%.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the Recreation Commission's funding request of \$14,833,254.

Ms. Newton stated, in the original Budget Book, the only place we have numbers were in the column for FY20-21 – No Millage Increase, and then Mr. Hayes verbally told Council what the requests were, so they were not recorded in print, in the Budget Book. Whereas, in the revised documents, we have actual numbers that have been provided in the FY21 amended request.

Mr. Hayes responded that is correct.

Ms. Newton stated the two numbers we did not have, at our previous meeting, were the school districts, and they have now been provided in the revised document.

Ms. McBride requested, prior to Third Reading, the amount of millage required for the Recreation Commission.

Ms. D. Myers stated, when we are looking at the agencies, not just the Recreation Commission, are we looking at them with the caveat that, when we get the new information, we may have to come back and adjust the budget through an amendment.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, is Ms. D. Myers saying, due to the ongoing pandemic, it could be possible the numbers Council votes on may have to be amended, at a later date.

Ms. D. Myer responded in the affirmative. She stated we are awaiting final budgetary projections from staff, and we know that we are shooting in the dark. These numbers, while seemingly aggressive, may ultimately be problematic.

Mr. Hayes stated the Auditor has provided some projections. The values, which specifically relate to the Recreation Commission, are coming in less than what he is projecting. Therefore, it is possible, Council could have to amend budget later.

Mr. Jackson stated, when we first began this process, he expressed his concern, at the first budget work session, and again the next day in writing, about the unrealistic expectation, on everyone's part, of any numbers at this stage of the process. Thereby, he requested a continuing resolution, so we would not have to approve any budget, but continue with the existing budget until we got to the point where we would have a more official determination of what numbers meant something, based upon collected revenue, as opposed to projections. He is not sure what happened with that request. Maybe, because he did not put it in the form of a motion, it did not get carried. He wants to go on record that we are definitely going by the seat of our pants, at this stage of the process. If that is what is required by ordinance, and we have to do it, he would like to say he would rather we consider a continuing resolution, as he requested, and make a formal budget request based upon realistic revenues collected, versus projected, in September.

Mr. Manning stated he thought we were shifting the 2nd Reading, 3rd Reading and Public Hearings until September. He has been confused about what parts we decided we were taking up tonight, and got left out of the parts moved to September. He requested that someone explain to him why we bifurcated what we are going on 2nd Reading tonight, without the information related to revenue, but we pushed another part of the budget to September for that same reason.

Ms. D. Myers inquired, if Mr. Jackson made a motion, and, if so, she would like to second it.

Mr. Livingston responded he did not take it as a motion.

Mr. Jackson responded he was trying to get clarification, and, if he got an answer that made sense, he was going to withdraw the original motion to approve the Recreation Commission funding request for 2nd Reading.

Ms. McBride noted that we talked about each agency having carryover funds. She inquired if we looked at that to see if they had funding available that was not spent this year.

Mr. Hayes responded, in the companion document, we did supply the fund balances, or reserves for each of the millage agencies.

Ms. McBride inquired about how that looks, as we think about what Mr. Jackson is talking about. She inquired if most of the agencies have fund balances.

Mr. Hayes responded each individual agency would have to answer. He does not have the specifics of their fund balances, so they would have to provide information on how many months of revenue they have available.

Ms. McBride stated she looked at some information that Mr. Hayes provided, and the balances were up in the millions.

Mr. Hayes responded the millage agencies provided the number, but keep in mind, they did not designate what was unreserved or reserved. To answer the specific question, he would rather each agency answer because he does not know the details of their specific fund balance.

Mr. Manning restated his earlier question about what portion of the budget Council is taking up tonight, and which portion will be taken up in September. He was under the impression all of it was moving into September, since the movement had to do with the fact that we did not have an idea, at this point, what revenues may be.

Mr. Hayes responded, when we started the budget process, he noted there were only two (2) items that needed to be taken up, and that was the millage agencies and one-year grants. The millage agencies are not a part of the Biennium Budget, so they have to have a budget in place by July 1st. In speaking to the County Attorney, he indicated a continuing resolution would not work because the budget is set by ordinance. If you were to specify they would continue at last year's amount, it would have to be by ordinance, and not a resolution.

