



Richland County Council  
Special Called  
October 2, 2018 – 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Beverly Harris, James Hayes, Kim Williams-Roberts, Cathy Rawls, Trena Bowers, John Thompson, Brandon Madden, Tracy Hegler, Sandra Yudice, Stacey Hamm, Eden Logan, Larry Smith, Dwight Hanna, Tim Nielsen, Shahid Khan, Jeff Ruble, Melissa Watts, Nathaniel Miller, Ronaldo Myers, George Rice, Jennifer Wladischkin, Chris Eversmann, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Quinton Epps, Brad Farrar, and Ismail Ozbek

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The invocation was led by the Honorable Gwen Kennedy
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout Troop 8 and their Scoutmaster Kirby Shealy, III.

**POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE** – Ms. Dickerson stated Ms. Heather Weiss, 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Solicitor, who was appointed by the Governor’s Office to serve was in the audience and wanted to introduce herself to Council.

Ms. Myers requested Sen. Darrell Jackson be allowed to speak at this time due to obligations at his church, and the death in his family.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sen. Jackson stated he was here to speak in favor of Richland County’s proposal/effort to bring sewer and infrastructure to Lower Richland. He stated he was a lifelong citizen of Lower Richland, and currently lives in Hopkins. The future of Lower Richland depends on getting great infrastructure in that area. He commended Council for their effort they have put forward. He stated there are 4 things that should be included in a sewer project plan: (1) Situation with the schools must be fixed. It is sad to see any school with public waste on top of the ground, there are 3 schools in Lower Richland where this exists. This by itself tells us that this is an urgent problem. (2) It is important that no one is mandated to have to sign on to it. If someone is on their own sewer, and they do not want the public sewer, they should not be mandated. He stated he lives in a house with its own septic and well, so he may not choose to tap on to the plan. (3) The tap on fees should be reasonable, but

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

preferably waived. Particularly for those that are going to sign up initially. There are citizens in our area that are on fixed incomes. Some of them would choose to tap on. There have been rumors floating around that the tap on fees are going to be extraordinary, and people will not be able to afford it. (4) The monthly fee for the services has to be reasonable. He has talked with staff and Council members, and have been reassured, contrary to some of the rumors, that there will not be an average of \$125 a month. He stated there is a template with Franklin Park that you can judge that by. He believes that has been included in the plan. He believes there are many residents that are not here that are in full support of it because we want Lower Richland to not only be good today, but good for years to come.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. Regular Session: September 18, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Special Called Meeting: September 25, 2018 – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Zoning Public Hearing: September 25, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

POINT OF ORDER – Mr. Pearce stated there was a meeting of the Budget Ad Hoc Committee. At which time the committee took one item, which was related to a change in the School District One budget. The item was tabled in committee. He stated, for clarification, that because that is tabled in the committee there would be no way of bringing anything related to that item out at tonight's meeting. He would have to reconvene the committee.

Mr. Smith responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated, now that we have correct numbers, we will have to have a quick Budget Ad Hoc meeting.

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

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS** – Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.

- a. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator
- b. Potential Litigation: Annexation of Streets and Road
- c. Detention Center Contract
- d. Employee Grievance
- e. Township Auditorium Update

7. **CITIZENS' INPUT: For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing:**

- a. Helen Taylor Bradley—Lower Richland Sewer
- b. Lilly Randolph—Lower Richland Sewer
- c. Walter Jones—Lower Richland Sewer
- d. Andrea Williams—Lower Richland Sewer
- e. Jennifer Mancke—Lower Richland Sewer
- f. Arnold Young—Lower Richland Sewer
- g. Carol Goodson Eaddy—Lower Richland Sewer
- h. Robert O'Brien—Ordinance Review Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

8. **REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. Detention Center Contract – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- b. Employee Grievance – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- c. Township Auditorium Update – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- d. Mass Fatality Training Table Top Grant – Dr. Yudice stated DHEC received a grant for education and training for public safety personnel and other stakeholders with regard to Mass Fatality Management. The scope of this grant will allow the participants to receive a completion certificate from a FEMA course designed to prepare rural First Responders, and officials with the basic knowledge, skills, and abilities to manage a mass fatality incident impacting our jurisdiction. The target audience includes First Responders, Coroners, Medical Examiners, public health officials, and others with responsibilities during a mass fatality incident. Issues addressed include establishing the roles and responsibilities, asset management, remains processing and identification, diversity issues, and development of a mass fatality plan that effect the construction of the mass fatality responses, as well as, the establishment of a family assistance center and the challenges of handling multiple deaths from an incident. This is a cooperative agreement between DHEC and the Coroner's Office to receive a \$10,000 grant, which does not require a match from the County. This funding will allow the Richland County Coroner's Office to host the training. This is a time sensitive matter, and according to Coroner Watts, it requires Council action to accept the grant funding.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to accept the grant funds.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what happens when the grant funds run out.

Dr. Yudice stated this is a one-time funding for this specific event.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

9. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL**

- a. REMINDER: Columbia Chamber Annual Gala, October 4, 6:00 PM, Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Columbia Chamber Annual Gala on October 4<sup>th</sup> at Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center.
- b. United Nations Community Send Off, October 8, 6:00 PM, Elm Abode – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming United Nations Community Send Off on October 8<sup>th</sup> at Elm Abode.
- c. Capital City Classic: “A Journey Remembered” Honoring Coach Willie and Mary Jeffries, October 11, 6:00 PM, Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center, 1101 Lincoln Street – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Capital City Classic Honoring Coach Willie Jeffries on October 11<sup>th</sup> at Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Ms. Roberts will be able to have the Proclamation for Coach Jeffries ready for her to present at the event.

Council moved to do a resolution instead of a proclamation.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. University of South Carolina – City and County Partners Reception, October 10, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, The President’s House, Historic Horseshoe – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming University of South Carolina’s City and County Partners Reception on October 10<sup>th</sup> at the President’s House.
- e. 2019 County Council Calendar – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the calendar.

Mr. Manning requested the Swearing-In Ceremony on January 8<sup>th</sup> be included on the calendar.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

- a. Economic Development Trip Update – This item was deferred until the October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

11. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and FN America, LLC, a company previously identified as Project Liberty, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.
- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem tax agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Monopoly to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; the execution and delivery of a purchase and option agreement; the transfer of approximately 15 acres of real property located in Richland County; the granting of an option on an additional approximately 15 acres of adjacent real property; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.

12. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 18-025MA, Tom James, NC to GC (5.53 Acres), Lower Richland Boulevard, TMS # R21800-04-20 [SECOND READING]
- b. An Ordinance authorizing deed to the City of Columbia water lines for Richland Library Northeast, 7490 Parklane Road; Richland County TMS # 17707-08-01 (Portion); CF # 340-15 [FIRST READING]
- c. Assignment of Funds
- d. Requesting approval from County Council for the purchase of Aluminum Chlorohydrate (ACH) from Gulbrandsen Technologies Inc. for ongoing delivery to the Broad River Wastewater Treatment Facility
- e. Devil's Ditch Project Funding Increase
- f. Renewal of the contracts for solid waste curbside collection service in areas 5A, 5B and 7
- g. County Council is requested to approve a Work Authorization (WA) in professional services with WK Dickson & Company, Inc. of Columbia, SC for design services for various airport site-civil project improvements at the Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport (CUB)
- h. County Council is requested to approve a standing agreement between the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) Cadet Composite Squadron and Richland County/the Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport (CUB)

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the consent items.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconsider all of the consent items.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

13. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

- a. An Ordinance Authorizing the levying of ad valorem property taxes, which, together with the prior year's carryover and other State levies and any additional amount appropriated by the Richland County Council prior to July 1, 2018, will provide sufficient revenues for the operations of Richland County Government during the period from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019 – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and FN America, LLC a company previously identified as Project Liberty, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve this item.

