



## Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING  
June 10, 2019 – 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Michelle Onley, Sandra Yudice, Kim Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Quinton Epps, Portia Easter, Wendy Davis, James Hayes, O’Jetta Bryant, Tyler Kirk, Steven Gaither, Dale Welch, Clayton Voignier, Michael Niermeier, Bryant Davis, Beverly Harris, Marjorie King, Ashley Powell, Ashiya Myers, Nancy Stone-Collum, Janet Claggett and Shahid Khan

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Manning, moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to add the Budget Ordinance to the agenda.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to adopt the agenda as amended.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **THIRD READING**

***An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt Biennium Budget II (FY 2020 and FY 2021) for Richland County, South Carolina; 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, 2019 will provide sufficient revenues for the operations of Richland County Government during the period of the first fiscal year of Biennium Budget II from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 (Fiscal Year 2020)***

### Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Recommended: \$15,243,965)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve Items 1 – 10 on the Motions list at the amounts approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Ms. McBride stated she needs to know the amounts that were approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated the amount noted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading column are the amounts that were approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. (i.e. Richland County Recreation Commission - \$15,243,965).

Mr. Manning withdrew his motion.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to fund the Richland County Recreation Commission at \$15,243,965.

Ms. McBride inquired how much additional funds were put in at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated the amount did not change.

Ms. McBride inquired if it increased from 1<sup>st</sup> Reading to 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated what they requested was the millage cap, which is what Council approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, they ordinarily, by law, get 5%, and we gave an additional 7.

Mr. Hayes stated the basic is 5 mills, and last year they got 13.5 mills. We do not have an associated millage with the current budget number.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, we have no jurisdiction over how they spend the 5 mills, and if we give additional mills will that give us any jurisdiction over the additional mills. In the future, she wants us to look at how the money is being spent, when we add additional mills.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. **Columbia Area Mental Health (Recommended: \$2,196,520)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund Columbia Area Mental Health at \$2,196,520.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

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

Mr. Jackson stated he knows that Lexington County reduced their appropriation for Riverbanks Zoo. He inquired, if Dr. Thompson knew the status of the final reduction, and if staff has had a conversation with the zoo officials to determine whether or not the funding requested from Richland County will be sufficient.

Dr. Thompson stated the County's portion is sufficient. He stated, according to the media, Lexington County is moving in the direction of funding the zoo appropriately.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there are any plans to lay any zoo staff off.

Dr. Thompson stated, at this time, he has not been informed of any.

Ms. Myers stated she does not see the millage numbers reflected, as opposed to what was requested.

Mr. Hayes stated the Auditor does not have the associated rate, at this time. They only have budget dollars, not an associated millage.

Ms. Myers stated that makes it difficult for them to determine whether what is being requested will have an impact upward on citizens' taxes.

Mr. Brawley stated because this is a reassessment year, and they have not received any additional information from the Assessor on growth, assessable transfers of interest and new construction, so, at this point, they cannot give you the exact millage. As he stated, at the last meeting, they did a 5-year trend analysis to arrive at the budget dollars being discussed tonight. They will set the millage rate in September/October.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Livingston

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

8. **Midlands Technical College – Capital (Recommended: \$3,423,854)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to fund Midlands Technical College – Capital at \$3,423,854.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Livingston

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

- 9. School District One (Recommended: \$232,915,525; Requested: \$244,161,524)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to fund School District One at \$232,915,525.

Mr. Livingston stated last time there was a discussion about the difference between the School District's projection of the millage rate versus the Auditor's projection. He inquired what projection is based on the \$244,161,524.

Mr. Hayes stated that would be the School District's projection. The amount approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading was the Auditor's amount of \$232,915,525.

Mr. Brawley stated he met with School District I, and the \$244,161,524 is what their needs are. It is not necessarily what the cap will generate for them in revenue.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if we said at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, that once the new numbers were in place, that we would go back and revisit that.

Mr. Brawley responded in the affirmative.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor

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

Mr. Jackson stated, as a proud graduate of Richland School District I public schools, a proud parent of 2 children who graduated from School District II public schools, and a proud husband of a teacher who taught for 20 years in School District II schools, he wants to publicly say how much he appreciates the support for public education. Particularly, when we can impact the future, not only of children in K5 – 12, but also beyond in our community technical colleges. This sends a very strong message, not only to the citizens, but also to businesses and industry. He stated more than 90% of the students who are educated are being educated in public schools. He appreciates the work that they do, and even though it is challenging, at times, and they ask for larger dollars than we have to give them. He wants to be able to give them as much money as they need to properly educate the kids, at the level that they need it, that will ensure they are as competitive as other student once they graduate.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

## GRANTS

- 11. Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$591,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated the committee approved \$560,000, and with the motion made by Mr. Manning, at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, to use fund balance in the amount of \$31,000, that brings the total to \$591,000 for 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$591,000 in Accommodations Tax Funding.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 12. Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies; \$2,046,186) NOTE: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, EdVenture and Township** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to fund the Ordinance Agencies at \$2,046,186.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 15. Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level; \$67,895)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$67,895 for SERCO.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 16. Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project (\$250,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$250,000 for the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 17. Approval of Historical Corridor funding level (\$372,715)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$372,715 for the Historical Corridor.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 18. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level; \$75,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$75,000 for Famously Hot New Year.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

**23. Hospitality Tax (Move to rollover remaining unallocated funds from H-Tax District 8; \$9,000) [MANNING]** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to rollover all remaining unallocated funds for each Council member, as well as, any unexpended grantee funds.

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

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 24. Hospitality Tax – District 8: Columbia City Ballet (\$37,000); Columbia Classic Ballet (\$37,000); Columbia International Festival (\$37,000); Historic Columbia (\$12,500); Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center & Visitors Bureau (\$10,000); Columbia Regional Sports Council (\$5,000); SC Philharmonic (\$5,000); Town of Eastover (\$2,500); 701 Center for Contemp Art (\$2,000); Pink & Green Community Serv. Foundation (\$2,000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve District 8’s Hospitality Tax allocations.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 25. Hospitality Tax – District 2: Blueberry/River Foundation (\$10,000); Columbia City Ballet (\$5,000); Columbia Classic Ballet (\$5,000); Capital City Lake Murray (\$20,000); Midlands Tech Harbison (\$5,000); Friends of Harbison Park (\$5,000); Palmetto Classic (\$10,000); Blythewood Historic Society (\$5,5000)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve District 2’s Hospitality Tax allocations.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

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



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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 28. Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants Committee; \$55,184)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve \$55,184 for the Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 29. Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (I move that the following neighborhoods be funded as reflected by the requested amounts printed in the Budget Book for FY20 Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants with the understanding that the County receives all required grant application information: Atlas Road Community Organization - \$1,500; Denny Terrace - \$1,500; Folkstone Community Association - \$1,492.48; Greater Woodfield Community Association - \$1,497.83; and Washington Park Association - \$1,500) [MANNING]** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve funding for the following neighborhoods: Atlas Road Community Organization - \$1,500; Denny Terrace - \$1,500; Folkstone Community Association - \$1,492.48; Greater Woodfield Community Association - \$1,497.83; and Washington Park Association - \$1,500.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 30. Special Revenue: (Approve grants departments are applying for)** – Mr. Hayes stated the net impact of this item is \$700,000 in matching grants, which is typically held in the Non-Departmental fund.