Ms. Dickerson stated we are always asked to transparent, and show where our funds are. She thinks these agencies should do the same.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, we cannot do a continuing resolution for the millage agencies, like the State Legislature does.

Mr. Hayes responded, according to the County Attorney, when he posed the question, the continuing resolution would not work. In order for you to continue, you would have to pass an ordinance keeping the amounts at the current level, as opposed to the new amounts.

Ms. Dickerson stated, she thought she specifically asked the attorney to be present, when we have these meetings, because questions come up that we need answered.

Mr. Farrar responded that Mr. Hayes is correct. Under Sec. 4-9-130, there are certain things that have to have a public hearing before you adopt, and the first one listed is to adopt the annual operating and capital budgets, which has to be done by ordinance. Under Sec. 4-9-140, it talks about the fiscal and budget years. All of that is a statutory process done through ordinance.

Ms. Newton stated, we are in this environment of uncertainty, so we can approve these numbers today. There is nothing that stops us from doing it, but there is plenty that stops us from knowing what the ultimate revenue numbers are going to be. She inquired, if we approve all of these numbers, and we receive information from the Auditor, Finance, etc., that says we cannot sustain

these numbers, what is the mechanism, at that point, to address the issue. We have asked about fund balances, and she knows there are some organizations that plan on dipping into their fund balances, but we do not know what the County's situation is going to be. Should our financial situation change, what would we need to do, and what are we legally able to do, if we needed to adjust these numbers.

Mr. Farrar responded, if you have unforeseen things come up, you can legally do budget amendments.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we can vote on the items, as presented, and specify a specific date when we would reconsider the numbers, so that way we would know exactly what we wanted, and how we were going to get there.

Mr. Farrar responded, it is his understanding, this cannot be an estimate. You have to plug in a specific number for what you think, at the time you are adopting the budget, to meet the obligations of the County. All you can really do is look at the circumstances you have now, and make whatever projection you need to make. It needs to be a number that can realistically sustain the item in the budget.

Mr. Livingston inquired, based on the Auditor's millage projections, if it is Mr. Hayes' understanding, the budget will support the numbers being presented.

Mr. Hayes responded, not to speak for the Auditor, these are projections, in the aspect of a pandemic. These are the Auditor's best guess numbers, at the current time.

Mr. Manning inquired as to when the public hearing and Third Reading is scheduled.

Mr. Hayes responded we have had the public hearing. There will not be another public hearing until we take up the General Fund amendment in September. Third Reading on this portion of the budget is scheduled for June 11th.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to adopt everything before us for 2nd Reading, and, if we receive additional information, we take it up at Third Reading.

Mr. Jackson stated he is not opposed to, for semantics' sake, going through the process of approval with the clear understanding, that at Third Reading, if we do not have a different approach to making this determination, he will be adamantly opposed to continuing, based upon the conversations we have been having, and the issues that have been raised by him and several of his colleagues. We are making decisions based upon estimates. In the best of times, those estimates have been pretty reliable. But, during these times, we have no confidence in the same estimates that we are basing our decisions on a year, or two, ago. As a result of that, he was willing to approve the recommending budget for the Recreation Commission because they are clearly significantly less, in their request, than they were the year before. In other cases, he would not be in favor of that tonight. For those that have not met the threshold, he will not be in favor of supporting them next week.

Ms. Dickerson stated she supports Mr. Jackson's comments on this. She commended the Recreation Commission for coming in, and clearly showing us that they have made an effort to reduce the budget.

Mr. Malinowski stated he also supports what Mr. Jackson and Ms. Dickerson just said. He has run the numbers on the 10%. The only ones that have not come into compliance are the two (2) Midlands Tech. He thanked all of the other agencies for following what they were requested to do.