Ms. McBride inquired about what this company manufactures.

Mr. Ruble stated FN is a gun manufacturer.

Ms. McBride inquired as to who they manufacture guns for.

Mr. Ruble stated their primary customer is the US Military. They also sell some weapons commercially.

Ms. McBride inquired about the impact of the fee-in-lieu, as it relates to jobs for Richland County.

Mr. Ruble stated there are no jobs associated with this expansion. The reason we are setting this up is so they can continue to invest at the site.

Ms. McBride inquired as to how many jobs they have provided for Richland County residents.

Mr. Tushar Chikhliker, the attorney for FN America, stated FN employs more than 500 people at the Columbia facility. Since its inception in 1979 it has actually had 3,500 people come through the facility, so it is a significant employer for Richland County and the local community.

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Chikhliker had data on the number of residents from Richland County that are employed.

Mr. Chikhliker stated he did not have that information, but could provide that information to Council.

Ms. McBride inquired about the length of the fee-in-lieu tax agreement.

Mr. Chikhliker stated the agreement is a standard 30-year term.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if any of the guns are sold to the general public.

Mr. Chikhliker responded some portion of the guns are, but he does not have the specific numbers. He stated he does know the Richland County Sheriff's Department is a major customer.

Mr. Malinowski stated he has asked the questions before, when it came to economic development matters, regarding how many employees may be from a particular county. Of course, no one has that information. They are not restricted to hiring from only Richland County. Any company can bring people from another area, from another county. The fact that we are hiring within the county, and surrounding counties, it proves to be an economic boon for Richland County.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if they could not have done the fee-in-lieu for less time and still gotten a good result.

Mr. Chikhliker stated, under State law, standard FILOT deals are typically 30 years throughout the State. He stated we have one of the highest property taxes on manufacturers in the United States in Richland County. South Carolina, itself, has the highest property taxes, as compared to our competitors. And, within the State, unfortunately Richland County has an extremely high millage rate. That kind of term is something that is relatively standard on these FILOT deals, and is necessary for companies to be able to continue to invest in facilities, which largely leads to the citizens in the community been employed.

Ms. Dickerson inquired about how many years the facility had been operating with a fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Chikhliker stated this is the first request for a fee-in-lieu.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, the facility has been operating here without doing a fee-in-lieu of taxes here.

Mr. Manning inquired if this item went through the County's Economic Development Committee.

Mr. Livingston responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, the committee had the opportunity to ask all of the questions and standards things you do for these kinds of matters.

Mr. Livingston responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning inquired if there was a recommendation out of the committee.

Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval.

Mr. Manning inquired if we have the percentage of Richland County employees who live in the County.

Mr. Ruble stated that is collected on an annual basis. He does not have it with him, but they can follow-up with the information.

Ms. McBride stated she has requested this information before because we are doing a tax reduction and it is affecting Richland County residents, if they are not receiving direct benefits from it. It is her understanding; we have not been keeping data on the number of residents actually from Richland County. She can appreciate Mr. Malinowski's comments, but she is majorly concerned with the residents of Richland County who need employment. She stated she did not know a lot about guns, but she inquired if these are the same automatic weapons that are being used, and we just passed a resolution on in regards to "bump stocks".

Mr. Chikhliker stated he does know the answer to that. He is not someone educated on gun issues, but he could certainly provide the information to Council.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to call for the question.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor of calling for the question.

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

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

The vote was in favor.

14. **SECOND READING ITEMS:**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem tax agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Monopoly to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes;

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**



authorizing certain infrastructure credits; the execution and delivery of a purchase and option agreement; the transfer of approximately 15 acres of real property located in Richland County; the granting of an option on an additional approximately 15 acres of adjacent real property; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item and to have additional information provided to Council prior to Third Reading.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the value of the 15 acres.

Mr. Ruble stated they valued the land at \$25,000/acre. However, when we put in our costs to acquire it and improve it, the value is about \$18,500.

Mr. Malinowski stated the Exhibit C Resolution does not have an actual date.

Mr. Ruble stated he would double check on this.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

- a. County Utility System – Mr. Pearce this item is regarding the information that was discussed that the Council Work Session. The committee forwarded this item to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this is a one reading item.

Dr. Yudice stated this is an item that will require an ordinance.

Mr. Malinowski stated, after hearing what he did from Citizens' Input tonight, he believes there are a lot of unanswered questions about the next item on the agenda, and that item would be included in this overall County utility system. That being included, we need to make sure exactly what we are moving forward on and providing the information needed to these people.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Kennedy, Livingston and Rose

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

Abstain: Manning

The motion failed.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Khan to give an overview of what is included in this plan.

Mr. Khan stated during the work session he presented that a utility is an asset that we have. The asset has been neglected over the years. It is time for us to go back and revamp and revive it, and do a state of

the art system, which we can be proud of. Not doing this could have its own consequences. Essentially, for the generations to come, we will not be able to survive a resilient service to our customers. It is driven by the vision Council had in 1978, wherein we committed that we would provide water and sewer services to all unincorporated Richland County. We made progress over the years. We had a lot of areas where we are covered, but there are a lot of areas which are still lagging behind, and this is the time for us to work on those areas. In addition to that, we have to make our existing infrastructure resilient, strong, and viable. He stated we worked as a team, it was not just his effort. He must commend the team working on this (i.e. Legal, Financial Advisor, Budget). They came to a conclusion for a path forward. The first part of the recommendation is that we make it a combined utility (i.e. one unit working hand in hand from top Northwest of the County to all the way to the Southeast of the County). The second recommendation was that we submitted a capital improvement program for every utility across the Columbia area, and across the State. There are capital improvements, which are continual improvements of the system. Whether it is replace and repair upgrade of the infrastructure or its expansion. They presented a CIP along with that, and they requested that be considered as information and allow them to finalize it and bring it back to Council in the next budget cycle. The third recommendation was there are some issues in hand. They have Broad River Wastewater Treatment Plan and the Broad River region, which have some regulatory weaknesses and issues that have to be resolved. They have to act fast and get those taken care of. There are some compromised systems (i.e. Cedar Cove). They are requested to be allowed to work with financial team to come up with a plan to resolve the regulatory problems, which could become serious issues if they are not resolved in a timely and efficient manner. The fourth recommendation is that all utilities like us have a plan. Utilities operate like an enterprise business. They look at what is the revenue stream? What are the expenses? And, how do we develop a rate structure. They engage a rate study consultant several months ago. The consultant analyzed our finances and rates. With the CIP finalizing they would be able to come back with a revised rate structure in a few months for approval.

Mr. Pearce inquired if it would be accurate to say that if we approved this plan that would give Mr. Khan the resources needed to correct some serious deficiencies we have, it would not, in any way, lock in any sewer system, in any one part of the County that may be of question.

Mr. Khan responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated on pp. 186-187 are the current wastewater rates for Broad River and Hopkins at \$20.00 for the first 1,000 gallons, and going up in increments up to \$3.87/1,000 gallons for the next 60,000 gallons. Mr. Khan said that he was still working on the revised rate system. She inquired if he expected the revised system to be a multiple of 5 times the current rate.