Mr. Manning moved, Ms. Dickerson, to approve the matching funds for the grants the departments are applying for.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the funds would come out of the Non-Departmental budget, and there are sufficient funds to cover that amount.

Mr. Hayes stated we do not generally receive all of the grants, but we have the flexibility to make adjustments within Non-Departmental, if necessary.

Ms. Myers inquired if staff has identified those grants where positions are attached, and the agencies would expect us to pick up the positions in the future.

Ms. King stated, in the budget book, starting on p. 97, it has each individual grant broke out with the financial impact to the County, once the grant has ended, if there is any, and if pick up of any positions would be required. There is (1) new position, if the grant is awarded.

Ms. Myers stated, once the grant funding is gone, she wants to ensure what the fiscal impact is going to be for the positions that remain, without grant funding.

Ms. King stated there are total of (8) positions, which would equate to approximately \$500,000. She stated this year there are 23 – 27 potential grant pick-ups, which totals \$1,447,155.

Ms. Myers stated, if all these grants are awarded, and all 23 – 27 people join Richland County, once the funding evaporated, we are talking about \$1.5 million in additional funding for the budget each year. Do we know, of those positions, how many of them are the departments planning to keep, and how many are budget positions that will evaporate after the grant is over? She stated we are enlarging the departmental budget, by this amount, and we need to acknowledge that in this budget cycle.

Mr. Hayes stated the potential impact, once this grant funds are eliminated, is what Ms. Myers is speaking to.

Ms. Myers stated we are binding a subsequent Council to this number of headcount, and she wants to be clear that is what we are doing. Essentially, we are granting FTEs to these departments.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers and Walker

Abstain: Kennedy

The motion failed.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the applications for the department grants, with the understanding that no positions will be determined to be picked up, once the grant expires, without the approval of Council.

Ms. McBride applauded the efforts of the County to secure funds. The County has so many needs, and without these grant funds, we would not be able to meet them. She understands the concerns of her colleagues, but she does not want that to be an issue, or a reason the County thinks we do not need to apply for grants. It is the understanding, if we want to fund these positions, as County positions, then it will come back to Council. Some of these positions are very important, and the County cannot afford to provide those services.

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

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

**10**

## GENERAL FUND

- 31. County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions; FY20 - \$172,670,127)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve the items that were approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, and then take up the motions that have come in since 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Ms. Newton requested clarification on which items they are approving.

Mr. Hayes stated Items 31, 32, 33, 35 – 42 were approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the motion on the floor is that we look at those items that were approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, and then look at the new motions. She inquired, hypothetically, if all of these motions were approved, would there be enough funds in the General Fund, or what would be the impact.

Mr. Hayes stated, if everything were approved in that section, we would be over budget by \$604,000. The only impact to the budget, at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, was approximately \$100,000. Subsequent motions have increased that total.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to which items were the Administrator's initial recommended amounts.

Mr. Hayes stated that would be Items 31 and 32.

Mr. Walker stated it is a terrible policy for us to tax our constituents, and turn around and make donations to charitable organizations using their funds. It thinks that is a right to be held at the constituent, individual level. They can choose how to spend their money better than we can.

Ms. Myers requested Mr. Hayes to explain what he means by, "in the negative." Technically, that is not an accurate statement.

Mr. Hayes stated it will be over what we have the ability to do, in terms of what is available. Council voted to keep the fund balance total within 25%. There will be approximately \$5 million that would be available, and still stay within that percentage. We used \$3.4 million to balance the budget, to offset the previous budget deficit, which left \$1.7 million. As he mentioned, during 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading, we used \$100,000, which left \$1.6 million. The motions that came in, against that, were approximately \$600,000 more than the \$1.6 million.

Ms. Myers inquired if that included the dollar amount that staff has identified as needing to be made as transfers into departments where their budgets have been overspent. Staff has already made the decision to allocate those amounts, some of which would impact what they are thinking are allocable amounts.

Mr. Hayes stated they did have to go back and make budgets whole, that did had deficits. That is a part of the Administrator's recommended budget. We had to increase personnel dollars to cover those deficits.

Ms. Myers stated, those increased numbers, may be impacting what we submitted, but we have not approved those transfers. We are unaware of what was left in the budget this year. Where you have made transfers. What she is saying, is that staff transferred those amounts, without Council doing a budget amendment, so they are not aware of what the whole of the impact might be. Whereas, they may be thinking there was a \$300,000 amount here, and ... There may be numbers that we are

looking at that are impacted by those transfer, and we are not aware of it. If there are carryover funds, from last year's budget, they should be brought forward into the new budget, and we should all be aware of the numbers.

Mr. Hayes stated he is trying to make the connection between...

Ms. Myers stated, if they have approved a budget for FY18-19, and those budgets, in their opinion, are set at where we approved them. Then (6) departments go over, but they are unaware they are over those budgets, and they are thinking the last set of numbers they received reflect accurately where those budget are, there may be carryover money. If that money has been allocated, and they are unaware of it, then the numbers are different. Typically, you would do that through a budget amendment, which if you are changing money between departments, you would have to do.

Mr. Hayes stated Council set a budget total for FY19. The departments did not exceed the General Fund department total. You only have to do an amendment to the budget, if we were to exceed the total General Fund. Some departments had surpluses, and some departments had overages. They used departments that had surpluses to transfer funds to cover those departments that had negatives, but they did not exceed what Council approved, as a budget.

Ms. Myers stated the last numbers they received did not reflect all of the overages that are in play. They would have been operating on different numbers, is her point.

Mr. Hayes stated Council requested a list of departments that had overages, and we did put those in the companion document.

Ms. Myers inquired, for clarification, if the money had been moved.

Mr. Hayes stated, not in all cases. This is part of their end of the year clean up. The General Fund, itself, is going to end up in a positive.

Ms. Myers stated, if we expected to spend \$200 million, and we have spent \$195 million, have we reallocated the \$5 million.

Mr. Hayes stated, Ms. Hamm said, besides the 25% targeted amount, there was \$5 million that would be available. Of that \$5 million, they used \$3.3 million to balance the budget, because there was a deficit they had made Council aware of previously. That left the \$1.7 million available for motions.

Mr. Livingston inquired about how much of the \$1.6 million was included in the recommended budget.

Mr. Hayes stated it was not included, only the \$3.4 million.

