



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
June 14, 2018 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Brandon Madden, Sandra Yudice, Kim Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Tim Nielsen, Stacey Hamm, Nancy Stone-Collum, Quinton Epps, Portia Easter, Wendy Davis, Ashley Powell, James Hayes, Jamelle Ellis, Dwight Hanna, Jeff Ruble, O’Jetta Bryant, Tyler Kirk, Steven Gaither, Wanda Kelly, and Tracy Hegler

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

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

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

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **SECOND READING**

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Requested \$14,601,333 – Mill Cap)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund the Richland County Recreation Commission at the millage cap.

Mr. N. Jackson stated while he is glad they have a new Director to handle business at the agency; however, he still has some concerns, whatever they asked for and get, the summer programs will be addressed. In the past, there was a shortage of funds for kids for the summer. They had to raise the fee and there were some concerns that a lot of people could not afford these summer programs. He is hoping the budget they presented to us, they will have the money, so they will not have to raise the fee for these kids.

Mr. Hayes stated they requested the cap in the amount of \$14.6 Million, as approved by the County Auditor.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that by 3rd Reading he would like to hear from them regarding the fees for the kids, and they will not have to raise the price.

Ms. McBride stated she would like to echo what Mr. N. Jackson said. Also, there are community organizations that have been using recreational facilities, and some were actually built for those community agencies. With everything going on, in terms of high costs, they cannot afford to pay additional costs. As taxpayers they are already paying for the Recreation Commission. She wants to know if those community/neighborhood associations will be able to use the facilities, designated for them, at no costs. In addition, that the appropriate staff be provided to staff the facilities.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. ***Columbia Area Mental Health (Requested \$2,032,210)*** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to fund the Columbia Area Mental Health at the cap.

Ms. Myers inquired if the \$2,032,210 is the cap.

Mr. Hayes stated they requested less than the cap. The cap is \$2,153,501. He stated you are voting on the requested amount.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Manning's motion was for the cap. The number that is recited on the millage agencies is not the cap.

Mr. Manning stated his motion is for the Columbia Area Mental Center to be funded at the cap.

Ms. McBride inquired if it was possible they did not know the actual amount for the cap.

Mr. Hayes stated he told them what the cap figure was. Maybe their budget request came in under the cap, but he did relay to them what the cap amount was.

Ms. McBride stated she realizes there are many, many mental health needs in Richland County.

Ms. Myers inquired if there was anyone in attendance from the Mental Health agency because she would like to understand. She stated she is in favor of mental health care, but they know their budget.

Mr. Livingston inquired if they got the cap number from staff prior to submitting their budget.

Mr. Hayes stated he believes it was provided to them before they submitted their budget.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, putting on a former hat of a millage agency that received funding from Council, this is really not that unusual. We made provisions to use those funds in the most prudent manner possible. Even though we asked for less than what we were given, on more than one occasion, we graciously accepted those dollars and used them in a very prudent manner.

Mr. Malinowski stated, based on what Mr. Hayes said regarding obtaining the information, making them aware of the cap versus their requested amount, he thinks we should honor what they are asking for.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion to fund them at their request, seconded by Mr. Rose.

Mr. Manning stated he might not have heard that exactly right. He thought originally the answer was yes they had it, but then he thought the answer kind of moved into well I'm not sure they had it. He requested clarification on which is the answer. Since this motion is based on, what he thought was a different answer than the final answer.

Mr. Hayes stated because they were one of the later ones that submitted a budget. And, obviously we have multiple millage agencies, he really cannot remember, in terms of when the email went out. The only thing he can say conclusively is the document they sent, in terms of their requested amount, was \$2,032,210. That is what they requested.

Ms. McBride inquired if they can provide us additional information prior to 3rd Reading.

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

Opposed: C. Jackson and Manning

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

3. Public Library (Requested \$28,275,839 – Above Mill Cap)

- a. Move that Richland Library, in addition to being funded at the allowable cap adjustment for CPI and Population Growth, receive the requested \$940,000 for Lower Richland and Edgewood Branch start-up funding.**
- b. Reduce amount to Lower Richland while library is in temporary location at \$100,000 or 2 head counts until year when permanent library location and construction plans established.**

Mr. Hayes stated the Richland Public Library requested above the cap at \$28,275,839. There are some companion motions sponsored by Mr. Manning and Ms. Myers.

Mr. Livingston inquired if any of the funds from the sale of the property or from the General Fund.

Dr. Yudice stated the additional request pertains to the proceeds of the sale of the property.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it was part of the \$940,000.

Dr. Yudice stated she believes it was \$700,000±.