Mr. Khan stated he does not believe it will, but for clarification the rate Ms. Myers was quoting was for water and not wastewater.

Ms. Myers inquired if when the rate structure is revised it would be \$120 - \$130 per month.

Mr. Khan stated he does not expect that. He cannot commit to that, but he has a strong conviction that it would not be that much.

Ms. Myers requested, for the record, Mr. Khan to state the range of preliminary numbers he gave to Council.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Mr. Khan stated currently the wastewater is \$44.54 for Broad River. At this time, he is not prepared to commit to any number, but he would not expect it to be 4 or 5 times more.

Ms. Myers stated you would expect it to go lower as more people are added to the system.

Mr. Khan stated that is correct, but there would be a time where they would have to ramp up the rate to a level where we capture the backlog or deficiencies in the system. Once they get the system back to normal it would just be maintenance and monitoring.

Ms. Myers stated when Mr. Khan did the first workshop he gave Council an estimate between \$45 - \$70 per month. She inquired if he would expect it to be wildly off that number.

Mr. Khan stated his best guess, in the first 3 – 5 years, it will not exceed \$70.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that is based on usage and not the base rate.

Mr. Malinowski stated, at the last meeting, Mr. Pearce brought up the fact Council had been discussing whether or not the County would sell the sewer system, hire a manager for the sewer system, or keep running it as it currently is. He stated he does not know if that was ever resolved. He would like to see any minutes related to that, if there was a final resolution on that.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- b. Council Motion: Move that Council immediately move forward with the revised Lower Richland Sewer Plan, which has been (1) improved to remove lift stations from private property (consolidated into 3 on public property), (2) expanded to replace all failed, closed septic systems at Richland One Schools (Hopkins Elementary and Middle Schools and Gadsden Elementary School) and the Franklin Park subdivision, (3) clarified to ensure that access to public sewer is available, without tap fees, to any requesting resident along the revised route, who requests service as the line are being constructed. No resident will be required to tap on to the system unless they wish to. Staff is further instructed to expedite the planning and procurement process to facilitate commencement of construction by April 2019, and targeted build out to residents, schools, and McIntyre Air Force Base by August 2019 [MYERS]  
– Mr. Pearce stated the recommendation from the committee is to proceed with an alternative, that in effect, would revise the approved plan and reopen that for discussion, at which time the issue of which road(s) would be debated, and have a public hearing to hearing from the citizens.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there were two (2) motions.

Mr. Pearce stated we had two (2) motions. We took them up together because both were dealing with Lower Richland. As he recalls, this was the one that dealt with both motions. What the committee is doing is offering a recommendation, which is open for discussion and if anyone would like to change it or offer a substitute motion, they are welcome to.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Mr. N. Jackson stated the reason he said the motion was not properly before us because it says to move forward with the revised motion. There was never a motion or procedure to revise the existing sewer plan. So, when staff came up with a motion to move forward with the revised motion...when was the public meeting? Where was the public hearings? Where was it noticed to the public that Richland County decided to revise the existing sewer plan that was passed. We had 2 readings and a public hearing. We went to court and won the suit, and only 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading was left. Somehow staff had the marching orders to revise the sewer plan, and a motion was made to move forward with the revised plan. If there was not a motion to revise the plan, then this motion is not properly before us. The proper way is that a Council member puts a motion on the table. It goes to committee. Staff prepares whatever documentation and how to move forward with that motion. That was never done. His concern is that when he made his motion in September 2017, he was asked to hold back on the motion. In February 2018, the former Administrator had the motion on the agenda again. It had to be removed because it was not proper. It was not proper then. It is not proper now. There were 23 easements, not lift stations. The tap fee was eliminated. Everything that is in this new motion has already passed. The only difference is you are running sewer line down Air Base Road where there are no houses and a railroad track. When the first motion was made, and the one that needs 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading, Cabin Creek Road has over 148 houses that signed up for sewer. The route has been deviated from those houses. His point is if you are going to reroute it, at least serve the people who signed up on Cabin Creek Road. Running it down Air Base Road does not make sense. McEntire Air Guard is already paying \$1.5 million to tie into the system. This system is now costing another \$17 million. The first system the money is there and has already been approved. The new system we have to find additional funding. Also, School District One was requested to provide an additional \$4 million. They should not have to do that with the original plan. What he would recommend is that we do a Phase II or III, but to move forward with the plan that was already approved. The plan that we had over 20 community meetings. Where we had citizens for and against. It was properly, publicly discussed and Council made a decision to move forward with 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading. That is why he is saying we should move forward with last plan approved, not revised, because there is no motion to revise the plan.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, the motion would revise the approved plan.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his motion is to move forward with the original plan where we had the funding.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, without any revision.

Mr. N. Jackson stated you can have a Phase II or III to the plan, but to have a revision we have to do Three Readings and a public hearing all over again. It is easier to add a Phase II or III to the plan, but what is before us now is to do a new route, and that is going to cause some problems.

Mr. Pearce stated, with all respect to Mr. N. Jackson, the committee felt like they took your motion under full consideration. If we failed, he apologizes.

Mr. Rose stated what Mr. N. Jackson is saying that if you revise the plan, then you have to have another public hearing. He feels like it is time to have a public hearing. From what he is hearing, there is a lot of uncertainty from the community about how this will be implemented. He thought Sen. Jackson's remarks were well founded. He wants to assist and alleviate issues that are existing. He would ask staff if there has been a public hearing in the area that would be affected recently.

Ms. Myers stated she has held six (6) public meetings. And, her motion is for another public hearing

along with moving this forward.

Mr. Rose stated it's not bad to have the ability to revise a plan because that is what the community wants is to be able to have a public hearing, be heard, and have the ability to make some changes. He inquired if this approved tonight, there is a public hearing going forward, but what is being locked in with this vote tonight.

Mr. Khan stated the public hearing that Mr. N. Jackson referred to did take place, although he was not a part of Richland County, at that time, he did attend one of the public hearings. The public hearings were conducted as a part of the regulatory requirement for DHEC to issue the permit to construct. As time moved on, Ms. Myers came aboard and her opinion was that we have to do it in a way that we can serve the public's interest and revise it to the best fit needs. He went back to the drawing board. He came up with a plan. He shared that plan with Administration, as well as the District 10 and 11 Council members. They held several public meetings, as well. His impression was that the tone was totally different from the first meeting he attended. The future public hearings will take place. If, and when, you choose to approve this project that would be allow him to proceed forward with the design stages of the project. When the project gets designed it will go to DHEC for approval. When DHEC is approving it, a similar set of hearings will take place again for them to issue the permit to construct.

Mr. Rose inquired about what is being locked in with the vote tonight.

Mr. Khan stated, his understanding is to proceed forward with the preliminary engineering design of the project, and then present it back to Council that this is the final preliminary engineering analysis. This is the path forward. And, then you allow him to move forward to do the full blown design. That design will be presented to Council, and then you allow him to proceed with construction. There are several steps to come. Today, you will be allowing him to go forward and formalize alternative 5, as submitted in the agenda packet.

Mr. Rose stated, for clarification, there are going to be more votes before a plan is locked in.

Mr. Khan stated there will be multiple stages to come where this project will come in front of you and you would have an opportunity to review, revisit, modify, amend, approve or disapprove.

Mr. Rose stated, for clarification, in these steps going forward there would be public input from the community for each step.