Mr. Livingston inquired about how much of the \$1.6 million was allocated on 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated \$100,000, and the rest have been added since 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading. The additional motions have eclipsed the fund balance policy.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve Items 31 and 32.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers and Walker

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

**12**

Opposed: Jackson, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The substitute motion failed.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio and Newton

The vote was in favor.

**32. Transfer Out (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; FY20 - \$8,058,159) –Above in previous motion.**

**33. Sheriff's Department (I move to amend the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading motion made to cover expenses in the Sheriff's Department that no longer can be paid for with seizure funds to allow use of additional funds from the fund balance in the General Fund to cover the following expenses for the Biennium Budget II and place these funds in the assigned fund balance: FY 2020: \$110,772.03 to continue operating the community cameras and \$168,000 for cell phones for a total of \$278,772.03)**

Ms. Myers stated there was a question as to whether or not we could do what was being requested. She inquired if that has been resolved.

Mr. Hayes this is an amended motion to increase the Sheriff's budget by the amount listed.

Ms. Myers inquired what would stop another department from coming in next year and doing this.

Mr. Walker stated this is a result of a particular issue within the Sheriff's budget where they can no longer use seizure funds, so it was a one-year shortfall. He would suggest, moving forward, that will be a part of their planning and will not be needed year after year.

Ms. Myers stated she wants to make sure we do not send the message that you come in and ask for rollover funds, and they will be added to your budget.

Mr. Walker stated the rollover fund is the reason we had to amend the motion and put it in this form because that is not allowable. There is a policy on file where we do not allow rollover funds.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if cellphones were already in the Sheriff's budget.

Chief Cowan stated they have used seizure funds to cover the costs of several items within their budget for the last 15 years. They had 7 items on their budget from the last years they have been planning and meeting with Administration on for the last 18 months. They explained, 2 of those items, they were not able to redirect funds within their budget to cover. One is Community Cameras, which Council voted to have in 2015. They used seizure funds to pay for those, and they are no longer allowed to use seizure funds to pay for those. They have had an ongoing list, since April 2017, with Budget and Administration, explaining that those were the items coming forward. He stated the seizure funds can only be used for specific means, and they are directed directly to the Sheriff to be spent. They have to be allocated toward specific items.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this becomes a part of the Sheriff's budget, since State law says you cannot decrease the Sheriff's budget.

Mr. Hayes stated it would increase the budget for FY20.

Mr. Manning inquired as to which body changes the seizure laws.

Chief Cowan stated they are monitored on a Federal and State level.

Ms. Newton stated, if we approve this, that money is added to the Sheriff's budget in perpetuity. She inquired if there is another mechanism, for giving the funds, that does not enlarge the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding could be placed in Non-Departmental and the expenditures could be charged to Non-Departmental.

Ms. Newton proposed a friendly amendment to provide the funds through the Non-Departmental budget.

Mr. Walker inquired if that has an operational impact or does that satisfy the paying point.

Chief Cowan stated Council requested the 48 camera boxes that were placed throughout the County. They are crucial to crime fighting. The cellphone issue is a bigger operational issue.

Mr. Walker inquired, if we redirect these funds to a Non-Departmental account, and the Sheriff's direct invoices the cost, would that cause an operational issue.

Chief Cowan stated that would not affect anything.

Ms. Dickerson stated the community cameras are very important in these communities. She wants to make sure the Sheriff gets these funds.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**32. Board of Elections & Voter Registration I move that Richland County fund the Board of Elections & Voter Registration at the department requested amounts, \$1,887,925 for FY 2020 and \$1,826,715 for FY 2021.)**

Ms. Terracio stated this is the whole budget amount for the Voter Registration and Election Department. It is not any excess funds that would be added to their budget. It is the full amount that they have requested. It is her understanding the recommended budget amount is \$1.5 million, so there is a gap between, which is mostly covered by the reimbursements the County gets back from the State, as well as the municipalities for which we conduct elections.

Mr. Hayes stated, to date, they have not received any reimbursements. The department has requested \$1.8 million, but the Administrator has recommended \$1.5 million.

Ms. Myers inquired what this means to their budget. Does it mean that we are going to have 10 less voting machines?

Mr. Charles Austin, Voter Registration and Election Board Chair, stated they depend on these reimbursements to assist them with the operational process for the Board. What they have inherited is that the money has not been sent forward. It is his understanding, that when money does come, it goes into the General Fund. They are trying to make the budget whole.

Ms. Myers stated, essentially, they are asking for a loan, so that when the money comes in it gets paid back.

Mr. Austin stated when the money comes in it will go into the General Fund. It does not come directly to the Voter Registration and Election Department.

Ms. Myers inquired if it is unusual for the money to be this late in reimbursement.

Mr. Hayes stated he would to research this, but he thinks normally we have received something.

Ms. Myers inquired if that is where the shortfall is coming from.

Mr. Hayes stated he has not personally had an opportunity to take a look at the connection between their reimbursement amount versus their request.

Mr. Austin stated, in their discussions, with the previous Director, we concluded the amount that was requested would be sufficient for operations, as they prepare for the 2020 elections.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, without that they will be underprepared for the elections.

Mr. Austin stated they could potentially be.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this is the department that Richland County is told by the State how much to provide for their budget. The County has no say over how they spend it or what they do with it. In the past, the State has told Richland County, this is the dollar amount you will fund them for their operational needs.

Mr. Hayes stated he cannot say the State has given a mandate.

Mr. Malinowski stated, historically, the State took Greenville County and Horry County, added them together and divided by 2, and that is what the County was to pay. If that is the case, the State mandates we pay a certain amount, and maybe they need to be making their request for additional funds from the State, since we have no say over how it is spent. It is also his understanding, that the funds for the municipal elections cover the cost of those elections.

Mr. Austin stated, as they have come on board, they have not received any directive at the State level, as it relates to preparing the budget. What we have is the budget that the previous Director prepared, and included the shortfall because of the reimbursement they were expecting.

Mr. Manning stated WLTX is reporting that the SC Election Commission announced today they picked a company called Electronic Systems and Software Express Voting for a new contract. The new machines will provide paper responses to our votes, and are scheduled to go online on January 1, 2020, which means it will be the system people use in the February Presidential Primaries, June Primaries and November General Election. He inquired if that is something calculated into this budget.

Mr. Austin stated they were just made aware of that, and have not had time to determine what the impact will be. The budget, they have presented, is based on what they are responsible for, at this time, and what they expect our responsibility. For example, if this does not come through, they still have a responsibility to ensure that the machines we have are operable, we have sufficient machines, and they get them to the locations where the voting will take place.

Ms. Newton stated the amount listed here is the \$1.8 million. In terms of the budgetary impact, were this motion approved, we are really looking at the delta between \$1.5 and \$1.8. She stated the way she understands the \$340,000, that they are anticipating, will be reimbursed by the General Assembly, but it may be timely for them to pay their bills. So, they are asking that we fund the difference, and accept the reimbursement, when it comes to the General Fund.

