



# Richland County Council

## SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

June 21, 2018 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joyce Dickerson, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Vice Chair; Seth Rose, Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Norman Jackson, Gwen Kennedy, Paul Livingston, Yvonne McBride, Dalhi Myers, and Greg Pearce

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Michelle Onley, Brandon Madden, Sandra Yudice, Kim Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Tim Nielsen, Stacey Hamm, Nancy Stone-Collum, Portia Easter, Wendy Davis, Ashley Powell, James Hayes, Dwight Hanna, Jeff Ruble, O’Jetta Bryant, Tyler Kirk, Steven Gaither, Jasmine Crum, Beverly Harris, Marjorie King, and Tracy Hegler

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.

Ms. Dickerson stated that Mr. Pearce was not in attendance due to a family emergency.

2. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **THIRD READING**

Dr. Yudice stated today we are having 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of the Budget Amendment for FY 2019.

Mr. Hayes stated the document we will be primarily working from is the motions list. At last week’s meeting, Mr. Livingston requested Budget to white out those items that Council did not have to revisit, and highlight those items they did have to visit. He stated there was a motion list that was sent our earlier this week with Budget Memo 6-1. On the attached motion list Item #20 was highlighted, but it should not have been highlighted because no additional information was requested on it.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, the highlighted items are the ones we will be taking up. The items that are not highlighted will not be taken up.

Mr. Hayes stated it is all a part of the budget ordinance. Mr. Manning and Mr. Livingston questioned going through all of the items again, and you would not have to do that because they would be included in the budget ordinance.

Mr. Livingston stated that’s not to say you could not pull out anything you wanted to.

Mr. Pearce stated that was his question. He wanted to know if he was confined to the highlighted items.

## Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Requested \$14,601,333 – Mill Cap)*** – Mr. Hayes stated they supplied additional information in a companion document. He believes Council had questions, as it related to the usage of the center for HOAs and the neighborhoods.

Ms. McBride stated her questions were answered, in the correspondence, regarding the use of the facilities.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the Memorandum of Agreement with the Recreation Commission was signed.

Ms. Myers stated she raised that question last week, and she was told it was signed and returned back to the Legal Department. She stated she had not physically seen it, but she has been told it was signed and returned.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the last formal meeting we had he did not recall it being signed. He remembered the discussion, but he does not remember anything coming back.

Mr. Smith stated they forwarded to the Recreation Commission, at the Council's direction, a MOU, which had not been signed. They sent back a document, which they said they would be willing to sign; however, the changes they made to the document were not consistent with what the Council directed us to do, related to that MOU. To the best of his knowledge, we do not have a fully executed document between the two parties, at this point.

Mr. Bob Coble stated they signed the last document, with one correction regarding the name of the Commission, and it was hand delivered back. If there is a miscue, in terms of getting it, we will get another copy of it.

Ms. Tara Dickerson stated she did deliver it. When they met there was a deadline of the next A&F Committee meeting. She hand delivered the document to Ms. Onley the afternoon of the A&F Committee meeting.

Ms. Dickerson stated, in other words, we do have it.

Mr. Coble stated, if you like we can get another copy of it, and have it hand delivered, but he has seen the signed copy. Mr. Smith is correct. There was previously one that was not what you had asked for, and we had said we wanted to talk about it. Hearing of further instructions from County Council that you wanted it signed, we complied with that, with the one change of the legal name of the Commission.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if they have to vote to ratify the document that has apparently been signed and returned, but they have not seen. He stated his concern is, being a member of the committee, along with several other members of Council, that met and discussed it, having not seen the final version, it would be nice to have a copy of that after having gone through the process. If it fell down within the walls of the County, so be it, but wherever it lies, he would like to have a copy.

Mr. Rose stated, if this is a big concern to Council, perhaps we could defer this to the end of the meeting, or whenever they can bring a copy for everyone to review. He stated he does not have

any concerns. He is fine with moving forward, but if a majority were to have a concern, he would rather move it to later in the meeting.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we could move forward with 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading, contingent upon the document the funds will be released.

Mr. Smith stated, as he recalls, the document required the Commission to commit to do certain things, going forward. It talked about them being subject to them being audited. It is an operational document, more so than anything else. These were some things Council was concerned about going forward with the Recreation Commission, in terms of how they were operating.

Mr. Livingston offered a friendly amendment that the release of the funding will be contingent upon receipt of the MOU.

Ms. Kennedy stated she believes all Council members need to be provided documents prior to the meeting.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, she asked last week at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading about the MOU, because she said she could not vote for it without it, and they said, "Well we gave it to the Clerk's Office." And, she said, "Oh, well I have not seen it. But, ok if you gave it to the Clerk's Office." She stated she has not seen it, but they certified last week the same thing they came here and said. She relied on that representation.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. ***Columbia Area Mental Health (Requested \$2,153,501)*** –Mr. Hayes stated there was some confusion last week, as it relates to the requested amount, and the cap. He stated he did go back and review their paperwork. Their paperwork did say they requested the allowable millage cap.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded Ms. McBride, to approve this item.

Mr. Pearce stated he was looking at the number, and it looked like the normal millage growth was the same number as the cap.

Mr. Hayes stated what typically happens because Mental Health has such a small millage, and you have such a small growth, it is not going to make much of a difference. You will find that in very small millages like the zoo and Columbia Area Mental Health.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. ***Public Library (Requested \$28,275,839 – Above Mill Cap)***
  - a. ***Move that Richland Library, in addition to being funded at the allowable cap adjustment for CPI and Population Growth, receive the requested \$940,000 for Lower Richland and Edgewood Branch start-up funding.***

- b. **Reduce amount to Lower Richland while library is in temporary location at \$100,000 or 2 head counts until year when permanent library location and construction plans established.**

**NOTE: The Library is requesting \$420K above the Cap; this includes funding for both the Edgewood and Lower Richland Branches; Council actions at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading approves an amount that is \$420K more than what they requested; that is an increase of \$840K above the Cap as opposed to \$420K above the Cap. With the amount in Lump Sum Appropriations approved for them at \$325K they would need only an additional \$95K to meet their request; otherwise, the amount will be \$515K.**

Mr. Hayes stated there was some confusion at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. The Library is requesting \$28,275,839, which is \$420,000 above the cap. It includes funding for both the Edgewood and Lower Richland branches. There was a motion made by Mr. Manning, and it could have been Mr. Hayes fault he and Ms. Myers did not have all the information, but there was a motion to increase their budget instead of \$420,000, but by \$840,000. If Council so chooses, that would have to be amended. As it stands now, the Library is only requesting \$420,000. A portion of that would be funded by the Lump Sum appropriation amount Council approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the Library request of \$28,275,839.