Ms. McBride stated she supports what her colleagues have said, in regard to those agencies that attempted to do the 10% reduction. However, she is concerned, given the circumstances we are in, regarding fund balances. If there is funding the agencies have, and can use, she does not know why we are funding them at the level. She has concerns regarding the overall fund balance, and the overall budgets.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, when Mr. Manning said everything before us, does he mean all of the millage agencies, or everything before her. Secondly, she supports the intent of us moving forward with Second Reading, since we are in this position, and it does not appear to be much we can do, as long as we acknowledge there is a time when we will have to come back and change this. She does not have any reason to believe, if we are doing Third Reading next week, we will have updated numbers. If we are making this determination, based on having information next Thursday, she wants to confirm we are going to have that information. If we are not going to have the information, we will find ourselves back in this situation again.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Columbia Area Mental Health also did not reach the 10% threshold. For the record, the millage agencies' total fund balance is approximately \$145M.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if the two (2) agencies, Mr. Malinowski referred to that did not submit an updated 10% reduction request, submit anything.

Mr. Hayes responded Midlands Tech did not submit anything. They submitted a response document, which explained their rationale. The Columbia Area Mental Health budget is extremely low. The difference between their original amount of \$2,311,000, and their updated request of \$2,196,000, is approximately \$115,000, which equated to an approximate 5% reduction.

Ms. McBride stated she would like to give them 10% more.

Mr. Livingston reminded Council the motion before them is Mr. Manning's motion to approve everything before us for 2nd Reading.

Ms. D. Myers stated her concern would be, given the Budget Office has noted they are not clear on what the numbers in the fund balances mean, and we will be reading a final budget next week, she is not certain that will be enough time. Given the volume of paper that we have on these numbers, unless there is a date certain by which the supplemental information has to be provided to Council, it would be problematic. She inquired, of staff, what their projected deadline is for providing information to Council, and will that include a request to the millage agencies to explain what they mean when they say fund balances.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, if Ms. D. Myers request is to have the millage agencies to provide a breakdown, per category, for their fund balance.

Ms. D. Myers responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Hayes stated, for each organization's fund balance submission, he had his staff place in the note that this was their fund balance in total. It may not have been their total unreserved food balance.

He noted he did not feel comfortable speaking about the details of what each one of the entity's fund balance amount were, but there were individuals on the line that could address that.

Ms. D. Myers stated, to make a decision on it, we need to know that information. If it is a reserved fund balance, it is different from an unreserved fund balance.

POINT OF ORDER – Ms. Newton stated she wanted to back up to the questions she asked earlier, to clarify the motion, and inquiring as to when we were going to get the updated numbers, and, if we were going to have them by next Thursday, when we are schedule to have Third Reading.

Mr. Hayes responded there is not to be any adjustments to the numbers provided by the Auditor's Office until the Fall. There will be no additional information between Second and Third Reading.

Mr. Manning responded the intent of his motion is to include everything from the first item to the last thing on the agenda, in a procedural way. He does not know why we are going through all of this tonight, and then go through it all again a week from now.

Ms. McBride reiterated the need to look at the unreserved fund balance. She thinks that could impact here decisions on the budgets.

Ms. Newton stated, as we look at these, Richland County funds our millage agencies, and we are obligated to do so. She inquired if there is any guidance, as it relates to fund balances, and whether those are items we can consider, as we are making our funding recommendations.

Mr. Farrar inquired if Ms. Newton is referring to agencies that might be funded through Hospitality Tax.

Ms. Newton responded she is specifically referring to the millage agencies. She inquired if fund balance is a line of inquiry they are allowed to consider in the budget, and, if so, is there any particular parameters regarding how we are instructed to make those decisions.

Mr. Farrar stated, under State Law 4-9-140, it says, "In the preparation of annual budgets or supplemental appropriations, council may require such reports, estimates and statistics from any county agency or department as may be necessary to perform its duties as the responsible fiscal body of the county." By extension, if you have these other entities that you have some obligation to fund, but it may not be a certain amount, you can certainly reach out and request that. You are going to need that type information to make a reasonable estimate. You can request it, but if they do not respond, or cannot do so timely that may be a bridge you have to cross later.

Mr. Livingston stated, if Mr. Manning's motion passes, we would have Third Reading next Thursday. It would be important to him to know what is going to be the difference. In other word, what information are we going to have then, that we do not have now.

Mr. Hayes responded, from staff's perspective, there will not be any additional information from Richland County. Staff can reach out to the millage agencies who have not provided a breakdown of their fund balances, to make sure we get a breakdown of everyone's fund balance.