Mr. Khan stated the way it works is should you like to do other public hearings through the Richland County operations he would be glad to do that, but DHEC, by mandate, when they issue the permit to construct, they have to conduct "X number" of public hearings, and they will be conducted to take input from the public before they make the decision to allow us to go for construction.

Mr. Rose stated, for clarification, in the design process, State law is going to mandate that DHEC have public hearings.

Mr. Khan responded in the affirmative. The public hearings will be attended by Richland County to answer questions.

Mr. Rose stated at one point and time there was a staff recommendation to go back to the School

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

District for additional funding to address the issues at the schools. He inquired as to where that stands presently.

Mr. Khan stated that is above his pay grade. There is progress being made.

Mr. Rose stated those discussions are obviously ongoing.

Mr. Khan stated it is not Richland County's obligation, but he feels schools need to be taken care of.

Dr. Yudice stated, it is her understanding, the School District has approved \$2 million. The County requested an additional \$500,000, and the Board was supposed to discuss that.

Mr. Malinowski stated a lawsuit was brought against Richland County in this matter. It is his understanding, Richland County won the lawsuit. When Richland County won the lawsuit, they won it based on certain information that was provided to the court. Would we not have to abide by what the final result of that lawsuit was, based on the information we provided the court vs. something that is being added now.

Mr. Smith stated there were two (2) parts to the lawsuit that was brought. The first part, requested the court to enjoin or stop Richland County from going forward with a plan to provide sewer service to that area. The court denied them ability to stop us from going forward. There is one portion of the lawsuit that is still pending that deals with whether or not Richland County provided certain documents under the Freedom of Information Act to the group that requested it, but that does not have anything to do with the merits of the plan.

Mr. Malinowski stated on July 23, 2013, at the Development & Services Committee, he had a motion that passed to explore water and sewer service expansion in the unincorporated portion of Richland County. A motion like that had to go to a committee, and then come to Council, so he does not see why a motion to change something would not have had to go to the Council to be assigned to a committee to come forward. It is his understanding, it just kind of got to the committee. From what he is hearing, it is like Mr. Khan and a Council member got together and decided how you were going to revise a plan without the full Council being involved.

Mr. Khan stated in the agenda packet there are multiple options that he has handed over to Council. When he starts working he has to decide if it is a viable option or not. The one he felt was the best option he presented to Administration and shared his comments and recommendations. From that stage, it went to the Council members, Ms. Myers and Mr. N. Jackson, and got them on board. Today, he is standing in front of you to present the same case to full Council with all 5 options on the table.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why we would run a sewer line up a road, along the railroad tracks, with no houses on it vs. the original one that went past all these homes, that he believes, Mr. N. Jackson referred to.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, we are not approving a specific routing of a road with this motion.

Mr. Malinowski stated that is part of the revised plan.

Mr. Pearce stated we are voting to revise a plan.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the reason the road is there is because there is one way to get to Gadsden Elementary, and it is down that road. To the extent, that you are going to connect to Gadsden Elementary School, you either have to go Bluff Road or Air Base Road, which is why it is there. She told Mr. Khan the other day, when the questions regarding Cabin Creek were raised, if a thousand people come to him and ask to be added, we would be crazy not to. The intent is not to exclude homes. It is to include. Mr. Khan is the engineer. She did not engineer a plan. That is Mr. Khan's plan that she thought would be helpful to pick up the 3<sup>rd</sup> school that has an open sewer. That is the only purpose.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why we cannot move forward with the original plan, which is a whole lot less money, and then put these other items as difference phases or additions. We are going 2 ½ times the money from 2014.

Mr. Khan stated we do not build the infrastructure for one project, one house, one street, or one area. We build the infrastructure for ages and years to come. The system he is recommending will build the backbone of the system so that when the next generation comes in we have a system in place, which can be expanded and tied onto to meet the needs. They did not do it so diligently in the Broad River, and there are some shortcomings we are dealing with. They do not want to cross that bridge when they finish this asset. The way the line is aligned is pure hydraulics. You can put the pump and pipe and send the water anywhere you choose to. The Master Plan they have developed would allow you to cover the drainage basin. The phases developed are developed for the future needs. Comparing apples to apples, the DHEC approved project can only be compared with Phase I of the project. There are pros and cons of both of the plans. The approved project had issues, which will not serve 10, 20, or 30 years down the road, and somebody will be standing here being asked why did you do this? And, he does not think they would have an answer. It is a pure engineering judgment, along with the directions and needs of the Council.

Mr. Livingston inquired if p. 197 of the agenda packet is the committee's recommendation under "Notes", and if the information included under the "Subject" section was supposed to be a part of the motion.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion is, "to proceed with an alternative, that could be revised, as necessary."

Mr. Livingston inquired if he already has the revised plan, based on the information under the "Subject". He stated Mr. Khan mentioned his recommended plan, and then inquired where that plan is located in the agenda packet.

Mr. Khan stated if you look at the staff recommendation in the briefing memo on p. 200.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, we are not undoing the previous plan. It will still be there, and would be an option.

Mr. Khan stated his recommendation would be to go with a new plan, which is Alternate 5. That is a modified version of the approved plan.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, all we would be voting on is to give Mr. Khan the authority to pursue an alternative plan.

Mr. Manning stated there was a question about Richland One and the Board of Commissioners. There

was a letter written from Richland One Office of Superintendent, and signed by the Chair of the Board, dated September 21, 2018 that was sent all members of County Council. At the top of p. 3, it says, "Finally, after several meetings with Richland County Administration, including a meeting with County Council Chairwoman Dickerson, Richland County School District One has discussed and communicated the following: Richland One Board of Commissioners has approved the contribution of \$2 million, and an additional \$500,000, if necessary, to support the Lower Richland Sewer Project." So, the answer, to an earlier unanswered question, that is the answer.

Ms. Dickerson stated according to the Council's Rules, because we belabored this a lot in the workshop, Mr. N. Jackson has spoken twice on this item.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this is the first on this subject that Ms. Dickerson is limiting it to 2 times to speak. He stated he has concern with that because she has never done it before, but when it comes to Lower Richland Sewer she wants to limit it. He stated he is not against public input. That is paramount. The public needs to understand and be involved. He was concerned about the process. There was never a motion to allow staff to do what they did upfront and then tell us to do a revised motion. He stated you can lay pipe anywhere and it can work with the proper pumping system, and proper size. Therefore, it does not matter where you lay the lines in the engineering process it can work. The original plan, the size of the pipes was not large enough for future expansion. Initially, when we asked the question, about the original pipes, we were told that it would develop some gas and there could be an explosion. He said the system could be vented. If the system is vented, the larger pipes would aid expansion in the future. He stated he had over 20 public meetings, and they had a lot of good discussions. The tap on fee was eliminated. No one was forced to sign anything. No one would lose their land. He stated Air Base Road is not the only route to Gadsden Elementary School. Air Base Road will tie back into Cabin Creek Road, at Congaree Road, and goes to Gadsden Elementary School the same way. He stated he has lived in the area for 40 years, and he knows the route. With the revised plan we are eliminating over 148 houses on Cabin Creek Road. McEntire Air Guard already committed to pay \$1.5 million to tie into Cabin Creek Road to continue. Some members of Council went to School District One to get an additional \$4 million for the revised plan. The concern that District One had was why come to us with a revised plan and there was no official revised plan. They decided to stick to the \$2 million that was approved and give an additional \$500,000. They had reserved over \$430,000 for Gadsden Elementary. What he thought was wrong was to go to the School Board and say, "We need an additional \$4 million for the revised plan," when there was no revised plan. He is talking about process because everything he has done on this Council; he has followed the proper process. He makes a motion, and if he is successful he has a minimum of 5 votes and it is done. He should expect all Council members to follow the same process. He supports public input, and he wants public input. If the public see that its fit to go down Air Base Road, that is fine, but the original motion he made for the sewer had nothing to do with Air Base Road. It dealt with the developers' plan to put two (2) sewer treatment plants in Hopkins, and he was totally against it. Eastover has a plant that has a capacity for several thousand houses, and he said run a line to the Eastover plant. The schools in Hopkins had a problem with DHEC; therefore, they were fortunate to be able to tie into the system. We can have a public meeting, and go through the same process again because he wants the public's input. He is just talking about the process and the false information that there were 23 lift stations. There were 23 easements, not lift stations. If you look in the plan passed, the tap fee was eliminated. To tell the citizens we are going to eliminate the tap fee, and get rid of the 23 lift stations is not true. That has already been done. He wants to make it clear to the citizens that the so-called revised plan is about the routing and the size pipes, not about what has already been passed.