Mr. Pearce stated Mr. Madden's memo had a number of \$95,000. Could someone explain that?

Mr. Hayes stated the Library is asking for \$420,000. Council approved a Lump Sum appropriation of \$325,000, which means they would only need an additional \$95,000. If Council approved the additional \$420,000, the total amount needed would be \$515,000.

Mr. Pearce inquired what the correct motion is to get the number right.

Mr. Hayes stated the amount they are requesting is \$28,275,839, which would be the cap, plus the \$420,000.

Ms. Myers inquired if the correct motion would be for \$95,000 above the millage cap because we appropriated some of it already. They need an additional \$95,000.

Mr. Hayes stated that is correct. The total would still be \$28,275,839, which would be their approved budget. That is a \$420,000 increase over the cap, which is funded by the \$325,000 approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading and an additional \$95,000, which would go against the unallocated General Fund.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, we are voting on the \$420,000, above the cap.

Mr. Hayes stated, which will be a part of the total budget, because you have to approve the total budget.

Ms. McBride inquired if that includes the \$95,000 or exclude the \$95,000.

Mr. Hayes stated it includes the \$95,000.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, N. Jackson, Livingston, and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Dickerson

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

The vote was in favor.

4. **Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Requested \$2,300,241)** –Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Midlands Technical College – Operating (Requested \$6,087,264)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Midlands Technical College – Capital (Requested \$3,177,870)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **School District One (Richland District 1 is asking for Council set the Cap millage rate of 263.4, plus look back of 3.4 or 266.8) NOTE: At the rate the district is requesting, the dollar amount is estimated by the District to be \$224,927,684. Maximum amount as calculated by the RC Auditor is \$224,497,097. Since deferral of ordinance, Council will pass a dollar budget.** – Mr. Hayes stated School District One is requesting the cap, and look back for a total of \$224,497,097.

Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **School District Two (Richland District 2 is asking that Council set the millage rate at 331.6) NOTE: At the rate the district is requesting, the dollar amount will stay the same as the cap amount (\$152,286,785).** –Mr. Hayes stated School District Two is requesting the maximum allowable cap for a total of \$152,286,785.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

## GRANTS

9. **Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendations - \$630,000)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

Mr. Pearce stated he continues to be concerned about the drop in A-Tax. He understands Mr. Hayes talked with the Department of Revenue about it, but the answer that was conveyed back to him did not really give us any insight in to why that revenue dropped.

Mr. Hayes stated it is included in the companion document (Exhibit B). The Department of Revenue sent us a rundown of what they captured in FY17 for unincorporated Richland County, as well as year-to-date for FY 18. You will notice there was a significant drop in the revenue. We also asked them if annexation could have potentially had an impact on it. Their response was, "When an entity who has previously paid to a local government, such as the County, if that entity is annexed into the City, those funds would go to the City now." You will also notice there was an increase in the funds to the City of Columbia, while we had a decrease. There was an assumption that some things that did get annexed into the City. The Department of Revenue did a side by side comparison, and we did experience a drop, but the City did experience an increase.

Mr. Pearce stated, it is his understanding, that A-Tax and H-Tax, when annexation takes place the losing entity does retain part of the base. In other words, if there was a restaurant and we were getting \$200,000 a year. We would continue to get the \$200,000. The restaurant is now generating \$400,000, so the City would get the additional \$200,000.

Mr. Hayes stated they asked about that and the Department of Revenue responded, "Accommodations Tax funds are collected on a monthly basis from any business, or individual, that engages in the act of supplying accommodations. The amounts are collected and allocated based on where the accommodations occurred, which is reported on a Schedule ST or 3T, of the Accommodations Tax Return. If a location that supplies accommodations is annexed into an incorporated area, that location then will be allocated to the incorporated area, and no longer allocated to Richland County."

Mr. Pearce stated next year it would really be helpful for Council to have one of the budget staff members do a detailed analysis of this.

Mr. Livingston stated the law Mr. Pearce is referring to refers to Hospitality Tax. It is true with Hospitality Tax. You will continue to receive what you received, prior to annexation.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

10. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies at FY18 level) NOTE: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, EdVenture and Township (\$1,676,743)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$1,676,743.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

Special Called Meeting

June 21, 2018

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. N. Jackson requested a breakdown of this item.

Columbia Museum of Art - \$765,872  
Historic Columbia Foundation -- \$385,143  
EdVenture - \$155,557  
Township Auditorium - \$300,000  
Operations -- \$70,171

Ms. Myers requested that next budget season we consider putting EdVenture on par with the other Tier I Ordinance Agencies. She stated it is one of the more important aspects of the community for children.

Mr. Pearce stated, when the funding was established for the Ordinance Agencies, there was an arbitrary number was picked out for EdVenture. Over the years, when the numbers were growing, when we had an ordinance that let the numbers grow, they had no base to grow on. That is why they have fallen so far behind. Ms. Myers suggestion of taking a look at that agency has some historical base to do that.

- 11. Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations - \$347,516)** – Mr. Malinowski stated on p. 22 of the companion document, Hospitality Tax Detailed, about halfway down we have the Gateway to the Army Association - \$8,000. Is that the one that Mr. N. Jackson brought up the question about us give them funds, but not all taxpayers can visit the base

Mr. Hayes stated the Hospitality Tax Committee did recommend giving them \$8,000, but that is not part of the \$100,000. They did answer a question, which is in the companion document. This is the same group, Gateway to the Army. The committee gave them \$8,000, but there was a Lump Sum amount Council agreed to give them over a 3-year period of \$100,000.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if that one is in the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated the \$8,000 is part of the committee, not a part of the \$100,000.

Mr. Malinowski inquired where the \$100,000 goes.

Mr. Hayes stated that is a part of the overall Hospitality Tax that Council approves. The committee recommendation is outside of the \$100,000.

Mr. Malinowski stated the Greater Columbia Restaurant Association has been recommended for \$10,000. He would make a motion the \$10,000 be removed because they taut themselves as being a Statewide non-partisan trade organization, but in the most recent primary elections they went in print as favoring particular candidates. He stated that is non-partisan, and the taxpayers money should be going to an organization that is favoring certain candidates over others.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to remove the \$10,000 allocation for the Greater Columbia Restaurant Association.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, there are a couple of restaurants. How is it listed?

Mr. Malinowski stated it is listed as the Greater Columbia Restaurant Association. It is actually listed as the SC Restaurant and Lodging Association.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the motion is to support the remaining recommendations of the Hospitality Tax Committee.

Mr. Malinowski responded in the affirmative.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the item regarding the Gateway to the Army that Mr. Malinowski inquired about earlier is #15 on the motion list.