Mr. Austin responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired, if they did not receive the funding, what impact would that have on the elections.

Mr. Austin stated the impact would be in terms of personnel (i.e. ensuring the voting machines are properly operating, to get them to the locations and provide training for the poll workers.)

Mr. Jackson stated it has been clear, to anyone who has seen the news, the challenge they have, in terms of assuming the role and responsibility of an election process that is faulty, at best, based on antiquated and outdated equipment. The last thing we should be debating whether or not we need to improve the accuracy of our election process. However, with the information that Mr. Manning shared, it sounded to him, there was some light at the end of the tunnel. The thing that disturbed him, was that we are not sure if the actual reimbursement amount is going to be the difference that is being requested. We do not know that because we have not gotten it, and apparently we do not know what that dollar amount is.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the budgeted amount up to the amount, once Mr. Hayes has determined the actual reimbursement figure.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, we are looking at is up to the \$1.8 million.

Mr. Jackson stated it would be up to the \$340,000 amount, based upon the number that can be verified as reimbursable.

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

Opposed: Dickerson

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 33. Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations \$146,000 in new recommendations, and \$54,000 in multi-year grants approved in prior years) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$200,000 of this item.**

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



Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 34. Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; \$825,392)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$825,392 for this item.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 35. LumpSum Allocations (Base amount approved FY19; \$2,083,668)** – This item was incorporated in Item #31.

- 35(a) Lump Sum (To allocate Lump sum funding to various groups that have historically been funded in multiple funds: \$55,000 Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 for Congaree River Keeper, \$42,900 Keep the Midlands Beautiful, \$53,000 River Alliance)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$55,000 for Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 for the Congaree River Keeper; \$42,000 for Keep the Midlands Beautiful; and \$53,000 for the River Alliance.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

- 36. LumpSum (Allocate \$130,063 to the United Way of the Midlands to partially fund a Resiliency Team pilot program at Jackson Creek Elementary School as part of the Resilient Richland initiative. This funding is for both years of the Biennium II. The funding is to be designated as a Lump Sum Outside Agency Appropriation; FY20 - \$130,063; FY21 - \$130,063)** – This item was incorporated in Item #31.

- 37. LumpSum (I move to approve a request from the Harriet Hancock Center in the amount of \$20,000 to assist the Center in upgrading their aging electrical systems and rebuilding the property's retaining wall. The Harriet Hancock Center serves on average 2,500 persons in the LGBTQ+ community each year. Approximately 35% of these persons are from the City of Columbia, 45% are from the greater Richland County area, and 20% are from out of County; \$20,000) [TERRACIO]** – This item was incorporated in Item #31.

- 38. LumpSum (Allocate \$50,000 to CityLight Community Development Corporation to pilot a summer educational, cultural and empowerment experience for youth residing at North Point Estate [also known as Bethel Bishop]. North Point Estate has more violent crime than any other block in**

*Columbia/Richland County [State Newspaper/August 2018]; \$50,000) [McBRIDE]* – This item was incorporated in Item #31.

39. *LumpSum (Allocate \$10,000 to Greenview Swim Team to offer free swimming lessons to youth from low income families throughout Richland County during summer months and on weekends during school year where feasible with indoor swimming pools. Swimming accommodations will be coordinated with both Richland County and the City of Columbia Parks and Recreation program. Program cost includes assistance for special transportation for students not living in walking distance and have no means of transportation to swimming lesson; \$10,000) [McBRIDE]* – This item was incorporated in Item #31.
40. *LumpSum (Allocate \$25,000 for the Wiley Kennedy Foundation to provide and expand services to underserved residents, youth and senior citizens residing in zip code 29203. The foundation has an excellent reputation in the community works to address needs of community through: feeding the homeless, providing food packages to sustain children from low income families for the weekend, health programs, summer enrichment activities for youth, programs for senior citizens and other community engagement activities; \$25,000) [McBRIDE]* – This item was incorporated in Item #31.
41. *LumpSum (Allocate \$150,000 to establish a Richland County Work Force Development and Outreach Program that will address employment and training opportunities and outreach for citizens from disadvantaged and underserved communities in Richland County; and to establish a Richland County Summer Youth Employment and Leadership training program. This program can be funded in-house or can be outsourced in collaboration with Midland Tech or another entity; \$150,000) [McBRIDE]* – This item was incorporated in Item #31.
42. *LumpSum (I move to provide \$35,000 for Randolph Cemetery for needed repairs, including grave fill in, brick border repairs, road maintenance (inside the cemetery), and long grass cutting. Randolph Cemetery was created in 1871 by a committee of African-American men in honor of Benjamin Randolph, a senator who was assassinated in 1868 and contains at least 13 Reconstruction-era African-American legislators; \$35,000) [TERRACIO]* – This item was incorporated in Item #31.
43. *Lump Sum (I move that Richland County Council appropriate \$100,000 to the Dorn Veterans Administration Hospital Fisher House Foundation. These funds will be used as Richland County Council's contribution to assist The Fisher House Foundation in reaching its 1 Million Dollar required Community Fundraising goal. Once, this goal is achieved, the Federal Veterans Administration will match this amount and approve the construction of the Fisher House on the property of the Dorn VA Medical Center in Columbia, SC.) [JACKSON]* – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve \$25,000 in discretionary Hospitality Tax funds for the Fisher House Foundation.

The Fisher House is a respite facility, attempting to be built in Columbia for the VA Hospital. It is similar to an adult version of the Ronald McDonald House or St. Jude's, where the family members of veterans, who are hospitalized, are provided temporary housing while they are dealing with their ill loved one. He had the opportunity to tour the facility in Charleston, and the VA here is working, through the Fisher House Foundation, to try to establish the matching funds required to build the same kind of facility.

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

Special Called Meeting

June 10, 2019

18

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 44. LumpSum (Allocate \$157,862 to the United Way of the Midlands to fund a Resiliency Team pilot project at Watkins-Nance Elementary School as a part of the Resilient Richland initiative. This funding is for both years of the Biennium II. The funding is from the General Fund Balance. [McBRIDE, KENNEDY, JACKSON, TERRACIO, LIVINGSTON & MANNING]** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to allocate \$157,862 to the United Way of the Midlands for the Resiliency pilot project at Watkins-Nance Elementary School.

Ms. Newton stated, as a Board member of the United Way, she supports Resilient Richland. It appears there are 2 Resiliency Teams for this project. There is one that was approved on Item #36, which is Jackson Creek Elementary School, and then this one.

Mr. Manning stated the first team, for Jackson Creek Elementary, there were matching funds available toward that one. Jackson Creek is in School District Two, and this one would be in School District One. Therefore, each of the school districts would have opportunity to have a Resiliency Team work with those children and families.