Ms. Myers stated, just note, as a starting matter, all of the pipes that we are discussing in District 10,

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**



which is the district that she represents. As a secondary matter, we are discussing plans that were 2012, 2010, 2005, and 2015. She was elected in 2016. If those plans had been approved in 2018, we would not still be in this place. If they had been accepted by the community, we would not still be in this place. Since she was elected, Mr. N. Jackson is exactly right, she has spent copious amounts of time on this project. She has read every piece of paper in Richland County on this project. She has had over 10 conversations with Rural Agriculture on this project. She has held countless community meetings on this project. She has been on the radio ad nauseam about this project. And, have directly call some of you who complain about not having information about the project, and not gotten a call back. She will say she is not an engineer. Do not purport to be one. When she met with Mr. Khan she said to him, we have McEntire that has been a part of this project. Now since the plan was approved, so-called, awarded a financing package in 2012. In 2015, a 3<sup>rd</sup> school failed. There is no way for it to be in a 2012 plan, if it fails in 2015, and we start making plans at that date. And, it is illogical to spend this much money knowing that a 3<sup>rd</sup> school needs service, and not to service it. She does not care what road it goes down. She cares about the priority places, that Mr. Khan has recognized, as cited by DHEC, get picked up. She does not have conversations with developers. She has not talked to developers about this plan. She does not know if they love it or hate it. She does not care. This is a plan for infrastructure. The backbone was designed by Mr. Khan. The role of local government is the fair and equal provision of public services to the taxpayers. Public infrastructure is a public good. She is not going to make any money off of it. She has not asked anybody to help do anything in secret for it, but this plan is critical. The reason that this troubles her so much is because where we are now there has been a lot said. Most of it is not fact based. When you hear people telling you that we have hatched a plan with developers, and she is a tool of developers, everybody who knows her knows she knows her own mind. She does not sit with developers for information. She reads. She talks to the residents. She talks to her colleagues, and she gets instruction from the experts. This is a plan for a community that needs a plan; however, it is not a perfect plan. And there can, and will, be changes. The motion before us is not in concrete. It specifically is a motion that says, "Please allow the engineers to get going doing something. Bring it back to us. Present it to the public." She specifically said in the D&S meeting, we need to have a public hearing, not just have a 3<sup>rd</sup> vote because we could have done that. We specifically said we have to have another meeting. When you hear folks telling you they have got first-hand information that there is some hocus-pocus and a developer is coming through to take your land, ask them to show them the piece of paper. It just is not fact based. As she says, every time she goes to every meeting, you are welcome to call me 908-3747, and she will talk to you about sewer ad nauseam, but what she will not do is engage in hyper, over the top bad information that is based in nothing. We are asking approval of the right to make a plan, that is all. The right to make plan, then discuss the plan. There is no move here to dig up your street, or anybody's street. It is the right to give our Director of Utilities authority to make a plan.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Kennedy and N. Jackson

Abstain: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- c. Council Motion: Move to authorize Dr. Yudice and staff to utilize emergency funds to facilitate third-party well testing in areas potentially impacted by Westinghouse's previously undisclosed 2011 uranium leak. Funds would be available for testing over the next thirty days, subject to individual requests [MYERS and DICKERSON] – Mr. Pearce stated the committee recommended for Council to identify funds

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

that would be used in a temporary mode, and once it is determined Westinghouse's liability, that these same funds that are being used would then be attached to whatever liability that they have, so it would be clear this is not a donation by the County, and should be paid back at a later date.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we need to talk about how much and where the funds are coming from.

Mr. Pearce stated it did not identify any funds. It recommended that Council identify the funds.

Mr. N. Jackson stated problem is it affects County issues, but it is a State and Federal issue. Federal with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and State with DHEC. What we are asked to do is pay for something that DHEC is already doing, or will do. We are supposed to spend additional funds to take care of something that DHEC will do. He has not seen the Senator or the House member asking for funds from the General Assembly to do the testing. Last night at the meeting, Westinghouse said they will not pay for it because there is a super site across the across the road from Westinghouse, a brownfield, which we cannot prove if the wells were contaminated by Westinghouse or brownfield. If Westinghouse has caused the problem, they should pay for it. We would should not have to pay for it, and hope Westinghouse pays us back. When Westinghouse decided to have a PR firm speak about their image, Westinghouse is more concerned about its image. They are not concerned about the citizens of Lower Richland. If they were why would they have a problem paying to test the wells. At the end of the day, DHEC said they will test 15 wells. They have tested 8 so far. He does not see why we should spend additional money to test over 1,000 wells when DHEC is the authority, and they make the final decision. He is concerned about Lower Richland. He wants clean water. He wants safe water. That is why he made the motion to build a safe system for the Lower Richland community, and have Westinghouse and other companies that contaminate the Lower Richland area pay for the system.

Mr. Manning stated he shares some of Mr. N. Jackson's concerns about the fact the Legislature, through Act 388, and the amount of money by the formula, in that State law, the counties are supposed to get. Each year, including this year, they put together a proviso to not give the County the money that the State law says we should get. And, then things like this happen and it is their responsibility, and because we are compassionate, good-hearted people we try to fill a gap. He imagines they just laugh, and next year they are going to come back and do the same thing and continue to not take responsibility for what is their responsibility. He is torn between anything that we can do for the sake of our citizens, he wants to be mindful of, but at the same time, there are people that are elected by citizens that are responsible for this through the SC Department of Health and Environmental Control for well, well water safety, and this kind of testing. He stated he is concerned about where the money is coming from. He would like to add a friendly amendment that at the same time, if Council moves forward on paying this, we also enter a suit against Westinghouse and DHEC for not paying for it.

Ms. Myers stated she is happy to accept the friendly amendment, but her committee Chair needs to give her leave to do that.

Mr. Pearce stated he would agree to that.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we will procure a firm to do this or how will we do this. Will anything come back before us to vote on?

Dr. Yudice stated they already requested 3 quotes. The range is between \$210/per test - \$900/per test.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Mr. Livingston inquired about how many test we may have to do.

Dr. Yudice stated the discussion in committee was to identify up to \$70,000. The recommendation will be to go with the company that charges \$210/per test.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what happens once the test is done.

Dr. Yudice stated she believes we will have to talk to Westinghouse, depending on the results, and have an action plan with them.