Ms. Myers inquired if the restaurant association is a pact, or the actual association, that took a position.

Mr. Malinowski responded it is his understanding it is the organization, and not the pact, based on the press release he has.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, so they do not use a pact for that.

Mr. Malinowski stated according to their "About Them" it says they are Statewide non-partisan that strive to represent the best interest of its members. They do not indicate they have a pact. Other ones indicate they have pacts.

Mr. Manning, who was on the phone, spoke regarding this item.

Mr. Hayes stated the only name he has for this organization is what was listed in Zoom Grants for this organization, which is the Greater Restaurant Association.

Mr. Malinowski stated if you continue under that it says a chapter of...

Mr. Hayes stated the chapter of the SC Restaurant and Lodging Association.

Mr. Rose stated this is an organization that does a lot of good with the funds that we allocate. We have committee of citizens that recommended this dollar amount. He certainly cannot go off of information that he has not seen on a press release, that he does not know if was properly written. Everyone up here supports First Responders. He knows the Firefighters have an association that issues endorsements. We certainly would not support firefighters because they have an association that makes independent endorsements. The bottom line is we have a group of citizens that recommended this dollar figure, and they do a good job.

Ms. McBride stated it would be good if our legal counsel could look at the letter, and then look at the name to verify that it is the same association.

Ms. Dickerson stated Mr. Malinowski brought in a copy of a press release. She does not know where it came from. She has not seen it either.

Ms. McBride stated she has not seen it, and she is asking for verification.

Ms. Dickerson stated, since they have not seen it, they can either vote it up or down.

Mr. Smith stated he would not be able to verify it, based on a press release or letter.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**



Ms. McBride stated she did not know what it was. She knew there was correspondence, and there was a name on the correspondence, so we could verify if that was the same name of the grantee.

Mr. Malinowski stated he agrees with Mr. Rose that we have a good group of citizens that made this approval. The recommendations are made in February of March. This particular incident came up in June, so they would not have known about it.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the official logos for the organization were on the press release.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski.

Ms. Kennedy stated she had a problem with this being compared to EMS and Fire Department. Restaurant with Emergency First Responders, but she is fine.

Mr. Pearce stated early today he spoke with the head of this organization because he was working on his personal discretionary. He gives them \$10,000 out of his money every year. This is a local organization that promotes local restaurants. They use the money we give them to promote Restaurant Week, and promote restaurants through various activities. He finds it very hard to believe that our local organization, which is a branch of this other group, would be involved in something like that. He personally does not have a problem with giving them money from his discretionary account.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about how many Greater Columbia Restaurant Associations we have up for grants. Just one, right?

Mr. Hayes stated, as far as he knows, there is only one. He would have to verify it.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this is the one that participated in partisan election.

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

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Dickerson and Rose

Abstain: McBride

Mr. Malinowski's motion failed.

Mr. Manning questioned the outcome of the vote.

Ms. Onley stated there were 5 nay votes, 4 aye votes, 1 abstention vote, and Ms. Kennedy was away from the dais during the vote; therefore, the substitute motion failed.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, if it is appropriate with the rules, and is okay with Mr. Manning, he would be glad, once Mr. Manning states his verbal vote, to cast the vote on his behalf.

Ms. Dickerson stated she does not know that you can do that. She does not think the rules allow someone else to vote. This is one of the things that really concerns her when we get in situation like this. She needs a parliamentarian to be right there to tell her what the next step is. Otherwise, we get bogged down in this is right, and that is not right. She requested Mr. Smith to go to the podium and help her with this item.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

Mr. Smith stated there is nothing in the rules that allows one Councilmember to vote for another because that Councilmember is absent. The rules allows a Councilmember, in a Special Called meeting, to participate, that includes voting, telephonically, which Mr. Manning is doing.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he thought when we changed the rules to have all votes cast electronically, it did away with any voice vote. So, whether telephonically, or present, Mr. Manning is casting a voice vote, and he thought that was eliminated when we went to total electronic voting.

Ms. Dickerson stated she thinks other than on a Special Called meeting call in vote.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, if an individual abstains do they not have to provide the Clerk with a document stating why they abstained.

Mr. Smith stated, if a person is recusing themselves from voting, they have to give a reason for the recusal. If they have a personal or financial interest, and they are recusing themselves. If a person just abstains from voting, and that person is sitting at the dais, their vote goes with the prevailing side.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it was his understanding, we did not allow abstention votes. That every Councilmember had to vote aye or nay.

Mr. Smith stated the abstention is different from the recusal.

Mr. Malinowski inquired where the recusal button is then.

Mr. Smith stated there is not a recusal button. The rules say, if a Councilmember has a conflict, they are to recuse themselves, and they are to give the reason for the recusal, and they do not vote at all. If a Councilmember, however, is at the dais, and they do not register a recusal, but they also do not vote, then they are abstaining from voting. Their vote is counted on the prevailing side.

Ms. Kennedy stated, for example, she had to recuse herself, at one time, because we were voting on a committee her daughter was running for. She recused herself at that point and let everyone know what it was for.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, if that is the case people have abstained every meeting that we have, so we would have to go back and look at all our meetings.

In Favor: Malinowski, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson and Livingston

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Rose and McBride

The vote was in favor.

- 12. Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY18 level) NOTE: Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Visitor's Bureau & Columbia International Festival (\$255,091) – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$255,091.**

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**10**

**13. Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level - \$67,895)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$67,895.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**14. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level - \$75,000)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$75,000.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**15. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Gateway to the Army Association [Council Advocacy Group] - \$100,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated the questions regarding this item were addressed in Companion Document #8, and Exhibit B.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve this item at \$100,000.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, Manning, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and N. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

**16. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project - \$250,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated the questions regarding this item were addressed Companion Document #9, and Exhibit B.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$250,000.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in reading Mr. Hayes response where he says, “There are areas, or pockets in the community that are deteriorating throughout the County. Emerging blight pockets, not addressed, can result in areas in each district with dilapidated and abandoned buildings.” He inquired how putting a park in is going to eliminate the blight. He stated, it seems to him, if we have a problem with the wrong element in this communities we are just providing them another place to gather, so he is not sure how this helps.

Dr. Yudice stated the “Gateway Pocket Parks” were the entrances to the main thoroughfares of the County to identify Richland County as a welcoming place to visit.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, this is a part of revivification. He stated he thought they set aside money.

Mr. Hayes stated these are the items that were approved last year, but you have to approve the funding again this year.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**11**

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 17. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Historical Corridor funding level -\$372,715)** – Mr. Hayes stated this item was approved for the first year of the biennium. This is to approve it for the second year. In discussions with Administrator, it is his understanding, that Council, during the 2017 Council Retreat, had some thoughts about historical items in some of the Council districts. This was supposed to be seed funding to address those items.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item at \$372,715.