Ms. Newton made a second substitute motion, Mr. Livingston, to approve the millage agencies for Second Reading, with the stipulation that we may have to come back, at some point, and adjust those numbers, and then continue with discussion on the other items on the agenda.

Ms. Newton stated she understands the situation that we are in, and she does not disagree with her colleagues, in terms of the questions around why we are doing this. There are some other items that she has questions about, regarding grants, and other areas, that we would not have the opportunity to discuss, as a body, if we approved everything all at once.

Mr. Malinowski stated the items would have the opportunity to be discussed. You can either get questions answered offline between Second and Third Reading, or you can bring it up at Third Reading.

Ms. Terracio stated, at the Budget Public Hearing, we had a small number of people who were there to speak for their organizations. She believes we have some people on the line tonight, and she inquired if we have allowed any time tonight, or any time for these individuals to advocate for their organization.

Mr. Livingston stated, according to our Rules, that can happen, but it would require a vote of Council to allow those individuals to speak.

In Favor: Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, McBride, Manning, Jackson and Myers

The second substitute motion failed.

Ms. Terracio stated some of her colleagues have brought up the fact there are problems with approving these numbers, based on the uncertainty ahead of us. She noted, a 10% across the board cut, while it is equal, it is not equitable, based upon the services that many of these organizations provide. There may be some organizations that are not very active right now, and there are some organizations that have been showing up and providing services the whole time COVID-19 has been affecting us. Her position is not to approve a 10% across the board reduction simply because it is equal. She would rather advocate for something that looks more like equity, in terms of services provided. She knows that is a difficult position to be in, but she feels it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, the General Fund is not on this track, and will not be taken up until the Fall.

Mr. Manning reiterated that his motion is for everything on the agenda.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Manning and Jackson

Opposed: Dickerson, Myers and Newton

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

2. ***Columbia Area Mental Health (Recommended: \$2,196,520)***
3. ***Public Library (Recommended: \$27,855,839)***
4. ***Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Recommended: \$2,222,100)***
5. ***Midlands Technical College – Operating (Recommended: \$6,445,030)***

Special Called Meeting

June 4, 2020

6. *Midlands Technical College – Capital (Recommended: \$3,590,858)*
7. *School District One (Recommended: \$234,746,954)*
8. *School District Two (Recommended: \$161,106,497)*

GRANTS

9. *Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$320,000)*
10. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies; \$2,046,186)*
11. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations; \$500,000)*
12. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY18 level; \$255,091)*
13. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level; \$67,895)*
14. *Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project (\$250,000)*
15. *Approval of Historical Corridor funding level (\$372,715)*
16. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level; \$75,000)*
17. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level; \$1,813,350)*
18. *Hospitality Tax (Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level; \$150,000)*
19. *Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level/Cost Allocation; \$4,485,000)*
20. *Community Conservation Grants (RCCC Community Conservation Grants; \$42,439)*
21. *Historic Grants (RCCC Recommended Historic Preservation Grants; \$207,561)*
22. *Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants Committee; \$77,146)*
23. *Grants (Approve grants departments are applying for; \$1,017,603)*

GENERAL FUND

24. *County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions; FY1 - \$177,913,578)*
25. *Transfer Out (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; FY21 - \$8,787,488)*
26. *Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations; \$160,000 in new recommendations, and \$40,000 in multi-year grants approved in prior years)*

27. *Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; \$842,477)*

28. *LumpSum Allocations (Base amount approved FY21; \$2,110,828)*

28(A). *Various (To allocate LumpSum funding to various groups that have historically been funded in multiple funds: \$53,000 – Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 – for Congaree River Keeper; \$42,900 – Keep the Midlands Beautiful; and \$55,000 – River Alliance)*

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

29. *Victim’s Rights (Allocate funding to approve Victims Assistance Budget;FY21 - \$931,021)*

30. *Fire Service (Allocate funding to approve Fire Service Budget; FY21 - \$29,049,480)*

31. *Hospitality Tax (Allocate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget; FY21 - \$10,015,237)*

32. *Accommodations Tax (Allocate funding to approve Accommodation Tax Budget; FY21 - \$320,000)*

33. *Transportation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget; FY21 - \$69,000,000)*