Ms. Myers stated she was at the meeting last night. Westinghouse did not unequivocally say they would not pay. They said they are discussing it, and we said the reason we are not holding off until they make a decision is because people have water they are drinking that we need to make sure is safe. It is a health and safety issue, but we made it clear to Westinghouse that we would unequivocally expect them to pay for these items. This is not meant to be a freebie for Westinghouse. They were not happy that is what we were asking for, but they certainly did not say they would not pay. That is why she likes the friendly amendment.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we can include a letter requesting Westinghouse to pay for the test.

Mr. Pearce accepted Mr. Livingston's friendly amendment to include a letter requesting Westinghouse to pay for the test.

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

- d. Council Motion: To resolve the water contamination issues in the Lower Richland community and put the citizens at ease I move that Richland County move forward with the water system already approved with partnership with Westinghouse nuclear energy plant, International Paper, SCE&G and others to provide seed funds as they all have contributed to water quality in the area [N. JACKSON] – Mr. Pearce stated the recommendation of the committee is to direct the Utility Director to explore the potential of receiving seed money to expedite this project.

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

Opposed: Rose

The vote was in favor.

- e. Upgrading the Murray Point Lane Water System (aka White Rock Water System) – Mr. Malinowski stated he received a call from one of the people that lives in this area, and they inquired if there will be any citizen input regarding this matter.

Mr. Khan stated there is no formal requirement for a public hearing, but if Council would like a public hearing one could be scheduled.

Mr. Malinowski stated he informed the individual there likely would not be a public hearing, but would

determine if that were the case. In addition, they would like to be provided the potential rates to be charged vs. Columbia resident rates.

Mr. Khan stated they could provide a comparison table of the City of Columbia rates, the County's current rates, and the future proposed rates to Mr. Malinowski and/or the citizens.

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

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **REPORT OF ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

- a. County Council is requested to approve the award of the contract for the Fountain Lake Rd. Paving Project to Armstrong Contractors, LLC – Mr. Livingston stated the committee's recommendation is for approval of this item.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Hospitality Tax Funding for EdVenture – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, for the record, if the employee responsible for costing the County taxpayers' \$58,000 have been disciplined.

Dr. Yudice stated her understanding is the employee has been disciplined and removed from handling grant matters.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Council Motion: Move forward with review of the SE & NE Sport Complex plans to promote tourism and

support AAU and other sports in the county [N. JACKSON] – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommendation was to move forward with a study.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if part of this study is the property that the utilities was an issue.

Ms. Dickerson responded that it is not that property.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this the study will include public input.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if a study was done on this particular item at the request of a former Council member.

Dr. Yudice stated she believes there is a study that completed for the Northeast.

Mr. Madden stated on p. 220 of the agenda packet, under the “Background” section, it references 2 feasibility designs and studies that were completed. It believes the motion from the committee is to allow staff to revisit those and present back to Council.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there were 2 studies. In the Northeast there is one for a softball/baseball complex and in the Southeast a basketball. The Northeast one was changed to waterpark, and defeated.

Ms. Kennedy stated the waterpark was before her time, but they did talk about a sports complex, and it was defeated.

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

Opposed: Manning and Rose

The vote was in favor.

- d. Request from the University of South Carolina’s Center for Applied Innovation and Advanced Analytics to partner and implement (including funding) a project that would provide rural internet to those areas of unincorporated Richland County that do not have access to broadband – Mr. Malinowski stated the notes from the committee meeting says, “The committee recommended Council approve staff developing a partnership agreement with USC and bring it back to Council, with a recommended funding source.” He stated part of the recommendation was also to bring back answers to questions posed by committee members.

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

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- a. Change Order to contract CPS 18054 with S&ME for due diligence at the Blythewood Industrial Site – Mr. Livingston stated this is a site we have been purchasing in that particular area trying to create a mega site. We are looking at about 657 acres of land, and we need to do some further investigation. The request is \$21,000 to continue the investigation.

Mr. Malinowski stated he understands, from reading the backup documentation, the reason for the \$21,000 is about finding artifacts and other ancient sites on the property. On p. 230 under “Analysis & Reporting” it says, “After project clearance has been obtained, S&ME will transfer the artifacts and relevant notes to the landowner at the completion of the project...” It seems that the County is paying for it, so the County should have the option of where they go, and he believes they should go to some historical society.

Mr. Ruble stated they identified potential “hot spots”. He does not know that they have specific artifacts in hand, but as part of the negotiations when we got the property under contract we agreed to provide the property owners the due diligence, which is why they would get a copy of the due diligence.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we have to do the due diligence as the purchaser.

Mr. Ruble stated as a potential purchase. We have the property under contract or option.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, even if we buy it, we are giving them anything that may be found.

Mr. Ruble stated we are giving them the due diligence study, not the actual artifacts.

Mr. Malinowski stated it says, “the company will transfer the artifacts and relevant notes to the landowner.”

Mr. Ruble stated they own the property, we do not.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, we are giving them the study report, but not the artifacts. This says we are going to give them the artifacts. He inquired as to why we would we give them artifacts if after that we purchased the property.

Mr. Ruble stated we would not then. We would be owners then.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the County is going to wait until we purchase it before any transfer.

Mr. Ruble stated, more than likely, if we find a bunch of artifacts out there, we are not buying the property. That is why we are doing the due diligence.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would still like to see them given to some historical society.

Ms. Kennedy stated no one has identified what kind of artifacts we are talking about.

Mr. Ruble stated they did a cultural resources study and in doing that they try to identify where there might have been development that could slow down development. They identified about 4 or 5 hot

spot, which could be a pottery shard or Indian head.

Mr. Livingston stated what we are trying to do is develop a mega site, which is pretty rare. We were able to do Jushi because we had a huge site, and this would allow us to develop another mega site for a huge project in Richland County.

Ms. McBride inquired about the cost.

Ms. Dickerson stated \$21,000.

Mr. Livingston stated what is before us tonight is to continue the study and do the due diligence on the land.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Project Blythewood; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Mr. Livingston stated the committee is recommending that we commit to negotiate the fee-in-lieu of ad valorem agreement with Project Blythewood.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

18. **REPORT OF RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

19. **NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS**

- a. Richland Library Board of Trustees: Six (6) Vacancies – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee interviewed 10 individuals over the course of 2 meetings. One of the individuals withdrew, due to personal matters. The committee recommended appointing Ms. Yvonne Stocker, Ms. Avni Gupta-Kagan, Ms. Erin E. Johnson and Ms. Jennifer Ford. The committee had no recommendation on the other 2 vacancies.

Mr. Rose made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to accept the committee's recommendation and to nominate Rev. Johnny Ray Noble and Ms. Lee Rambo.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, the reason the committee only recommended four (4) is those are the only four (4) we could get consensus on.

Mr. Livingston stated Mr. Rose's motion is simply to amend the committee's recommendation to add those two.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Ms. Dickerson stated Mr. Rose has added two (2) names to the committee's recommendation. One of them, she does not want to vote for. So, if that is the case she will have to vote against the whole slate.

Ms. McBride made a 2<sup>nd</sup> substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to accept the committee's recommendation and to vote individually for the remaining vacancies.

Mr. Manning inquired if the person's name that withdrew was on the agenda.

Mr. Malinowski stated their name is not on there.

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

The vote in favor of the 2<sup>nd</sup> substitute motion was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to appoint Ms. Lee Rambo and Rev. Johnny Ray Noble.

**POINT OF ORDER:** Mr. C. Jackson stated he thought the motion that passed was that we would take them up one at a time.