Mr. Pearce inquired if we spent the money last year.

Mr. Hayes responded that it was not used.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, that we are now approving another sum.

Mr. Hayes stated Council essentially approved the same funding level for FY18 and FY19. What he did was simply shift the funds over, if Council so chose to approve it.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to how much was approved last year.

Mr. Hayes stated \$410,000. The funds that were not spent will go to the H-Tax fund balance. The \$372,715 would be available for expenditures, if Council so chooses.

Mr. Pearce stated he is trying not to short change the project. When it started talking about the Civil Rights Museum, part of that involved the historical trail. He inquired if Council got started on this project this year, and the cost exceeds \$372,000, would we have access to the money we appropriated last year.

Mr. Hayes stated it would take 3 readings. Council would only be approving the \$372,000. He stated Council could go back and earmark those funds out of fund balance, but it would take 3 readings. He stated Council essentially approved the same funding level. There is a \$38,000 difference between FY18 and FY19. He stated he took the \$38,000 from the corridor project, and kept everything else level.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 18. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level) NOTE: Amounts to \$164,850 to be allocated to each Councilmember (\$1,813,350)** – Mr. Hayes stated this item is the funding level for the Councilmembers' H-Tax discretionary amounts.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**19. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Conservation Commission funding level -\$75,000)**

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**20. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Multi-purpose facility funding level -\$2,000,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated this was approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, but there were comments regarding continuing projects that were associated with the Renaissance.

Mr. Pearce inquired if this is one of the projects that was in Renaissance.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to which project that would be.

Mr. Hayes stated it was the multi-purpose facility in the FY18 budget presented by the previous Administrator. "Biennium budget I recommends designating funding to explore the development of a multi-purpose facility to prompt public/private partnership. This involves construction of a civic center to host concerts and entertainment events in the Southeastern portion of the County.

Mr. Pearce stated that money is already there.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding was approved for FY18, but Council will have to approve it for FY19.

Mr. Pearce stated Council set aside the funding for those projects, so why do we have to approve it again. He inquired if the funding approved last year will just disappear.

Mr. Hayes stated it will roll into fund balance, to be designated for that project. It was budgeted, but because it was not expended it will roll into fund balance to be designated for the multi-purpose facility.

Mr. Pearce stated we made a motion that temporarily everything was frozen with Renaissance. He inquired if we are going to take a piece out and move forward. He stated he does not understand, if the money is already there, why we have to vote on it, and the project is still there.

Mr. Hayes stated he got clarification from Mr. Madden that there was an estimated amount of funding calculated for FY19, but none of that was approved. That is why Council is being requested to approve funding for FY19.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to why Council is not approving funding for Columbia Mall then.

Mr. Madden stated, when Council approved Biennium Budget I, they approved the budgets for one year for the millage agencies, and for General Fund both years were approved. Hospitality Tax, Conservation, Neighborhood Improvement and Accommodations Tax was only approved for FY18. Now we are coming back to request approval of the funds for FY19.

Mr. Pearce stated the project in Lower Richland is going to cost a lot more than \$2 million.

Mr. Madden stated this was intended to be seed funding to assist in facilitating that. The total cost will be higher.

Mr. Hayes stated the total will be \$4 million, and they will be earmarked for that funding. The \$2 million, that was not spent, will go to the H-Tax fund balance, and will be designated for usage for the facility.

Mr. Livingston stated if we deferred the Renaissance, then there is not a project before us.

Ms. Myers stated then we should not be voting on the Gateways or Pocket Parks, since none of that is properly before us either. She noted that if we are not voting on anything to do with Renaissance, we just voted on 3 items, that by definition are Renaissance. Either we are cherry picking, or we are going to take them as they come, but we just voted on several Renaissance projects.

Mr. Pearce stated he thought Revivification was separate. It came up before Renaissance.

Dr. Yudice stated Revivification did come before Renaissance, but once Renaissance was adopted it was rolled into Renaissance.

Mr. Livingston stated, if that is the case, he is going to make a motion to reconsider all those things that were in the Renaissance Plan, so that way we will be clean about it, and we can come back later and make votes on those things we want to move forward on.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to defer 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of this item.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if he wanted to bring this back item back for 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading, could he do so at any time.

Mr. Smith stated he could either designate a specific time for it to come back, if not, it would be an indefinite deferral. The preference is to designate a time, if not, it would normally roll over to the next meeting.

Mr. Pearce proposed a friendly amendment to defer the item until such time as the Renaissance comes back for a vote.

Mr. Livingston stated he may want to separate this item and bring it back prior to the Renaissance coming back for a vote.

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

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, and McBride

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Myers stated someone specifically commented the Gateway Parks and beautification were parts of the Renaissance that they liked, and wanted to vote to fund. She wanted to point this out for the record, so we are clear that we are obviously cherry picking which things we are going to fund, and which things we are not.

Mr. Livingston stated, for the record, it is going to be his recommendation is going to be to defer all of them.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**14**

Mr. Pearce stated the money stays in the bank, so the money will still be there, and be available.

Mr. N. Jackson stated as long as the money remains in Lower Richland for those projects, he is fine with it.

- 21. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level -\$150,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated according to his research the contingency funds were put into the budget by the previous Administrator for the other initiatives associated with Richland Renaissance. There was some funding put aside to supplement the Gateway Pocket Park, the Gateway to the Army, the multi-purpose facility, etc.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve this item for \$150,000.

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

Opposed: Dickerson, Rose and McBride

The vote was in favor.

- 22. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level - \$2,564,800)** – Mr. Hayes stated this is the cost allocation for the H-Tax Fund.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the funding level of \$2,564,800.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, N. Jackson, Rose, and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

- 23. Hospitality Tax (A one-time additional allocation of \$250,000 to the Columbia Museum of Art from H-Tax fund balance) NOTE: This is a carryover item that did not get taken up during the FY18 budget process.** – Mr. Hayes stated the questions regarding this item are answered in Companion Document #11.