Ms. Newton suggested piloting one in FY 20 and one in FY21.

Ms. Terracio stated she is supportive of Resilient Richland, and her name is on the motion. When this motion came around, we were looking at a lot of funds being available, but now we are looking at a lot motions and deserving groups and initiatives. She would be supportive of focusing on one pilot program, and making sure we get it right. Then, focusing on another one when we know we have something good going.

Ms. McBride stated she thinks we are looking at 2 different areas. There are 2 different segments, dealing with 2 different populations, and all having really great need for this type of program. In terms of research, it would be better to look at both programs going at one time. She stated a number of those students that attend those schools are in her district. The students going to that particular school are from very disadvantaged areas. She would not want to deny those students the opportunity since we have a number of programs trying to address that problem right now.

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

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski and Walker

Abstain: Newton and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

- 49. Various (I move to assign an additional \$1.5M from unassigned Fund Balance to the Total Rewards program. This will bring the staying total to \$2.5M)** – Ms. Myers stated she made a motion to add an additional \$1.5M to the Total Rewards Program, so that we could jumpstart the payment to employees. We have not received any numbers for that yet.

Mr. Hayes stated since the Total Rewards has to do with salaries, and salaries are recurring expenditures, he would advise to not tie the Total Rewards to Fund Balance.

Ms. Myers stated she was suggesting to add a \$1.5M from the Fund Balance. It is her understanding, staff recommended put aside \$1M.

Mr. Hayes stated that is correct. The funding was tied to revenue.

Ms. Myers inquired if it was possible to tie the additional \$1M to revenue.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding we are utilizing tonight is not revenue. We are using Fund Balance dollars.

Ms. Myers stated the point of the motion was to be sure that we set aside additional money to jumpstart Total Rewards. She inquired if Mr. Hayes had any suggestions on a way to jumpstart Total Rewards.

Mr. Hayes stated he would suggest to leave it as is. We have \$1M that has been designated to start in January 2020. That \$1M becomes \$2M in FY21. Next year, their intention is to do a middle-cycle budget amendment, when we have more updated numbers. You cannot predict revenue numbers. We could potentially have additional revenue dollars in FY21. Once we come back next year, we could make an adjustment, if it looks like revenue is going to come in higher.

Ms. Myers stated her goal was to help achieve the goal of Total Rewards, in a more accelerated fashion. If, Mr. Hayes is saying, we need to take the \$1.5M to \$0, she would have to yield to his suggestion.

Mr. Hayes stated, if you were to pass any amount, he would have to hope that revenue would come in to cover that amount for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, we have projected to phase in Total Rewards over 3 years.

Dr. Yudice stated that is correct, but we have tied it to revenue, not Fund Balance.

Ms. Myers stated, in Years 2 and 3, we have projected \$1M one year and \$3M the next.

Mr. Hayes stated that was Human Resources numbers, but it was not tied to revenue. At this time, the budget could not absorb that.

Ms. Myers stated, for record, she has requested, a ton of times, the numbers, so we can make some headway on getting our employees up to par.

Dr. Yudice stated, perhaps, Council can allocate \$500,000, with the caveat, that we will fund it, if the revenue comes in. If the revenue comes in higher than \$500,000, we will come back to Council, so you can fund it at the amount that the revenue comes in.

Ms. Myers stated, ordinarily, she would accept that, but she just asked Mr. Hayes and he told her, "No."

Mr. Hayes stated, if we do use \$500,000, that would mean, based on his revenue projections, he does not have a place for that \$500,000. Next year, when we do update revenue numbers for FY21, his projections could go up by \$500,000.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to allocate \$500,000 from unassigned Fund Balance to the Total Rewards Program.

Ms. Newton stated we have a deep commitment to making sure that we are compensating our staff, and attracting the best staff. She inquired if there is a model, anywhere, that someone has presented, that is tied to revenue, and sustainable, that shows how we can make Total Rewards happen.

Mr. Hayes stated we have only gone to the Biennium. We have not had time to go past FY21, but that is something he attended to work with the HR Director on.

Ms. Newton inquired if Mr. Hayes feels confident in the numbers.

Mr. Hayes stated, based off their current revenue projections, we would seed fund the Total Rewards in FY20 by \$1M. That \$1M, of course, if funded in January, would have to be a full year of funding in FY21, so it would become \$2M. Next year, this time, when we are doing the mid-cycle budget amendment, and he has more updated numbers for FY21, it could be that he has more revenue flexibility to go over and above the \$2M. Based off revenue projections, as they stand 2 years out, he is not comfortable.

Dr. Yudice stated another option is LumpSum appropriations, which is recurring revenue.

Ms. Myers stated, with all due respect, that is what she thought she was doing.

Mr. Hayes stated, what Dr. Yudice is referring to, is the motions that are against the outside agencies, which total \$3.1M. Of course, that number has been taken up since motions have been made against it.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Kennedy, Walker, Livingston and McBride

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Walker stated Ms. Myers, and others, have asked specifically for an implementation plan. What we want to know is, with advisement, where can we go source these dollars? How can we phase this thing in? We want this to happen, please show us how.

Ms. McBride stated she support Ms. Myers and the Total Rewards Program, but she is also listening to the Budget Director. She wants to be sure he is comfortable with what we are doing. We will have the opportunity to come back, if necessary, to make the appropriate changes.

**50. CASA (Fund a CASA attorney position: CASA attorney is \$44,146; FICA would be \$3,377, and SCRS (retirement) would be \$6,870 in FY20 and \$7,311 in FY21; so the total needed in FY20 would be \$54,393 and for FY21 \$54,834) [LIVINGSTON, DICKERSON AND McBRIDE]** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the CASA attorney position in the amount of \$54,393.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, since this is a staff position, it is a recurring expense.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to recess the meeting for 5 minutes.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor of recessing for 5 minutes.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconvene the meeting.

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

Present but Not Voting: Newton, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**45. LumpSum (Move to allocate \$50,000 to The Therapy Place from General Fund to support services for autistic children in RC) [MYERS]** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to allocate \$25,000 to The Therapy Place.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio and Newton

The vote was in favor.

**46. LumpSum (Move to allocate up to \$15,000 per Council District for Richland County Council “Youth Summer Reading & Enrichment” book give away and reading day) [MYERS and McBRIDE]** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to table this item.

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

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**48. LumpSum (Move to allocate up to \$50,000 for 6 regional Richland County Summertime “Dinner & A Movie” Nights Out with RCC) [NEWTON, MYERS, JACKSON and TERRACIO]** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to table this item.

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

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**47. Non-Departmental (Move to allocate \$50,000 per year in FY20 and FY21 to hire a firm to guide the County in establishing a strategic plan) [NEWTON]** – Ms. Newton stated she had moved to allocate up to \$50,000 for FY20 for a strategic plan, which would help us better serve our constituents, and also help us as we are allocating funds towards the priorities that we have previously identified. Ms. Terracio seconded the motion.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a source of funds in the Administrative budget, that are unassigned, that could be used for strategic planning.

