



Richland County Council
Regular Session
March 16, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Michelle Onley, Ashiya Myers, Elizabeth McLean, Jani Hussain, Michael Byrd, Michael Niermeier, Randy Pruitt, Clayton Voignier, Jennifer Wladischkin, Mike King, Lori Thomas, Ronaldo Myers, Jeff Ruble, Stacey Hamm, John Thompson, Laruen Hogan, James Hayes, Tamar Black, Leonardo Brown, Dale Welch, Dante Roberts, Geo Price, Bill Davis, Dwight Hanna, Judy Carter, Sandra Haynes and Beverly Harris

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:02 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The Invocation was led by the Honorable Cheryl English.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Cheryl English.
4. **PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATION** – Ms. Onley read into the record the proclamation recognizing March 2021 as Bleeding Disorders Awareness Month.
5. **PRESENTATION**
 - a. **Town of Irmo Update** – Irmo Mayor Berry Walker introduced himself to the newly elected Councilmembers.
 - b. **Columbia Veteran’s Center** – Mr. Robert Case presented an overview of the Vet Center Program.
6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **Regular Session: March 2, 2021** – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.
7. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the agenda as published.

Regular Session
March, 16, 2021

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS**

- a. Coggins v. Richland County and Seals (Gerald Seals Settlement) (Discussion of attorney-client privileged matters/Receipt of legal advice/settlement of claims; all pursuant to Sec. 30-4-70 (a)(2))
- b. Hamilton-Owens Stormwater Utility Fee Receipt of Legal Advice; pursuant to Sec. 30-4-70(a)(2) of the SC Code of Laws
- c. 911 Call Center Proposal
- d. Clerk to Council Candidates Review/Recommendation

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to go into Executive Session.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Terracio, J. Walker, and Newton

The vote was in favor.

***Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:26 PM
and came out at approximately 7:12 PM***

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to recess from Executive Session and direct Legal to create a document regarding the Coggins vs. Richland County and Seals (Gerald Seals Settlement) matter, which will be taken up during the second Executive Session item.

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

Opposed: J. Walker, and Newton

The vote was in favor.

9. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

- a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public – Mr. Aaron Smith submitted comments thanking Council for proclaiming March as “Bleeding Disorders Awareness Month”.

10. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

- a. Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda (Items for which a public hearing is required or a public hearing has been scheduled cannot be addressed at time.) - No comments were submitted.

**Regular Session
March, 16, 2021**

11. REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

- a. Coronavirus Update – Mr. Brown noted the information he routinely presents can be found on the DHEC website. Over the last 14-day period, the percent positive has gone to 3.9% in Richland County. Previously, we talked about the 5% positive number being an ideal number as an indicator of a sustainable number, as it relates to community spread of COVID-19. The incident's tier dropped from high to moderate for the current reporting period, which indicates Richland County is experiencing a reduced level of positive cases. He noted we still continue to have mask giveaways and testing events throughout Richland County. On March 15, we started accepting appointments for in-person services. Listed in the agenda are the departments that are accepting appointments (i.e. Assessor, Auditor, Business Service Center, Neighborhood Improvement Permitting, Register of Deeds, Treasurer and Zoning). Over the weekend, the links were posted on the website. Without any public notice, there have been hundreds of individuals that booked appointments. There have not been any incidents with people participating in the process. Also included in the agenda is a projected timeline for allowing public access.

On March 2, the Governor's Office released information stating on March 8th Phase 1B persons would be eligible to receive the vaccine. After that he met with the department heads which report to him and requested they begin making plans for all staff to return to work by mid-April. His rationale was that based on the Governor's Office release, the projected roll out for Phase 1C is April 12th. Phase 1B includes many of the County employees and Phase 1C should catch the remainder. The projected timeline for Phase 2, which is the general public (16 and above) is May 3rd. Based on that information, he projects by July 1st, we would be able to allow public access without appointments.

If a person schedules an appointment for the vaccine within two weeks of becoming eligible, eligible persons must wait 21 - 28 days after their 1st shot before they are eligible to receive their 2nd, you are looking at a 45-day timeframe from the date of eligibility to full vaccination.

Ms. Barron inquired how the public, specifically those that do not use social media or digital technology, will know they can come into the building, by appointment. She noted in a separate meeting they discussed a dedicated phone line for those that do not have access to the internet.

Mr. Brown responded they plan on reaching out to the news outlets, radio shows, and advertisements in public outlets. He noted the public would not have to electronically book an appointments. If they call a department that is accepting appointments, the department can schedule the appointment.