Mr. Pearce stated this item actually goes back to 2015, when Karen Brosius approached Council and announced that the Columbia Museum of Art was initiating a capital campaign to expand the facility, which assist them long-term in producing additional revenue, and providing additional space for shows and educational space. They set an aggressive goal of \$14 million. When she made the presentation, she stated they would not be asking Richland County for any capital support. They felt it was the responsibility of the museum to see what it could do. Half of the \$14 million was for the renovations of the facility, and half was for a long-term endowment. They did not do quite as well as they thought, and raised \$7,021,406, which was sufficient money to cover the cost of the renovations and additional space. The City of Columbia contributed \$1 million to the capital campaign. In addition, the South Carolina Art Commission gave them \$1.2 million. This renovated space will enlarge the Columbia Museum of Art to 123,000 sq. ft., and add additional 27,000 sq. ft. They have added an industrial kitchen. They will have 12,322 sq. ft. of additional space for shows, and 4,500 sq. ft. for additional educational areas. They had not appropriated any money for reinstallation of the permanent collections, so all of the items that do not leave the museum are in storage. They wanted to appropriately reinstall that, and the cost was going to be \$250,000. They wrote a letter, last year, asking for the biennial budget to give \$125,000 last year and \$125,000 this

year for reinstallation of the exhibits. It was the very last page of the budget last year, and did not get taken up. They will be ready during this fiscal year to reinstall the exhibit. One option would be to give the \$125,000 this year, and agree to give the other \$125,000 next year; however, his motion will be for the \$250,000.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve \$250,000 for this item.

Ms. Dickerson requested that Mr. Pearce amend the motion to \$125,000 this year and an additional \$125,000 the following year.

Mr. Pearce accepted the friendly amendment.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 24. Hospitality Tax (\$25,000 to Columbia Classical Ballet)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Items 24 – 31.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Rose

Abstain: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 25. Hospitality Tax (\$25,000 to Columbia City Ballet)** – See #24

- 26. Hospitality Tax (\$15,000 to Olympia Granby Historical Society)** – See #24

- 27. Hospitality Tax (\$10,000 to Annual World Affairs Council Dinner)** – See #24

- 28. Hospitality Tax (\$10,000 to Annual International Festival & New International Student Welcome Event)** – See #24

- 29. Hospitality Tax (\$200,000 to EdVenture Children’s Museum)** – See #24

- 30. Hospitality Tax: District 2 Allocations (Moving Forward Summit - \$10,000; River Community Foundation [Blues, Blueberry and BBQ - \$50,000; River Community Foundation [Broad River Community Best in Show Fall Fest] - \$25,000; Richland Music Festival - \$30,000; Capital City Lake Murray Regional Tourism Board - \$10,000; SC Philharmonic - \$2,500; Columbia Classical Ballet - \$3,500; Blythwood Historical Society - \$2,000; Famously Hot New Year - \$5,000; Midlands Tech Harbison Theatre - \$2,500; and Palmetto Capital City Classic - \$5,000)** -- See #24

- 31. Hospitality Tax (Move to approve \$150,000 for Promotions at Pinewood Lake Park by the Foundation which must submit a plan of events)** – See #24

**Hospitality Tax (Allocate Discretionary H-Tax funds as follows: 701 Center for Contemporary Art - \$1,000; Ann Brodie’s Carolina Ballet - \$2,500; Carolina Marathon Associations - \$1,000; Columbia City**



**Ballet - \$15,000; Columbia Classical Ballet - \$15,000; Columbia Film Society d/b/a Nickelodeon Theatre - \$1,000; Columbia International Festival - \$25,000; Columbia Metro CVB - \$10,000; Columbia Regional Sports Council - \$5,000; EdVenture - \$1,000; Famously Hot New Year - \$1,000; Historic Columbia Foundation - \$12,000; Miss SC Pageant - \$1,850; SC Philharmonic - \$10,000; Sparkleberry Northeast Fair, Inc. - \$500; Special Olympics - \$2,000; Town of Eastover - \$2,500)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers inquired if the unallocated fund were rolled over.

Mr. Hayes stated the rollover amount will not be available until after the books for FY18 are closed.

**32. Richland County Conservation Commission (RCCC recommended Historic Preservation Grants - \$207,900)** – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve Items #32 and #33.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve Items #32 – #40.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, that Mr. Hayes put in a companion document that none of these groups submitted an application.

Mr. Hayes stated the companion document had answers from Ms. Hegler stating that none of the groups had submitted an application. The motion at the last meeting was for the groups to complete an application.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, these funds are predicated on the groups submitting an application.

Mr. Hayes stated that is his understanding.

Mr. Manning withdrew his motion.

Ms. McBride made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Items #32 - #44.

Mr. Manning made a 2<sup>nd</sup> substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve Items #32 - #54.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Livingston and Rose

The vote was in favor.

**33. Richland County Conservation Commission (RCCC Community Conservation Grants -\$42,100)** – See Item #32.

**34. Neighborhood Redevelopment (Neighborhood Redevelopment matching grants committee - \$50,213)** – See Item #32.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**17**

35. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate funding to approve the Neighborhood Redevelopment Budget) NOTE: Includes using \$650K in Fund Balance (\$1,447,277) – See Item #32.*
36. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Fairwold Acres/Harlem Heights \$1,384) – See Item #32.*
37. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award St. Mark's Wood \$1,500 – See Item #32.*
38. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Fountain Lake \$1,500) – See Item #32.*
39. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Green Lakes \$1,500 – See Item #32.*
40. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Yorkshire HOA \$1,500) – See Item #32.*
41. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Atlas Road Community \$5,000) NOTE: Community Development Office should return to Council with a plan for the Atlas Road Park (\$1,500) – See Item #32.*
42. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Belvedere Community \$1,500) – See Item #32.*
43. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award North 21 Terrace Neighborhood \$1,200) – See Item #32.*
44. *Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Pinehurst Neighborhood Association \$1,000) – See Item #32.*

#### GENERAL FUND

45. *County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions -\$3,896,076) – See Item #32.*
46. *Computer Technology Replacement (To allocate GF Transfer to CTR fund to continue with the 3-year computer leasing program -\$310,000) – See Item #32.*
47. *Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations \$123,652 in new recommendations, and \$76,348 in multi-year grants approved in prior years) – See Item #32.*
  - 47(a). *Discretionary Grant (Epworth Children's Home and New Economic Beginnings be reduced to the maximum allowable amount of \$10,000 and that Harvest Hope Food Bank and SisterCare each receive \$10,000) – See Item #32.*
48. *Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve at FY18 Funding Levels - \$825,932) – See Item #32.*

Special Called Meeting

June 21, 2018

**49(a). LumpSum (Move to have all FY18 approved amounts become FY19 recommended amount for FY19 LumpSum Appropriations - \$1,673,668) – See Item #32.**

**49(b). LumpSum (Antioch Senior Center \$5,000) — See Item #32.**

**49(e). LumpSum (To allocate \$50,000 to Garners Ferry Seniors Association) – See Item #32.**

**49(f). LumpSum (\$63,240 for Senior Resources Meals on Wheels) – See Item #32.**

**50. LumpSum (Therapy Place \$25,000) – See Item #32.**

**53 LumpSum (Town of Eastover \$100,000 for decommissioning of former school and Asbestos removal) – See Item #32.**

**54 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; \$75,000 Keep the Midlands Beautiful; \$53,295 River Alliance) MO) NOTE: Various Funds – General, Stormwater, Temporary Alcohol, Solid Waste (\$201,295) – See Item #32.**

#### **SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS**

**55 Economic Development (To allocate funding to approve Economic Development’s Budget) NOTE: Includes the \$775,000 transfer in from the GF. Council approved to include a half mill transfer out from General Fund that should have occurred in 2016-2017 for 2016-2017 (\$3,211,500) – There was a discussion regarding Items #49(c), 49(d), 51 and 52 that were withdrawn at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. Mr. Hayes stated those items were removed from the motions list.**

Mr. Livingston stated, at one time, we were including in the budget the catch up funding for Economic Development. Council granted them a .5 mill in 2017 and 2018. For whatever reason, they did not receive those funds. That was \$1.496 million. He inquired if that was incorporated in this budget.