Dr. Yudice stated that is a one-time expense, and can be funded with Fund Balance. If you want to fund it in FY19, we can find the money.

Ms. Myers inquired if Ms. Newton would be willing to accept a friendly amendment for Administration to find a source of funding.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, when they say, “Funding it through FY19”, they mean through June 30, 2019.

Mr. Hayes stated, what they could do, is encumber the funds and roll them over.

Ms. Newton accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we have done a strategic plan. If so, when was it, and what were the results.

Dr. Yudice stated, since she came in early 2017, we have not done a strategic plan. She does not know if there was one done in the past.

Ms. Newton stated, the best practice, is to regularly do a strategic plan. Even if we did one a year and half ago, she would suggest that we do another one. As times change, needs change. This will allow us to align our plans and budget.

Mr. Manning stated he thought we did one at the Council Retreat.

Ms. A. Myers stated the official strategic plan was done in 2005 – 2006. It used to be published on the County’s website, but has been taken off. It is her recollection, there was a facilitated session, but there was not a produced strategic plan provided to staff.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this is a part of Mr. Walker’s motion regarding a citizen’s survey.

Mr. Walker stated the survey to the constituents will provide input and data points for the formulation of a strategic plan, but without funding set aside for the strategic plan, the data will fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Manning stated he does not quite understand. We are doing 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of the budget, but we are taking up a motion about doing some funding out of the current fiscal year.

Mr. Livingston stated Mr. Manning is correct. It would not be a budget item.

Mr. Hayes stated, he believes, Council is giving him the authority to find the money to put on the PO. It has no budgetary impact for FY20.

Dr. Yudice stated, what we can do, at the next Council meeting, we can put an item under “Other Items” to use Non-Departmental funding for the strategic plan, using FY19 funds.

#### **SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS**

- 51. *Victim’s Rights (Allocate funding to approve Victims Assistance Budget; FY20 - \$921,021)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve Items #51 – 69, at the same amount that we did at 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

Mr. Hayes stated the dollar amount that is being approved, for Victim’s Rights, is the funding source. That is what the budget can support. The actual expenditures are roughly \$300,000 higher, but we did not have the ability to fund that because of the cap amount that could be sent over to the General Fund, unless Council made a motion to adjust it. The transfer was capped at \$686,000. The revenue has dipped the last couple of years. He did speak to the Chief Magistrate and he expects the revenue dollars to increase, but he can only go off of where they are currently.

Ms. Dickerson stated, at one time, she thought we were not increasing this budget. She would prefer that it stay at \$686,021.

Mr. Hayes stated they did not increase it. Their revenue amounts, that was budgeted, were not accurate, so we had to reduce the revenue down to the correct projection. The revenue amount, coupled with the \$686,000 from the General Fund, is not currently sufficient to support the item. There was a court case that impacted the revenue for Victim’s Assistance.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if we are approving the \$921,021.

Mr. Hayes stated that is what we can currently support. That will be the \$686,000, and the rest is what we feel like the revenue will be, based off of current trends. It is not General Fund funding; it is only the additional revenue.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Mr. Hayes is recommending to add the revenue to the \$686,000, but what has been done in the past.

Mr. Hayes stated, in the past, the 2 funding sources has been the transfer in from the General Fund, and whatever the revenue is. They had to go back and adjust the revenue dollars down because the revenue numbers were not keeping up with what was budgeted.

Ms. Newton stated, just to be clear, if we accept this motion, and approve Items #51 – 69, what is the financial implication of that.

Mr. Hayes stated, essentially, the Victim’s Assistance fund would end up in the negative because the expenditures are more than what the funding source is.

Ms. Newton inquired, if we approve Items #51 – 69, what will be the implications of that, and will that affect what we have just done with the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes stated all of the Special Revenue budgets will be balanced, with the exception of the Public Defender, Victim’s Assistance and Title IVD-Sheriff’s Dept. In the notes section, he put down what the revenue could support, and noted what the expenditures were. He could not set the budget at the amount of the expenditures, if he did not have the supporting revenue. That is why he denoted the difference between what the sources were, and what the expenditures were.



Ms. Newton stated, the Victim's Assistance, Public Defender, and Title IV, if approved, as is, would be over their budget, and we would have to find another allocation source. Traditionally, that has been the General Fund, correct.

Mr. Hayes stated the amount of transfer out is fixed by Council, so when we made adjustments to make their budgets whole, they did not have enough revenue coming in to support the increase. Of course, we could not change the transfers out, that is a Council action. Consequently, there was no mechanism to fund the "deficit". Historically, the amount from the State has been fixed.

Mr. Jackson requested a friendly amendment to remove Items #51 – Victim's Assistance, #61 – Title IVD – Sheriff's Department, and #63 – Public Defender from the motion.

Ms. Newton stated, when you look at #70 – Public Defender, which she fully supports, it says it is going to increase the transfer out from the General Fund. Has that been accounted for?

Mr. Hayes stated, they are currently already \$500,000 short, so if you added another \$500,000 to it, it would bring them \$1M short. That motion was separate from Administration's recommendation.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to call for the question.

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

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy and Dickerson

The vote in favor of the calling for the question was unanimous.

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

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor of approving Items #52 – 69, with the exception of Items #61 and #63, was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve \$921,021 for Victim's Assistance Program.

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

Abstain: Manning

Present but Not Voting: Newton

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

**52. Tourism Development (Allocate funding to approve Tourism Development Budget; FY20 - \$1,288,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

**53. Temporary Alcohol Permits (Allocate funding to approve Temporary Alcohol Permits Budget; FY20 - \$165,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

**25**

54. **Emergency Telephone System (To allocate funding to approve ETS Budget; FY20 - \$6,345,314** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
55. **Fire Service (To approve downward adjustment to Fire Services Budget; \$28,193,956)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
56. **Stormwater Management (Allocate funding to approve Stormwater Management Budget; FY20 - \$4,528,787)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
57. **Conservation Commission Fund (Allocate funding to approve Conservation Commission Fund Budget; FY20 - \$977,991)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
58. **Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund (Allocate funding to approve Neighborhood Redevelopment Fund Budget; FY20 - \$834,003)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
59. **Hospitality Tax (Allocate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget; FY20 - \$9,970,794)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
60. **Accommodations Tax (Allocate funding to approve Accommodation Tax Budget; FY20 - \$560,300)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
62. **Drug Court Program (Allocate funding to approve Drug Court Program Budget)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
64. **Transportation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget; FY20 - \$68,500,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
65. **School Resource Officers (Allocate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget; FY20 - \$6,148,303)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
69. **Economic Development (Allocate funding to approve Economic Development Budget; FY20 - \$1,905,000; FY21 - \$2,030,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.
61. **Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund (Allocate funding to approve Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund Budget; FY20 - \$51,000)** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to allocate \$51,000 to the Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund Budget.