Ms. Newton inquired, on the website, where one would go to make an appointment, as it is not readily available on the homepage. She also inquired about the broader reopening plan for the County. She requested to have the plan provided to Council.

Mr. Brown responded the scheduling component is not prominently placed on the County's website because they did not want to make the assumption County Council wanted to continue down that path. The information was listed on the individual department's homepage. The information will be placed on the County's homepage now that Council has been briefed.

Ms. Newton inquired if masks and social distancing is required with these in-person appointments. She also inquired if appointment blocks are adequately timed to ensure people come and leave in a safe manner.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. He noted we will have certain protective measures in place when the building is opened up to the public in July.

Ms. Newton inquired what accommodations are being made for staff.

Mr. Brown responded the reason he shared his expectations with staff was to prepare for any issues. Some employees have not been in County facilities since early on in the pandemic. As a result, they may come into an office area and realize there still needs to be some changes made.

Mr. Brown presented Council with an award from the Senior Resources for the County support for seniors during the pandemic.

12. **REPORT OF THE INTERIM CLERK OF COUNCIL** – No reports was given.

13. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** –No report was given.

14 **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of an assignment by Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc. ("TPF") of a 2017 fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF to Tyson Case Ready, LLC (formerly known as Project Charlie); the execution and delivery of an assignment by TPF to Tyson Case Ready, LLC of a 1996 fee-in-lieu of taxes agreement in the form of a lease agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; the execution and delivery of an amendment to the 2017 fee- in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; and other related matters – No comments was received.
- b. Authorizing the First Amendment to the Master Agreement governing the Forest Acres Business Park between Richland County and Fairfield County; authorizing the First Amendment to Intergovernmental Agreement between Richland County and the City of Forest Acres; and other related matters – No comment was received.

15. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 20-031MA, Jim Chapman, M-1 to RM-MD (39.47 Acres), Rivkin Blvd., TMS # R22807-01-07 [THIRD READING]
- b. 20-033MA ,Yani G. Mouratev, RR to HI (69.93 Acres), 115 Tims Road, TMS # 06600-02-12 [THIRD READING]
- c. 20-039MA, Will Unthank, NC to GC (.86 Acres), 9366 and 9370 Two Notch Road, TMS # R19908-03-23 & 07 [THIRD READING]
- d. 20-043MA, Jeff Baker, NC to GC (.8 Acres), 1630 and 1636 Leesburg Road, TMS # R19203-11-05 & 06 [THIRD READING]
- e. 20-044MA, Alexis Kisteneff, Jr., RS-HD to RM-HD (.20 Acres), 3921 Capers Avenue, TMS # R13805-03-19 [THIRD READING]
- f. 21-003MA, Walter L. McLaughlin, Jr. RU to GC (.33 Acres) 10400 Broad River Road TMS # R03300-06-08 [THIRD READING]

**Regular Session
March, 16, 2021**

- g. An Ordinance Authorizing an easement to Washington & Assembly, LLC for a perpetual right to receive light and air over and across land owned by Richland County; specifically the Main Library Branch of the Richland Library, located on the southwestern side of the intersection of Hampton Street (S-40-135) with Assembly Street (S-48), in the City of Columbia [SECOND READING]

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the Consent Items.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

- a. 20-042MA, Gita Teppara, RS-MD to RM-MD (6.2 Acres), Sloan Road and Dorichlee Road, TMS # R20101-05-01 [THIRD READING] – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to defer this item until the April 6th Council meeting.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of an assignment by Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc. ("TPF") of a 2017 fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF to Project Charlie; the execution and delivery of an assignment by TPF to Project Charlie of a 1996 fee-in-lieu of taxes agreement in the form of a lease agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; the execution and delivery of an amendment to the 2017 fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; and other related matters. – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

Ms. Terracio inquired if there could be a public update and additional information on this project now that the name has been released.

Mr. Ruble responded, in June 2020, Tyson announced they were closing their facility and laid off approximately 170 people. Since then, Tyson has found a business that cuts, packages and delivers meat to grocery stores. It is a different line of business that is going to create a need for 330 jobs. They are in the process of re-hiring the people that were laid off. The facility had to be improved, and some of the special source revenue credits are associated with that.

Ms. Terracio inquired about the wages.