Mr. Hayes stated that is incorporated in the \$3,211,500. The repayment amount is incorporated in that amount.

Mr. Livingston stated there was also a reserve fund of approximately \$800,000.

Mr. Hayes stated there is currently about \$8.5 million in the General Fund Balance assigned for Economic Development. They are utilizing approximately \$3.5 million for projects this year. The fund balance is not a part of this fund.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it is available for Economic Development.

Mr. Hayes stated Council would have to earmark it for it to be appropriated, but it is in the General Fund fund balance assigned for Economic Development. Of the \$8.5 million, \$3.5 is being utilized to fund Economic Development project, but the residual is in fund balance. Council would have to do 3 readings and a public hearing to access that.

Mr. Livingston stated if he wants to use \$800,000 fund balance from this current year.

Mr. Hayes inquired, for clarification, if Mr. Livingston was referring to a portion of the residual fund balance. He stated the \$1.4 million is coming from unallocated, but they do have funds assigned that could be used to increase the budget further.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, that the \$1.4 million is not in General Fund.

Mr. Hayes stated the .5 mill is coming from the General Fund millage. In essence, we are repaying the Economic Development Fund for FY17 and FY18 from the General Fund. Fiscal Year 2019 was factored in, prior to 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston stated in the note on this item it says it includes the \$775,000 transfer from the General Fund for 2016-2017. He stated he had a sheet where the transfer should have been for 2 years.

Mr. Hayes stated \$940,000 is for the MCIP Revenue. That is the only thing they have gotten over the last couple of years. The Economic Development fund has 2 sources of revenue: MCIP and the Economic Development Fund that Council passed. There was a 2<sup>nd</sup> set of funds Council passed, which was the General Fund transfer in. The \$940,000, plus the \$775,000 gave you a pre-Second Reading budget of \$1,715,000. The \$775,000, which is based off the Auditor's current value of the mill for the General Fund was already included. What you asked for at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, was to go back and account for FY17 and FY18, which totaled \$1,496,500. When you take \$1,715,000, plus \$1,496,500, you get the total of \$3,211,500.

Mr. Livingston inquired about what last year's total budget was.

Mr. Hayes stated it was approximately \$973,000.

**56 Public Defender (To allocate funding to approve Public Defender's Budget) NOTE: Includes increasing transfer in from GF by \$400K (\$3,968,098)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Mr. N. Jackson, to approve this item.

Ms. Kennedy made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Items #56-59.

Mr. Malinowski made a 2<sup>nd</sup> substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to take up the items individually

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston., Rose and McBride

Opposed: Kennedy

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve this item.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**20**

Mr. Pearce stated, when the Public Defender moved, there were some issues about security. He inquired if all of those things get settled, and they were able to get moved and settled in their new space.

Mr. Madden responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 57 Fire Service (To approve downward adjustment to Fire Services Budget that the millage will support -\$26,757,330)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 58 Emergency Telephone System (To allocate funding to approve ETS Budget) NOTE: Includes funding for 5 new positions as a part of the Council approved RCSD takeover of Call Center (\$6,252,352)** – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 59 School Resource Officers (To allocate funding to approve SRO Budget) NOTE: As indicated budgeted revenues have not kept pace with actual revenues and we have had conversations with the RCSD and plan to convene a committee in the fall to include all stakeholders and bring a corrective plan of action back to Council. Heathwood amount of \$71,995 has been removed. (\$5,939,419)** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item.

Mr. Pearce inquired if this is the item that deals with paying for the School Resource Officer and paying for the private school.

Ms. Dickerson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated we cannot eliminate a position that exists, so if the person does not go to the school, we will have to appropriate money to pay for the salary for the full time deputy because we by law cannot eliminate the position. He inquired if that had been accounted for.

Mr. Hayes stated, based on the motion to remove Heathwood, he removed approximately \$72,000 from the budget.

Mr. Pearce stated we cannot do that because it will eliminate the position.

Mr. Hayes stated he was just doing what the motion was.

Mr. Pearce stated that is against the law.

Chief Cowan stated Mr. Pearce is correct. Heathwood spends \$44,487 and the County spends \$27,468 currently for the position at Heathwood. If you remove the \$27,468 from what the County is spending because of the decision by Council that means the County will have to pick up \$71,955 for the position.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, when the person is working at Heathwood, they are being paid with private money. No public money is being used. During the time they are not at Heathwood, they are regular deputies doing their duty in other parts of the County. What passed was to eliminate the whole job. We would need a motion tonight to provide the extra money for the deputy's salary or allow the deputy to work at Heathwood.

Mr. Livingston stated either we pay all or part of it.

Mr. Pearce stated, if we pay part of it, Heathwood gets a deputy for the time they pay. So, the motion as it should, would eliminate that, but it does not provide any extra money, so the motion would have to be amended.

Mr. N. Jackson moved to add the County portion back in.

Mr. Hayes stated the total amount that funded for Heathwood is \$71,955.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his understanding from the breakdown is that the County portion is \$27,468. So, he is making a motion to add that back in.

Chief Cowan stated that will not fund the position.

Mr. N. Jackson stated then he moves to fund the position.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the County has a contract with Heathwood.

Chief Cowan responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to when the contract expires.

Chief Cowan stated they have signed a new contract for the next school; however, Council action would take precedence.

Mr. Pearce made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to complete the contract where Heathwood pays for when the deputy is there, and the County pay the portion when the deputy is not there.

Mr. C. Jackson stated all SROs are funded the exact same way. Now of them are there are 100% of the time. Public schools close down during the summer, Christmas, and there are no SROs there, and we cover the cost. Because there was opposition to covering the cost for a private school, he made a motion to simply pull them out and have them totally responsible for the full cost of the position. Chief Cowan indicated there still needs to be a position. The question was whether or not, if there were a position covered by the County, that position should go to another public school that has a vacancy, or has a need. There are many of them in Richland

One and Richland Two, where the position could be applied. There was no interest, on his part, in making the motion that we cover Heathwood Hall.