Ms. Dickerson stated that was Ms. McBride's motion, so Mr. Livingston's motion is not in order.

**POINT OF ORDER:** Mr. Manning requested Mr. Malinowski to read out the remaining names of the applicants Council will be voting on.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to who on the list is an incumbent.

Mr. Malinowski responded Rev. Johnny Ray Noble is an incumbent.

Rambo: Malinowski, Pearce, N. Jackson, Livingston and Rose

Frierson: C. Jackson, Pearce, Manning and Dickerson

Watson: Malinowski, Myers, and Pearce

Snelgrove: Manning, Dickerson and McBride

Noble: C. Jackson, Myers, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Ms. Roberts stated Ms. Lee Rambo and Rev. Johnny Ray Noble were appointed.

Mr. Manning inquired if Ms. Rambo got six (6) votes.

Ms. Dickerson stated she got five (5) votes.

Mr. Pearce stated it's the two (2) with the most votes.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, that it is the two (2) highest, not the majority of Council and we do

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**



not go back and re-vote.

Ms. Dickerson stated that is correct.

Mr. Manning stated he wanted to go on record that he does not think that is correct. That without a majority of Council you should not be appointed to a board. That is you do not have a majority of the Council that is here, then there should be another round of voting.

Mr. Smith stated the way this has worked with Council is that when you vote on these persons, individually, for the appointments to these boards and commissions, the candidate(s) that have the most votes are the ones that you appoint, based on the number of votes they get.

20. **REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Approval for Garners Ferry Road and Harmon Road Intersection Condemnation – Mr. C. Jackson stated there is no action required on this item. We were going to recommend that Council approve condemnation; however, the homeowner signed the agreement.
- b. Approval to construct sidewalk around the existing brick mailbox and reduce the sidewalk width to approximately 4', directly behind the mailbox – Mr. C. Jackson stated the committee recommended to approve extending the sidewalks 4' to go around the brick mailboxes in this neighborhood.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was any citizens' input on this to make sure they wanted sidewalks.

Mr. Beaty stated the sidewalks before Council are part of the Candlewood Neighborhood Improvement Plan, which County Planning had a series of public meetings in the past where these neighborhood plans were put together.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was citizens' input.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Approval to defer Hampton Street design and move forward with resurfacing and restriping Calhoun Street Road Diet – Mr. C. Jackson stated there is a recommendation to defer this item until the October 16<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. The City has requested to hold another public hearing on this matter before they sign on to it.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

- d. Approval of the draft to House Representative Bales clarifying that the Shop Road Extension Transportation Project does not include bicycle lanes – Mr. C. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of the letter and to allow Dr. Yudice to send the letter to Rep. Bales on behalf of the County.

Mr. Malinowski stated he does not understand why we have to approve somebody sending a letter in response to one we received.

Mr. C. Jackson stated we are doing certain things where we are giving the Assistant Administrator permission and authority to act as the County Administrator. This letter was directed to the County Administrator.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Approval of Polo Road Right of Way Easement with the City of Columbia – Mr. C. Jackson stated the committee recommended moving forward with the easement. The City has placed in writing its efforts they will make to minimize any of the issues involving or relating to repairs and work that needs to be done, as well as, coordinate with the County prior to any work so there is no incurred by the County.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the easement is within the City or unincorporated Richland County.

Dr. Thompson stated it is within the City.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the funds for the easement be coming from the City's Penny Tax portion. His question is, it is within the City, the City's funds are paying for it, seems like the County stands to lose a lot if the City does not like the way it is done by them being able to come back and tell the County that you have made a mistake. It says in there, "...should the construction, maintenance, operation or existence of the encroachments, as described in this agreement, cause the City now or in the future to have to relocate or replace any portion of the City's existing water main, appurtenances or associated facilities, then such relocation or replacement shall be the sole expense of Richland County." He stated we are doing this within the City, for the City, yet in the end we are going to be responsible if something goes wrong, at any point in the future. He does not see that as good for the County.

Dr. Thompson stated, this was the issue at hand, the City did give us in writing that if they have to make any modifications or repairs to their utilities that they will reach out to us, so that they do not simply damage the shared-use path. Also, Mr. Beaty can add additional information. We are not talking about them going out next year to make repairs. We are talking about pipes that are going to be out there for at least 50 – 60 years.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if there is a mishap, the way this is worded, sure the City is going to talk to you first, and as soon as they are done talking they are going to say, "and here's the bill."

Mr. Beaty stated this is an existing waterline that has been in place for about 30 years. It should be in place for another 75 years before any repairs are needed. What we are proposing to do is place 10' concrete sidewalk across their easement. The City is telling Richland County, if something happens to

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

their waterline, for whatever reason, they will notify the County that they need to come out and repair their line. They are going to cut out a section of the concrete path to repair their waterline. Since the County will be in there by permission, the City would not fix the sidewalk back, that responsibility would be on the County.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is not understanding Section 5 then because that is not what it is saying. We are not talking about the sidewalk section. We are talking about the actual pipes that are under the ground.

Mr. Beaty stated, he is an engineer and not an attorney, but he thought that was referencing, if during the construction of the shared-use path, if the construction were to damage the waterline, then the County would be responsible for repairing the damage.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it says here, "If the City now or in the future has to relocate or replace any portion of the City's existing water main, and other related items, then that relocation or replacement is the sole expense of Richland County."

Mr. Livingston stated, it also says, "If such location or replacement will be for the benefit of Richland County, not required by the City..."

Mr. Malinowski stated you keep reading and it says, "...relocation and replacement, but only at Richland County's sole expense."

Ms. Kennedy stated so we are going to foot the expense if something happens to it.

Mr. Beaty stated only if it is at the fault of Richland County. If when the sidewalk contractor is going in there and he tears up the City's waterline, then as an agent of Richland County, the County is responsible. And, then the City is saying, "if in the future, at some point in the future, they have repair their line, if the County's sidewalk is on top of their line they are going to tell you that they have to repair their line and they are going to cut out a piece of sidewalk."

Ms. Kennedy stated, for clarification, we are going to pay them to repair their line.

Mr. Beaty stated the County would only have to pay to repair the sidewalk.

Ms. Kennedy inquired why would have to repair the sidewalk.

Dr. Thompson stated because we are on their current right-of-way.

Ms. Myers inquired if it was standard, in these kinds of contracts, that the person who destroys the thing fixes it back. Would it not be usual for the person who destroys the thing, to get to its property, to repair it leaves it for you to come back and fix it.

Mr. Smith stated this looks like an encroachment agreement, which authorizes Richland County to go onto what is the City's property, where this pipe is, to put the sidewalk in. You have the language that deals with, if in constructing that sidewalk, or if we have to maintain it, at some point we damage their pipes then we would be responsible for any damage we do in the construction or maintenance of the sidewalk.

Ms. Myers stated they further say that if they come in to make repairs to their pipe and destroy our sidewalk they will make us aware and we will be responsible for repairing the sidewalk.

Mr. Smith stated that language, in that particular case, obviously the City is saying, if they have to come in to repair or replace their pipes, and in doing so they have to tear up the sidewalk, we have put in, they will ask us, at our expense, to put it back.

Ms. Myers inquired if that is unusual.

Mr. Smith responded it is unusual.