Mr. Ruble responded the average wage is \$18.62/hr., which equates to \$37,000 a year.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. J. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to reconsider this item.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- c. Authorizing the First Amendment to the Master Agreement governing the Forest Acres Business Park between Richland County and Fairfield County; authorizing the First Amendment to Intergovernmental Agreement between Richland County and the City of Forest Acres; and other related matters – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to a company identified for the time being as Project Catawba; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Ms. McBride stated this proposes a commercial development in the Olympia neighborhood. The project represents a total of \$72M to build a 279-unit market rate apartment complex. The committee’s recommendation is for approval.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this was the item that updated documentation was to be provided.

Mr. Ruble responded in the affirmative. There was a discrepancy between the original application and the legal documents. The company’s attorney updated the information, and the information should have been forwarded to Council.

Mr. Malinowski noted he did not receive the updated information and requested a redlined-version before the next Council meeting.

Mr. Ruble responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Mackey stated, for the record, she was recusing herself from this vote to due to the fact that her parent company is involved with the proposed project.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Abstain: Mackey

The vote was in favor.

- b. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Project Curb; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Ms. McBride stated this is an existing manufacturer located in Blythewood who is considering a \$21M investment that would

create 165 new jobs. The committee recommends approval.

Mr. Malinowski requested additional information before the next Council meeting.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

18. **REPORT OF THE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION AND OVERSIGHT AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Clerk to Council Candidates Review/Recommendation – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- b. County Attorney Search Update – Ms. Newton stated the committee recommended retaining the Randi Frank Consulting LLC to assist with recruiting for the County Attorney position. Randi Frank has prior experience recruiting attorneys for other municipalities. There are some administrative procedures that need to happen, in terms of identifying budget line items and creating POs. Once that happens, Procurement will be in the position where they can speak with the search firm and obtain additional information on their recruitment process.

19. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Approving the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for the Blythewood Business Park; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston inquired if this item came out of the Economic & Development Committee.

Mr. Ruble responded the Economic Development Committee recommended approval of this item.

Ms. Barron inquired if there was any interest from industries or companies as they develop this land.

Mr. Ruble responded they are still in the process of developing the site. Deed covenant restrictions do limit some of the companies we can attract. We have negotiated with the Town of Blythewood and the citizens to come up with a vision of the park. The vision required a higher level of ascetics, essentially a technology park.

Ms. Barron inquired if this is merely a formality, where it is a “if you build it, they will come” scenario.

Mr. Ruble responded the deed covenant restriction are similar to HOA policies. They protect the tenants, but they also protect the County.

Ms. Newton inquired if they wanted to make any changes to the document it would have to come back before Council in this same manner that it is currently before them.

Mr. Ruble responded in the affirmative.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. CDBG-DR Planning and Implementation Services Task Order #7 Change Order #12 – Mr. Voignier noted last year Council approved the reallocation of \$1,050,000 from the Business Assistance Program to the Single Family Homeowner Repair Program under the County’s Community Development Block Grant-Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) grant. These funds would enable the repair program to serve additional homeowners who experienced storm-related damage to their homes from the 2015 flood, and who are on the program’s waiting list. At that time, staff identified that a change order for planning and implementation services would be necessary to facilitate the completion of the additional homes. Staff is now recommending approval of this change order to extend the period of performance for Tetra Tech from March 16, 2021 to September 30, 2021, at an additional not to exceed amount of \$945,621, to facilitate the completion of between 7-18 homes and finish out the repair program under the Disaster Recovery Plan.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve this item.

Ms. Terracio inquired why the number of additional homes is 7-18. It also seems to be quite a large amount to only pay the consultants.

Mr. Voignier responded the reason for the range in the number of homes is because they anticipate additional potential weather conditions over the next 6-months, as well as some impacts from COVID-19, which we continue to experience. They are committed to completing at least 7 homes. The reason for the extent of the change order is because Tetra Tech staff will be doubling their efforts to get as many homes done as possible. We believe we can complete up to 18 homes in 6 months. The other reason for the discrepancy, in the range of homes, is that we are still evaluating some of the homeowners on the waiting list, so we do not know if some of those homes will be rehabilitations or rebuilds. Rebuilding a home takes considerably more time and resources, as compared to rehabs. The change order is covering what they believe is the maximum amount, but he does not anticipate they will spend all of the funds because Tetra Tech has rolled savings in the past. The change order will also include HUD monitoring preparation.

Ms. Terracio inquired, if they do the 18 homes, it would cost approximately \$52,500 per home, which does not include the cost of the homes, but simply paying Tetra Tech.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative. This is simply project delivery costs.