34. *School Resource Officers (Allocate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget; FY21 - \$6,316,005)*

DEBT SERVICE

35. *General Debt Service (FY21 - \$13,906,265)*

36. *RFC-IP Revenue Bond 2019 (FY21 - \$1,604,234)*

37. *Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S (FY21 - \$1,488,013)*

38. *Broad River Sewer 2011A (FY21 - \$2,135,563)*

39. *East Richland Public Svc Dist (FY21 - \$1,438,560)*

40. *Recreation Commission Debt Svc (FY21 - \$3,237,425)*

41. *Riverbanks Zoo Debt Service (FY21 - \$2,663,973)*

42. *School District 1 Debt Service (FY21 - \$43,022,192)*

43. *School District 2 Debt Service (FY21 - \$61,529,744)*

44. *Transportation (FY21 - \$127,523,750)*

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

45. *Richland County Utilities (RC Sewer Reduction; \$11,248,138)*

Special Called Meeting

June 4, 2020

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)

46. *Detention Center (Phase 5 Sprinkler Upgrade; \$150,000)*
47. *Detention Center (Dormitory Shower Upgrade; \$80,000)*
48. *Detention Center (Security Camera Upgrade; \$1,200,000)*
49. *Detention Center (Laundry Upgrade; \$50,000)*
50. *Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Eastover Building; \$225,000)*
51. *Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Single Axle Dump Truck – Replacing AJ001 [1999 Chevrolet Dump Truck]; \$125,000)*
52. *Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Tandem Dump Truck – Replacing AP006 [2005 Chevrolet C8500 Dump Truck]; \$125,000)*
53. *Road & Drainage Maintenance Division (Slope Mower – Replacing AP008 [2005 CAT Challenger]; \$185,000)*
54. *Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Backhoe – Replacing AK004 [2000 Caterpillar 416C Backhoe]; \$98,000)*
55. *Stormwater Management (Update inventory SI assets: structures and pipe type, size, condition and age; \$2,000,000)*
56. *Stormwater Management (Melody Garden Stream/Ditch Stabilization Project Construction; \$500,000)*
57. *Airport (Taxiway Rehabilitation, Access Roads, Perimeter Fence: Phase II; \$28,500)*
58. *Airport (Airfield Lighting Rehabilitation [Design]; \$8,750)*
59. *Engineering (Roadway Repair-Design; \$100,000)*
60. *Engineering (Roadway Repair-Construction; \$400,000)*
61. *Solid Waste (Landfill Gas System: This is top priority. This was exchanged for the trash compactor listed in the budget. Required by SC DHEC; \$750,000)*
62. *Solid Waste (Excavator; \$350,000)*
63. *RCSD/Coroner (Security Fencing, Cameras, and Gates – Powell Road; \$100,000)*
64. *RCSD/Coroner (Aviation Unit End of Life Cycle Replacements – Replacement Parts; \$350,000)*
65. *RCSD/Coroner (Security Fencing and Lighting – Region Seven Substation; \$85,000)*
66. *RCSD./Coroner (RCSD Additional Equipment and Vehicles; \$2,600,000)*

Special Called Meeting

June 4, 2020

- 67. *RCSO/Coroner (Coroner Equipment; \$250,000)*
 - 68. *ESD/EMS (New Ambulances; \$1,000,000)*
 - 69. *ESD/EMS (EMS Equipment Needs; \$2,800,000)*
 - 70. *ESD/EMS (ESD Equipment Needs; \$500,000)*
 - 71. *ESD/Fire (ESD Fire Needs/Equipment and New Construction; \$7,000,000)*
 - 72. *Information Technology (IT Equipment Needs; \$1,500,000)*
 - 73. *Operational Services (Various Facility Needs; \$5,000,000)*
 - 74. *Operational Services (Security Upgrade Project; \$500,000)*
 - 75. *Operational Services (Township Parking Lot –Est. Cost; \$1,802,350)*
 - 76. *General Information Systems (Countywide Orthoimagery – Flight; \$268,500)*
 - 77. *Magistrates (Various Magistrate Needs; \$8,000,000)*
 - 78. *Assessor (CAMA System; \$1,500,000)*
3. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:05 PM.