Ms. Kennedy stated she did not understand why this officer could not go to one of these public schools.

Chief Cowan stated if the County fully funds the position that is what would happen. The Sheriff would determine where the deputy would go.

Ms. Myers stated, what we are debating, and what we debated the last time, was whether or not we should accept private money from a party, with a private contract, to have a School Resource Officer during the days and times when they are there. They are not getting the benefit of having that officer during the summer, but neither do the public schools. Nobody pays to have a SRO, in the summertime, because they do regular, Richland County deputy duties during the summertime. We are basically debating whether or not a private party should be allowed to hire a deputy. If we are going to create a blanket rule to do that, that's fine. It's not really fair to say because the private party contracting runs a school, they cannot have a deputy. That is what they are doing. They are paying for the deputy every hour they have him/her.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, they are not paying for every hour they have him/her. They are paying for a percentage of that time. There is a set salary for the hour, and we pay a certain percentage and they pay a certain percentage.

Ms. Myers stated she could be dead wrong about this, but what she has gotten from the Sheriff's Department, and the school, is the reason the contracts all read that way is because they are getting paid for 9 months. What we are subsidizing in the summer is getting our officer back. The so-called subsidy is to pay the officer's salary for when they are not working at the school. This is the Sheriff's Department program that they went out and solicited this school to pay for. The school did not come to them, they went to the school. The documents she was sent reflect that. She is not died in the wool trying to get an officer away from the public schools, but she is died in the wool for fairness. To the extent that they are paying for a service they were offered, and have been paying all this time, even assuming we are going to take the officer, we should not take it midway through a contract and not even give them the benefit of figuring out what they are going to do for some private source security.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Heathwood Hall has an option of paying 100% of the salary, if they choose to do that. His making the motion last week was not to suggest that we pull out of a contract, or that we penalize them unfairly or do anything differently than Richland One is going when they pay 77% of the salary, or Richland Two when they pay 67%, and Lexington pays 58% of the salary. Heathwood pays some percentage of the salary. He simply made a motion that instead of paying 58% of the salary, they would pay 100%.

Mr. N. Jackson requested clarification on Mr. Pearce's motion.

Mr. Pearce stated his motion is that Heathwood Hall will pay when the officer is there, and the County pays when the officer is not there.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to the value of the position.

Chief Cowan stated the position is \$71,955.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**23**

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, Council will have to put back \$71,955.

Mr. Hayes stated the motion will restore the amount back to the amount before 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, which was \$6,011,374.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, we would not eliminating the position. If we move it to another school, it is not that we are eliminating it you are just moving it to another position.

Mr. Hayes stated they would have to move the “cost center” from the Heathwood Hall to one of the school districts.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is not about the removal. It is about the funding.

Mr. Hayes stated he was under the impression Council would keep the \$71,955 in, but instead of it going to the cost center of Heathwood Hall, it would move to another public school.

Mr. Livingston stated he shares Ms. Myers concern about yanking the position now. He would like for us to move forward with it this particular time. We would have to come up with some kind of future policy. If we do not do anything, we could have several private schools requesting officers. And, if we open up the door to all of them, then we will have to substitute all of those because we are going to have to hire officers whether we need them during the summer or not.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if Mr. C. Jackson previously made a motion, he wonders why it is not in front of us or why it has not been on the floor, at some point and time. He thinks what he is saying is that the Sheriff’s Department goes to Heathwood Hall and says, “The Council has said if you want this particular SRO, you will pay the entire amount. If they do not pay the entire amount, then we fall back to us funding it, at another school in the system.” He inquired if that motion was somewhere.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it was approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated he took out the \$72,955, which reduced it from \$6,011,374 to \$5,939,419. If Council’s opt to put the funding back. Be it that Heathwood decides to pay 100% or you opt to send the funds to another school, they can do so.

Ms. Dickerson stated, if you look at the last sentence, it says, “Heathwood Hall in the amount of \$71,955 has been removed.”

Ms. Kennedy inquired if it is legal for us to provide SROs for private schools.

Mr. Smith stated Council funds the Sheriff’s budget with public dollars. As to the deployment of his staff, Council does not have the authority to say where he sends the deputies. It is up to the Sheriff to deploy his deputies where he sees fit. Council could not make a motion to say send a deputy here or send a deputy there. Council funds a position, and then he deploys them and takes care of the operational aspects of his office, as an elected official. He wanted to sure the motion did not include anything about where the deputy would go.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if it was legal for the Sheriff to use public funds, at his discretion, for private schools.



Mr. Smith stated the Sheriff has the right to enter into contracts himself. The Council is funding a position, with public dollars. It is his understanding, a portion of the funding for this position is with private dollars, which is not a problem. However, Council is funding a portion of it, and it is his understanding these individuals are also performing a function for the public, as well. He does not know the degree of that, but it appears we are not talking about a situation where this position is totally funded by private money.

Ms. McBride stated we all want to make all of our schools safe, regardless if they are public or private, but we do have responsibility, as a Council, to make sure that we are providing funds to our public schools. She thinks there is a great need, and it was her understanding, there is a great need for School Resource Officers. Also, we are setting a precedence because any private school could come in now and say we would like an officer, and we will fund all of it for the time they are in school, and you will fund the other part. She does not think that will be fair to the other schools if they come in. She stated she supports taking the position, as Mr. C. Jackson said, and find a school that will want the position and pay for the position. In addition, you are looking at the amount of money that we are paying, but these officers are also part of the retirement fund that we will be paying. That is her concern, as well as others, that we do not take public funds and put them in private schools.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his concern is that the Sheriff is fully funded, and we do not cut any positions. Us having a discussion how the Sheriff spends his money, and what he does it not really before us because we cannot do anything about that. The only thing we can do is make sure we pass the funding.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, all the benefits Ms. McBride spoke about are included in the funding provided by the school.

Ms. McBride stated it would not cover full retirement. We will be paying the rest of it.

Mr. Rose requested a definitive response regarding the retirement funding.

Chief Cowan stated when they charge the school districts, they charge them in 3 categories: salary, personnel services, and equipment. There are different stages of that, but under the money we are talking about right now, the personnel services Ms. McBride is asking about, is fully covered in the \$71,955 (i.e. FICA, Retirement, Longevity, etc.). The concern under Mr. C. Jackson's motion, is the position no longer has funding. If that is the direction of Council, the Sheriff will take the position and move it to another location, under his determination, but that means the position needs to be funded.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, it is her understanding what Mr. Smith said was that all of the motions put forward may be outside the bounds of the law. We have the authority to fund the Sheriff's budget at a certain level. We do not have the authority to direct him, as an elected official, where he does, whatever he does. That is his job.