Ms. Terracio inquired if County staff will be working on this, but solely Tetra Tech work.

Mr. Voignier responded it is solely Tetra Tech.

Ms. Terracio noted her reservations and moved to defer this item. Mr. Malinowski seconded the motion.

Ms. Terracio inquired if anyone was going to lose their home if Council does not vote on this item.

Mr. Voignier responded, currently they have three homes they have opened, which no work is being conducted. Those individuals are in temporary relocation status, and the County is paying for their housing and/or storage.

Ms. Terracio inquired if Council votes on this change order tonight could these families be in their

rehabilitated homes before April 6th, when Council meets again.

Mr. Voignier responded it is possible. It will depend on how quickly the work can occur.

Ms. Terracio inquired how long work has been stopped.

Mr. Voignier responded the current change order expired March 12, 2021.

Ms. Terracio withdrew her motion for deferral.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the change order is more or less equivalent t of a “not to exceed”. It is not saying we are going to spend this amount, but setting a threshold.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired if it was correct to assume, historically, Tetra Tech has also “rolled over” savings, so the amount billed to the County was less than what we anticipated.

Mr. Voignier responded it would have been had they discontinued the program. They continued the program, so there were several months they were able to realize savings by carrying over funds from a previous change order. He noted they have received their CDBG mitigation funding, which has projects in it to address home repairs and rebuilds, as well. They are anticipating submitting RFPs over the next 30-45 days to bring in contractors for that work. If they were able to get the RFPs and people in place, they could potentially cancel the change order by July.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, pending additional funding, we would not hit the maximum threshold because we would redo a change order to incorporate a different program.

Ms. Voignier responded it would not be a change order, but a new contract.

Ms. Newton inquired if there would also be assistance for the County with the HUD reviews.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative. Tetra Tech would be providing services for the HUD monitoring.

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, and Terracio

Opposed: Livingston, J. Walker, Barron, Mackey, English, and ,Newton

Present but Not Voting: O. Walker

The motion for deferral failed.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

Ms. McBride requested clarification on what service delivery means.

Mr. Voignier responded all the project delivery activities are include on pp. 157 – 158 of the agenda.

Ms. McBride inquired as to why we are giving Tetra Tech the funds.

Mr. Voignier responded Tetra Tech conducts Tier I and II environmental reviews, lead-based paint testing, clearance tests, case management services, determine eligibility for relocation assistance, and inspect the performance of the contractors.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, Tetra Tech conducts technical assistance, and not any of the actual building.

Mr. Viognier responded they pay other contractors to do the construction on the homes.

Ms. McBride noted she wanted to clarify this money is not for actual construction. She assumes Tetra Tech has staff working on different projects for the County.

Mr. Voignier responded HUD considers this work to be project delivery work because these services can be billed to a property. They are not considered administrative or planning-related funds.

Mr. Malinowski inquired what QA and QC meant.

Mr. Voignier responded it stands for Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

Ms. Terracio inquire if anyone on staff has ever provided these kind of services, or does the County have the ability to do this themselves.

Mr. Voignier responded the County does not have the expertise to do this type of work. We have inspectors that inspect code, but they are not doing construction inspection. Tetra Tech's inspectors are going to make sure they have performed these duties in accordance to the scope of work. The County's inspectors do not cover that type of activity.

Ms. Terracio stated we are essentially paying up to \$50,000 per house for construction and inspection.

Mr. Voignier responded that is one of the services, but there are several more listed in the agenda.

Mr. Newton stated, for clarification, when Richland County was trying to manage the program exclusively, it resulted in us having to put the program on hold, and put the funding at risk, in terms of our ability to deliver homes.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative. There were several issues that occurred because the County was trying to administer the program directly.

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

Opposed: Pugh, Terracio

Present but Not Voting: English

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Terracio, and Barron

Opposed: Malinowski, Livingston, J. Walker, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- c. 911 Call Center Proposal – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- d. Emergency Rental Assistance Program – Mr. Brown noted in the packet is the culmination of items related to the Emergency Rental Assistance Program. Staff is asking for three things: (1) Approve the policy and procedures associated with the program; (2) Approve the use of the Contractor associated with this program; and (3) Move forward with this program in the beginning in April. Staff is requesting Council to approve this program with the changes addressed by Council members (i.e. publicizing the program on more than a digital platform; and to provide face-to-face assistance for individuals to sign-up).

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

Ms. McBride inquired about the checks and balances for the appeals process.