Mr. C. Jackson stated in the letter we sent to the City, and they confirmed it, regarding this issue where there was a meeting held on August 16<sup>th</sup>, it says, "...we discuss maintenance activities anticipated for the waterline under the proposed path along Polo Road. It is our understanding the City anticipates that any maintenance or repair, of the existing waterline, will be very infrequent, and the City will make every reasonable effort to coordinate with the County prior to any activities." The point that was made that they could not go any further that in the conversation was that they would not just come in and destroy our sidewalk, if there was a problem with their waterline without coordinating with us before they did any digging.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, in notifying us have they said they will pay, or are they just coordinating so we will know we have to come fix.

Dr. Thompson stated they did not say they were going to pay. They are just going to coordinate with us.

Ms. Myers inquired if the City was asked to pay.

Mr. Beaty stated that was a part of the conversations. And, they said since they are allowing Richland County to be on their property, and they have prior rights, it is similar to any other roadway project. If a utility is there, or in this case, the County, is there by permission, then when the owner has to affect their property and they can ask you "Hey, I've got to work on my property. You need to get out of my way". That is basically what the City is saying is they are there first.

Ms. Myers suggested, if that is their position, because it will have impact on all other such agreements within the City limits, and we will end up assuming liability, we coordinate through Mr. Smith to get some uniformity with this and come up with something that makes more sense than this because this could be quite expensive, if it is across all of the contracts.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, that with this clauses, and similar clauses, the Legal Department work with the City to come up with what is a reasonable middle ground to ensure that we do not accept unfunded liability.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if a substitute motion can be made and override the committee recommendation.

Ms. Dickerson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Smith stated anything coming from the committee, in the form of a motion, is a recommendation to

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

the full Council, which the full Council can either accept or reject and/or another motion can be made and seconded by other members of Council.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we do that in reverse. Does the County tell the City if we tear up their property, they have to fix it?

Dr. Thompson stated he does not have that answer.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson and N. Jackson

Opposed: C. Jackson, Pearce, Manning, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The substitute motion failed.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Myers, Kennedy and N. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

- f. Approval of the Resurfacing Authorization – Mr. C. Jackson stated the recommendation from the committee is to approve the Program Development Team’s request to proceed with construction on the additional \$7.5 million of resurfacing projects. Those funds are the current year’s budget.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. Approval of staff recommendation for a procedure to include the PDT’s management of the Dirt Road Program into the contract – Mr. C. Jackson stated Council voted to give the Dirt Road Program to the PDT; however, no contract modification has been done to make it official or the authorization of payment, as a result of that responsibility. The motion is to modify the PDT’s contract to include the management of the Dirt Road Program.

Ms. Dickerson requested additional clarification on this item.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, a couple meetings ago, Council voted to take the Dirt Road Program from the current contractor and reassign it to the PDT. However, no modification in the PDT’s contract had been done, as a result of that vote by Council to authorize payment to do that work. The motion is to authorize the PDT’s contract to be modified to include the Dirt Road Program in their current contract.

Ms. Dickerson inquired as to when Council will see the contract.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it is modifying the current contract to include the Dirt Road Program under that umbrella.

Ms. Myers inquired if the attorneys look at what we are proposing to make sure it is in harmony with the rest of the contract.

Dr. Thompson stated we have identified the procedure. He still has to go through Legal and the procurement process.

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

Opposed: Rose

The vote was in favor.

- h. Approval of the Spears Creek Church Widening Contract – Mr. C. Jackson stated the recommendation is for Council to approve the PDT to proceed with the 30% design plan, and to modify the scope of the project to ensure the original referendum amount for this project is stayed within those boundaries, even by reducing the length of the project by 1,800 ft. We realize this is going to require 3 Readings and a public hearing, and that is a part of the recommendation, as well.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in the backup information, a large portion of the project is within the City of Columbia municipal limits, but when it gets to project management the City is not included. He inquired if they have to be.

Dr. Thompson stated only when their utilities are affected will they be included.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- i. For Information Purposes: -- Mr. C. Jackson stated these items are for information.
  - 1. The removal of paving the Culvert within the Sunset Sidewalk Project
  - 2. The extension of sidewalks on Westridge Road to Clemson Road and the installation of sidewalks on Rhame Road and Summit Center Drive
  - 3. Transportation Program Update
  - 4. Approved Work Authorizations:
    - a. #60 Garners Ferry Road, Harmon Road, North Springs Road, Harrington Road, Screaming Eagle Road, Percival Road
    - b. #61 Blythewood Road Widening
    - c. #62 Bull Street and Elmwood Avenue

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if Mr. C. Jackson was planning to schedule a work session.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Mr. C. Jackson stated we are planning a work session to hear from Dr. Thompson and Mr. Beaty on where they are with all of the Transportation Penny Projects.

Mr. Malinowski requested the report to be provided to him with a larger font.

21. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Approval for letter recommending awarding bid for Sidewalk Package S-9 – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

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

Abstain: Manning

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

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

22. **CITIZENS' INPUT: Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda** – No one signed up to speak.

**POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE** – Mr. Manning stated he submitted a motion regarding majority vote for the individuals we put on Boards and Commissions. Part of the reason for that is he was reflecting back to when we did the appointment for the TPAC committee. That is the one vote he remembers where we had a lot more people than we had positions, and Council very clearly, on that vote, if a person did not have six (6) votes or majority of Council they were not seated. We continued rounds and rounds until we had majority votes for people to be seated. He stated he just wanted to go on record that Council operated differently in appointing citizens on committee with a majority vote.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if they went through Rules and Appointments. She does not recall them going through Rules and Appointments.

23. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.

- a. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator
- b. Potential Litigation: Annexation of Streets and Roads
- c. Detention Center Contract
- d. Employee Grievance
- e. Township Auditorium Update

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

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor of going into Executive Session.

***Council went into Executive Session at approximately 9:04 PM and came out at approximately 9:54 PM.***

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

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

- a. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to direct the Director of Human Resources to finalize the contract with the candidate for the position of Interim County Administrator under the terms and conditions as discussed in Executive Session. The starting date will be October 29<sup>th</sup>.

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

Abstain: Dickerson

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. Dickerson abstaining from the vote.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to reconsider this item.

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

Abstain: Dickerson

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Potential Litigation: Annexation of Streets and Roads – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to instruct the attorneys to reply to the letter with the definition discussed in Executive Session, and whatever other information that is appropriate.

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

Abstain: Manning

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

- c. Detention Center Contract – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to follow staff's recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski stated this item is going to ultimately cost the taxpayers' quite a bit of money. He was wondering if the person responsible for the lack of action has been counseled.

Dr. Yudice stated the person has not been counseled, but they will be.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**



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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski and Manning

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- d. Employee Grievance – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to uphold the Assistant Administrator’s recommendation.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Township Auditorium Update – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to direct staff to move ahead with this matter as discussed in Executive Session.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Livingston and Rose

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

24. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. Move for a resolution honoring Olivia McCartney for being named 2018-19 Spring Hill High teacher of the year and 2018 American Legion Dept. South Carolina teach of the year [ROSE] – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the resolution.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**

- b. Move for a resolution honoring Pastor Noble of 2<sup>nd</sup> Nazareth Church for a decade of service to his congregation and the community [ROSE, McBRIDE, MYERS and MANNING] – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the resolution.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. We move that the Second Citizens' Input (Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda) to be included with the First Citizens' Input section nearer to the beginning of the Richland County Council Regular Session meeting agendas [C. JACKSON, MANNING, and N. JACKSON] – This item was referred to the Rules and Appointments Committee.

25. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:03 PM.

**Special Called  
October 2, 2018**