Mr. Manning inquired as to what these funds are utilized for.

Chief Cowan stated the funds are used to offset the costs the operation of the civil process unit (i.e. cellphones, color printers, etc.).

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

63. **Public Defender (Allocate funding to approve Public Defender Budget; FY20 \$4,000,448, which includes Transfer In from the GF of \$2,400,448; budgeted expenditures \$4,541,747 in FY20 and \$4,674,030 in FY21)** – Ms. Myers moved to approve this item. This is one of the motions that she put in that she is not asking Council to look for another source of funding.

Mr. Livingston stated we are dealing with Item #63, but Ms. Myers is showing the relationship between Items #63 and #70.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding sources are roughly \$500,000 less than what is currently budgeted for expenditures. Item #70 speaks of increasing the budget by \$500,000, based off of the Total Rewards. If you are already \$500,000 in the hole, and you add another \$500,000 that becomes a million.

Ms. Myers stated she understands that Mr. Hayes is a budget man, and everything that does not have numbers beside it looks like a negative to you. What we are doing is moving money from category to another. The Public Defender has not created a deficit. They do not have enough funding. We are asking for a place to allocate funding to fairly compensate people who are defending the indigent.

Mr. Hayes the budget has been about making the personnel budgets whole, across the board. What he is saying, to make their budget whole, it takes \$500,000. He could not, personally, add more to that.

**70. Public Defender (Move to increase the Public Defender's annual budget by \$517,735 to bring Public Defenders' salaries in line [decreasing to about 5% deficit from approximately 20%] with the Richland County Solicitor's Office [MYERS, DICKERSON, McBRIDE and MANNING]** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the Public Defender's recommended budget, and an additional \$517,735 to bring the Public Defender's salaries in line with the Solicitor's Office.

Mr. Livingston inquired where the \$500,000 is coming from.

Mr. Hayes stated we have \$141,000 left from the General Fund to still stay within the 25% target.

Mr. Manning inquired, for clarification, when we are saying 25%, was that the 25% we came up with when we were doing Biennium I, or is that the policy.

Mr. Hayes stated Council targeted to stay within that 25% for FY19. The policy is to stay within 20 – 35%.

Mr. Manning stated, if we dip below the 25%, we would still be 4% above what the actual Council policy is for fund balance.

Mr. Hayes stated, based off our current direction from Council, we are to make sure that we have a 25% target for fund balance for FY19. The fund balance money we are spending is money that we are anticipating.

Mr. Manning stated that is based on Council not changing the fund balance policy. The Council, 2 years ago, established a goal of 25%, which was 5% above the actual Council policy. So, if we are looking, going into Biennium 2, and we feel like we need to make these expenditures, and that drops us from the 25%, we are still 4% above the Council policy.

Mr. Hayes stated there is no target that has been set for Biennium II, but there is a target set for FY19. The fund balance numbers we are giving you, which came from Ms. Hamm, has to do with projecting out through June 30, 2019. So, the \$5M we put out there is still to keep us within the target. Council can certainly change that.

Mr. Manning stated the Council's policy is based on the Federal Government Finance Officer Association's recommendation. If we took care of the Public Defender's situation, we would still be 4% above the Council's policy.

Ms. Myers stated this is significantly more than a parade or festival that we fund. This has to do with whether or not we take a person off the street and deprive them of their liberty, and making sure that the people who defend those people, who cannot get their own lawyer, have adequate counsel to defend them. She knows that some of her colleagues have been working on this long before she got here. She would suggest this is one of the more important motion we have taken up.

Mr. Jackson inquired if we are going to have an opportunity, in a couple of months, to find out there is some additional revenue that can be added back into the Fund Balance.

Mr. Hayes stated, when you close the books, perhaps, the numbers will come up a little bit higher. Though, this more of a question for Ms. Hamm.

Mr. Jackson stated, it seems, that we are trending that way. We are debating an issue that 6 – 8 weeks from now may be a moot issue.

Ms. Newton stated she fully supports the motion, but she wants to make sure she has looked at the avenues, so that she understands how we are going to pay for the thing that we absolutely must do. Whether we need to decrease the target, officially, or direct staff to find other funds, she wants to make sure we have that mechanism.

Ms. McBride stated this is one of the most important decisions we are going to make tonight. This not only impacts the persons that have been accused of committing a crime, but it impacts the economy of Richland County, and the lives of families. We need to continue to improve the salaries for Public Defenders, as well as, the number of Public Defenders we have.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to allow the General Fund policy, as established by this Council, to be kept between 20 – 35%, and is applied for Biennium II.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, this will also impact the target for FY19.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we can vote on this particular motion, or does it need to go to a Council meeting.

Mr. Smith stated, if, the fund balance policy impacts what you are currently voting on then it would be germane to the question.

Mr. Hayes stated this motion may potentially impact the County's bond rating.

Dr. Yudice stated they look at if a jurisdiction is dipping into its fund balance because there is not enough revenue to fund operations. That is taken into account when they do the bond ratings.

Ms. Myers stated she asked 2 hours ago, this very question, for this reason, because she knew the numbers were not exact. This is not a precise science. The reason she was asking those questions was because you had given us this prediction, and she knew, based on the math that you gave us 3 weeks ago, that it seemed slightly off by approximately \$1.2 million. She knows 6 weeks from now, we are going to come back and there are going to be differences.

Mr. Hayes stated those numbers were provided by Ms. Hamm, and were the numbers she was comfortable with.

Ms. Myers stated, if, we come back and find that we have taken ourselves 5 points below fund balance, and we need to adjust, we are free to adjust before the implementation of the new budget year. We can make whatever adjustments are necessary to be sure the County remains healthy and strong. She also knows depressing those salaries, and locking people up unfairly because they are not adequately represented, there is a certain unfairness to that.

Mr. Manning stated he wanted to echo what Vice Chairwoman Myers and Councilman Jackson said. Mr. Jackson may have looked before he got on Council, but the trend has been that we do our budget conservatively enough, even when we were in a repressed economy, that when we close the books we add a significant amount to the fund balance. Again, we are not changing the policy on the fund balance. The policy on the fund balance is 20 – 35%. We just made up the target of 25% for Biennium I. He does not think we need to have a motion about changing the 25% in a budget that will be ending in a couple weeks.

Mr. Hayes stated the previous Administrator had a target of 26%, and Council voted to reduce it to 25%; therefore, they could not change the amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if that was the percentage voted on by Council, for the last 2 years, then we would have to start with a new vote for the next 2 budget years.