Mr. Brown responded they can work on having different people involved in the appeals process and the submission process.

Ms. Barron inquired about the publicity and media plan, and how the information will be disseminated.

Ms. Harris noted they are looking at a multi-prong approach. We know we cannot rely on posting information on social media platforms and the website. One of the key components of getting information out is community partnerships by working with organizations that deal directly with renters in the community. We have already heard from some of these organizations. They are waiting for the information to go out so they can start working with the people they assist on a daily basis.

Ms. Barron stated we have to do our due diligence to ensure that everyone is included and no one is excluded for something as sensitive as this, and noting that people's housing is in the balance if we do not do our part. She inquired if we are on point with the target date and what does implementation look like.

Mr. King responded the target date is April 5th and are on target. If they are approved to move forward with this program, there are several steps that will take place, including putting together a final work plan. The plan has to be flexible. Today, they received additional guidance from the US Treasury Department, who is facilitating the program. They want to make sure they are in compliance with all the Treasury requirements and directions as they come out. There is a lot of time pressure on this program. If they get 65% of these funds expended by September 30th they have an opportunity to get additional funds. Also, looking forward to the American Rescue Plan, there is an opportunity for additional funds for Emergency Rental Assistance. They are going to finalize the work plan, assess the current needs, ensure the standard operating procedures are in place, and utilize the application tools. They want to ensure they track applicants, so no one gets lost or falls through the cracks. They will be getting the call center up and running, with phone lines and internet links, so we are ready to go live on April 5th.

Ms. Barron inquired how often Mr. King will monitor this program and report back to Council.

Mr. King responded he will be monitoring this program daily, and comply with any reporting requirements. He noted after implementation they expect to be very busy and may need a couple weeks to be prepared to report back to Council.

Ms. Newton inquired about who comprises the oversight committee.

Mr. King responded there are two committees: the Special Case Panel Committee and the oversight committee. The Special Case Panel Committee consists of the Planning and Community Development Director, Community and Government Relations Director and himself. The oversight committee will consist of a member of Administration, Planning and Community Development Director and himself.

Ms. McBride inquired if they are advertising the program, prior to the implementation date.

Mr. King responded they have not done so yet because Council had not given their approval.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

20. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to go into Executive Session.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, J. Walker, and Newton.

The vote was in favor.

***Council went into Executive Session at approximately 8:39 PM
and came out at approximately 10:50 PM***

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. J. Walker, to come out of Executive Session.

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

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The motion in favor was unanimous.

Coggins v. Richland County and Seals (Gerald Seals Settlement) (Discussion of attorney-client privileged

matters/Receipt of legal advice/settlement of claims; all pursuant to Sec. 30-4-70 (a)(2)) – Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to adopt the language drafted by Legal, as follows: After review of Judge Newman’s Order in the Coggins’ case, Richland County has determined it much come into compliance with the Freedom of Information Act laws, as noted in the Court’s Order. Thus, I move to authorize the settlement of any and all claims between Mr. Seals and Richland County, as memorialized in the original agreement executed by the parties on May 14, 2018. Additionally, the County regrets FOIA errors that occurred in the original vote and settlement agreement and wishes Mr. Seals well in his future endeavors.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, J. Walker, and Newton.

The vote was in favor.

Ms. English moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, J. Walker, and Newton

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, and English.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

Hamilton-Owens Stormwater Utility Fee Receipt of Legal Advice; pursuant to Sec. 30-4-70(a)(2) of the SC Code of Laws) [ACTION – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. English, to direct the Legal Department and Administrative staff to explore options related to the leases associated with Owens Field, and any other related properties as appropriate to this matter.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Clerk to Council Candidates Review/Recommendation – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to authorize Find Great People and Richland County’s Human Resources Office to negotiate with candidates B, A, C, and D, as discussed in Executive Session.

Ms. McBride made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. English, to authorize Find Great People and Richland County’s Human Resources Office to negotiate with candidates A, B, C and D as discussed in Executive Session.

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

Opposed: J. Walker, Barron, Mackey and Newton.

The vote was in favovr.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: J. Walker, Barron, Mackey, and Newton.

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, O. Walker, and English

The motion for reconsideration failed.

911 Call Center Proposal – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to authorize the Administrator and the Sheriff's Department to move forward with bringing back a proposal, no later than the April 16th Council meeting, in reference to the 911 Call Center.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, and English

Present but Not Voting: McBride and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

21. **MOTIONS PERIOD** – There were no motions.

22. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:04PM