Mr. Rose inquired if that is why the contract is not with the County, but the Sheriff's Department.

Chief Cowan responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Rose stated the point was well received that Ms. Myers made. Once we fund the Sheriff's Department's budget it is him that determines the use. The contract is not with this body, but with the Sheriff's Department and the school.

Ms. McBride stated she does think anyone is questioning the authority of the Sheriff, and what he can do with the position. Our concern is the \$27,000 the County is paying.

Mr. Livingston stated it looks like we only have one option anyway, and that is to fund it.

Ms. Dickerson requested clarification of Mr. Pearce's motion.

Mr. Pearce stated it was to leave it alone and let the contract works its way out, and go from there.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, because we cannot eliminate the position, we were going to make sure the \$77,000 was back in the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated before 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading the funding was there. The total was \$6,011,374. He took it out based on the motion to remove the cost center. He stated he needs a budget dollar. If Council is going to put the funding back, that would bring the total \$6,011,374.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is his point. If we cannot eliminate the position then we have to put it back.

Mr. Pearce stated his motion was whatever the figures we presently operate under to continue to operate under those figures, at least until the end of the contract.

Mr. Hayes stated the total is \$6,011,374.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Dickerson, N. Jackson and Livingston

Abstain: Kennedy, Rose and McBride

The vote was in favor.

**60 Transportation Tax (To adjust the Transportation Budget to match projected Revenue and approve funding levels for the various Transportation related projects) NOTE: This represents the 65.1M projected to be brought in by the Sales Tax Revenue in FY19; the total recommended Transportation Budget is \$148,978,756 including BANS drawdown (\$65,100,000) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded Ms. Myers, to approve this Items 60 and 60(a).**

Mr. N. Jackson stated there was also a recommendation the County will manage the transportation system.

Mr. Hayes stated that is not written in the details.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there is a certain amount of money included if the County takes over the transportation system.

Mr. Hayes stated all of the projects are listed on p. 73.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**26**

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski,

The vote was in favor.

**60(a) Transportation Tax (Administration Office requests that Council direct staff to engage the City of Columbia in developing a global intergovernmental agreement. This agreement will be applicable to all transportation projects funded with the transportation penny tax revenues, for which the City submits annual budget requests according to County Ordinance No. 039-12HR, to ensure the funding is expended pursuant to the SC Department of Revenue transportation penny guidelines.) – See Item # 60.**

**61. Debt Service Funds (Various Debt Service Payments FY19) (\$389,960,321) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.**

Mr. Pearce inquired as to what the debt limit is.

Mr. Hayes stated this is just the County.

Mr. Malinowski stated the one we just voted on has \$148,978,756 and this one has \$257,479,000.

Mr. Hayes stated the \$148,978,756 is the Transportation Operating budget for next year. The amount of money on the other is the debt service associated with the repayment of the BAN.

Mr. Livingston stated he called Mr. Hayes after he saw that because it showed a 207% increase in debt service. He realized that the \$250M bond was a part of that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated there are some legitimate Countywide issues that we have that regardless of whether we call them Richland Renaissance or Revivification, or whatever that are going to continue to plague us. Those of us that are going to be around for a while are going to have to continue to contend with these blighted areas in our County. We are going to need to address this blight, and not politicize it. By classifying blight with a title that it was associated with this or that; therefore, that was tabled, so we do not address the issues. If these areas of blight and improvement were the goals of Ms. Hegler under the Revivification Plan, prior to Richland Renaissance, then he would respectfully request that Council give staff permission to go back and pull out all of the items in the budget that were connected with Revivification and resubmit for approval. To simply not address some of the horrible conditions in our community simply because they are associated by title is grossly unfair, when we acknowledge in this room that those very issues we are talking about removing were issues prior to Richland Renaissance.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded Ms. Myers, to direct Planning and Development staff to pull out all of the items in the budget that are connected to Revivification and resubmit them for approval.

Mr. Livingston inquired if that will include the Historic Trail because he thought was separate.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he did not want to debate which is, and which is not. He is asking that we give staff permission to pull it out and submit to us a list of things that are a part.

Mr. Livingston stated the Historic Trail may not have been under Revivification and he wants that pulled out.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he heard the issue, concern, and the debate we had tonight when we made a decision on a couple of areas and approved them. Then another one come up later and we associated with Richland Renaissance, as the others were, and we did not approve it. He was simply asking. The explanation was that some of these were under Revivification. He wanted us to look at all of those under Revivification to make sure none of those areas did not lose their approval for moving forward.

Mr. Hayes stated what he has a record of being approved is the \$250,000 for the Gateway Pocket Park., \$372,000 for the Historic Corridor, but did not approve the \$2 million for the multi-purpose facility.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the items have been discussed and approved. At this point, to go back and pull them out. You would have to reconsider those items to take them out to reconsider. He stated we cannot go back now, and just say take these things out on something that has been already been approved. We have to go back to those specific items. Reconsider those items and move forward. He stated he agrees with Mr. C. Jackson. His understanding of the Renaissance Plan was temporary, to get our thoughts together, and then move forward. Not to kill it. He tells his constituents it is not killed. It is temporarily on hold to get a clearer understanding on how we move forward.

Mr. Malinowski stated he was looking at the chart Mr. Hayes provided, and in the Special Revenue, the very first one has Victims' Rights, and he wants to make sure it is not being increased from previous years.

Ms. Kennedy stated she wanted staff to remember that District 7 is a part of Richland County. Nothing has been allocated to District 7 for the Renaissance, or any other thing.

Mr. Rose inquired if this is a proper before us. He inquired if we would have to go back and reconsider the items instead of make a blanket motion.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he would be happy to amend the motion to simply ask that staff look at those areas that fell under Revivification that were not approved tonight.

Mr. Rose inquired if that needs to be in the form of a motion, or could Ms. Hegler simply bring this to us at the next Council meeting.

Mr. Smith stated Council can either make it in the form of a motion or a directive to staff.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he made a motion.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Livingston

Abstain: Manning

The vote was in favor to have staff look at the areas that fall under Revivification.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 21, 2018**

**28**

Ms. Myers inquired when the debt service on the BAN begins.

Mr. Hayes stated we have a debt service payment coming up next year, but we are not currently paying debt service.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and Rose

The vote was in favor of the debt service.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the budget ordinance, as distributed.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Manning and Rose

The vote was in favor.

In Favor: Malinowski

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to reconsider the budget ordinance.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

4. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:49.