Mr. Hayes stated it is germane to this discussion because your fund balance dollars are what is left from FY19. The \$5M was what you had available to stay within the 25% target. Spending more than the \$5M, could potentially, based off numbers now, would drop that number below 25%. Staff cannot do that. They need a motion from Council to do so.

Mr. Manning stated he does not think Council has to make a motion that we might not hit a target that we voted on. If, we do not hit that target; we did not hit the target.

Mr. Livingston stated Council has a policy. The policy clearly says from 20 – 35 %. So, as long as Council is within that range of that policy, then it is fair. It can choose, at any point, to vote a certain number, for a given budget. That does not mean because we vote for 25% we are changing the policy. We are voting for that particular time.

Mr. Hayes stated staff was under the direction to stay within the 25% because that was the target.

Mr. Smith stated if you are talking about the policy that you established for staying within the 20 – 35% range, then this does not change that.

Ms. Myers withdrew her motion.

Mr. Manning moved to allocate \$106,844 for a paralegal and an Investigator II in the Solicitor's Office. The motion died for lack of a second.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

## DEBT SERVICE

- 71. General Debt Service (FY20 - \$14,408,304)** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve Items #71-80.

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

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 72. Fire Bonds 2018B - \$1,500,000 (FY20 - \$585,846)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 73. Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S (FY20 - \$1,486,600)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 74. Broad River Sewer 2011A (FY20 - \$2,138,113)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 75. East Richland Public Svc Dist (FY20 - \$1,438,560)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 76. Recreation Commission Debt Svc (FY20 - \$3,235,525)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 77. Riverbanks Zoo Debt Service (FY20 - \$2,640,381)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 78. School District 1 Debt Service (FY20 - \$61,026,893)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 79. School District 2 Debt Service (FY20 - \$59,777,979)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.
- 80. Transportation (FY20 - \$180,250,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous item.

## ENTERPRISE FUNDS

- 81. Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Allocate funding to approve Solid Waste Budget; FY20 - \$35,057,991)** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve Items #81 – 82.

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

Present but Not Voting: Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

- 83. Hamilton-Owens Airport (Allocate funding to approve Airport Budget; FY20 - \$613,896)** – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to allocate \$613,896 for the Airport Budget.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Livingston

Opposed: Dickerson

Abstain: McBride

Present but Not Voting: Jackson and Manning

The vote was in favor.

#### **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)**

**84. Administration & Health Chiller Replacement (3), Cooling Tower Replacements, & Rooftop ERV Replacements** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve Items #84 – 110.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, she thought we were going to approve the Capital Improvement Plan, and we would revisit the items, at a later time.

Mr. Hayes stated that is correct.

Ms. Myers stated there should be a dollar amount, and not projects.

Mr. Hayes stated they were under the impression Council would determine a dollar amount.

Ms. Myers stated Council was going to act on staff's recommendation. They were expecting a CIP dollar amount, but not specific projects.

Mr. Hayes stated, historically, CIP is not a part of the budget ordinance, so you could pass a dollar amount at any time. CIP is funded by debt service, and we bring the debt amount for Council to vote on separately. The total dollar amount of projects is \$18.5M.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it was his understanding, the Conservation Commission had presented a Capital Improvement Program, and it is not listed here.

Mr. Hayes stated several departments did. Administration decided, because there were so many projects from different departments, to focus on those projects that were building maintenance related. At a separate time, we will bring a list of those priority projects.

The Non-Utility CIP Projects will be brought back at a work session, with a recommendation of priority projects.

Ms. Myers suggested the projects be put in broad categories.

Mr. Jackson stated his concern is that the organizations/agencies, who were making the request, did not feel like they were given the opportunity to determine, but that we determined for them, what their priority would be.

Mr. Hayes stated, because the CIP process was brand new this year, they had a committee to vet the project, but the last step, to get with the subject matter experts, was not taken.

**85. Probation, Pardon & Parole Roof Replacement** – See item above.

**86. Coroner's Office Emergency Generator** – See item above.

**87. Administration & Health Complex Roof Replacement** – See item above.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

- 88. DSS Warehouse Upfit & Roof Replacement** – See item above.
- 89. Detention Center Cooling Tower Replacements** – See item above.
- 90. Township Auditorium LED Lighting Upgrade** – See item above.
- 91. Township Auditorium Boiler Replacement** – See item above.
- 92. Sheriff's Headquarters IT Server Room HVAC Replacement** – See item above.
- 93. Sheriff's Headquarters IT Room Flooring Replacement** – See item above.
- 94. Judicial Center Rooftop HVAC Unit Replacement** – See item above.
- 95. DSS Parking Lot Resurfacing** – See item above.
- 96. Laurens St. Garage Rejuvenation Project –Phase 5** – See item above.
- 97. Central Services Upgrade Printing Process to Digital** – See item above.
- 98. Administration Building Electrical/Generator Upgrade** – See item above.
- 99. EMS Headquarters Chiller Replacement** – See item above.
- 100. Public Works Complex Multiple Roof Replacements** – See item above.
- 101. Sheriff's Headquarters Emergency Generator Replacement** – See item above.
- 102. Sheriff's Headquarters Electrical/Switchgear Replacement** – See item above.
- 103. Pineview Public Safety HVAC Replacements** – See item above.
- 104. New Magistrate Facilities** – See item above.
- 105. RCSD Vehicles** – See item above.
- 106. In-Car Cameras** – See item above.
- 107. Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs)** – See item above.
- 108. Body- Worn Cameras** – See item above.
- 109. CAMA System** – See item above.
- 110. Dickerson: would like to make a motion consider funding for lights to be included in BRRC plan**
- 111. Dickerson: Motion to study the Dutch Fork Magistrate office located on Beatty Road to be included in the Revivification of the county. It is not ADA compliance. Move that County Council would highly consider the blighted Ole Antique Mall for the Dutch Fork Magistrates to be shared with the Sherriff Department (TBD)** – See item above.



**112. Broad River Wastewater Treatment Plant (BRWWTP) (FY20 - \$4,315,000)** – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve Items #112 – 115.

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

Abstain: Jackson

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy

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

**113. Broad River Sewer Collection System (FY20 - \$4,805,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

**114. Lower Richland Sewer Collection System and Treatment Plant (FY20 - \$790,000)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

**115. South Region Sewer Expansion (FY20 - \$16,409,500)** – This item was taken up in the previous motion.

**116. South Region Water Expansion (FY21 - \$9,450,000)** – No action taken.

**117. Northwest Region Sewer Expansion** – No action taken.

**118. Northwest Region Water Expansion** – No action taken.

**119. North Region Sewer Expansion** – No action taken.

**120. North Region Water Expansion** – No action taken.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the budget ordinance.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Manning and Walker

The vote was in favor.

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

Opposed: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

In Favor: Malinowski, Kennedy and Walker

Present but Not Voting: Terracio

Abstain: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

4. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:25 PM.

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

**33**

**Special Called Meeting**

**June 10, 2019**

**34**