Ms. Myers stated the response to the question is the \$700,000± and then there is additional funding, which makes up the \$940,000.

Mr. Malinowski stated his recollection from all of the budget requests, and percentages, that this particular agency request was the highest request, percentage wise. He inquired about the dollar amount they are above the cap.

Mr. Hayes stated the cap amount is \$27,55,839.

Ms. McBride stated, the \$940,000 for the Lower Richland and Edgewood branches, she has been working on the Edgewood branch for over 5 years. This is regarding the start-up funding. She inquired if there is a difference in the amount of money that will be designated for Lower Richland versus the Edgewood branch.

Mr. Hayes stated he believed, in the packet they submitted to Council, they outlined how much would be for each of the branches.

Ms. McBride stated she supports both of them, but she knows how long they have worked on the Edgewood branch. She would hope it would not be jeopardized for another project. They is why she was questioning the amount of money, and whether one would affect the other.

Dr. Yudice stated the proceeds from the property was \$909,905.50.

Ms. Huggins stated the money they requested above the cap was \$420,000. That money is for operational costs for Lower Richland only. The \$700,000 they requested from the proceeds of the sale of Sandhills is not in their operational budget request. They have been talking about that as a separate transaction. She stated she was surprised to see a \$940,000 figure here. The operational costs for Edgewood is in our cap budget. They do not need any additional funding for that. They have already hired a manager, and are starting to hire staff. They are on the way to opening that location. It is the capital costs, that is not here, that is separate.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he knows that Ms. McBride has been working for 4 years, but they have been working for the past 10 years on the Lower Richland Library. The distance between the Southeast branch and Eastover branch is 17 miles.

Ms. McBride stated they have probably been working on Edgewood for 20 years. She just said that she has been working on it 5 years.

Ms. Dickerson inquired about the affect when we go to the cap, and where would the funds come from when exceed the cap. She inquired if the Library had their budget knowing what the cap was before they submitted their budget. She also inquired if the \$909,905 was supposed to go to help with the Library.

Mr. Hayes stated, by State law, you cannot exceed the cap, in terms of millage. You can authorize funding that would come from the General Fund. For example, last year you used \$325,000 discretionary general fund dollars.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, that last year we did do funding, for millage agencies, beyond the millage, out of the General Fund.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning stated this is not the first time we have ever done this. As a fact, in his 9 years here it has happened more years than it has not. He stated the motion that he put in, that somehow got put into all this, with some wordsmithing, was not this. It had a figure for both branches that had nothing to do with the sale because he thought they had dealt with that in a different way. He requested Finance assist him with the motion he actually turned in.

Mr. Hayes responded that this is the motion Mr. Manning turned in. If you recall, the \$940,000, you are referring to, it was his understanding Mr. Manning was referring to the sale, because there is only one \$900,000.

Mr. Manning stated he was never referring, because, as he said, from day one, when we were looking at putting that property on sale, he carried on about it being a library building and when we sale a library that the library should get library building money into their budget to do what they

need to do with it. He has been firm, from day one. At some point, and with what the library turned in, he saw 2 figures. One that looked like what he was seeing for us to adequately and properly serve the citizens at Edgewood, who for some time between when Richland County was founded and today, have been wanting a library, and a chunk of money for Lower Richland, who for some time between when Richland County was founded and today, have been wanting a library. He understands that. He is in a district that does not have a library. He understands these people have been trying to get forever, but he is not going to be convinced that he was thinking, in his motion, that was library sale proceeds.

Mr. Hayes stated they put the motion down just as you sent it in the email. If the \$940,000 was not proceeds, what was the funding source?

Mr. Manning stated, like other things in here, it would have been out of the General Fund balance.

Mr. Hayes stated that was not indicated, so he could not put it down.

Ms. Myers stated, in harmony with Mr. Manning, she joined his motion and she thought it was a General Fund motion, as well. She would like to clarify that she is supporting the allocation coming from the General Fund. She stated she added the 2nd companion motion for the Lower Richland branch. She did not want to see us, day 1, funding 6 head count when we are still in build out phase.

Mr. Manning inquired if this budget includes an amount of money to grow the General Fund balance.

Mr. Hayes stated Council approved the General Fund budget for FY198. What you are doing is amending. The amount of money used to balance the budget from the General Fund was not added to it. We did not use anymore fund balance. They opted to keep the same amount that was approved last year.

Mr. Manning stated, last year when the biennium budget was presented to Council, which was going to make a lot less work and chaos this year, we were told that in the budget was to grow the General Fund balance by \$2 million. Last year, the motion was made to only grow the General Fund balance by \$1 million. And, this Council, pretty liberally, spent a \$1 million extra than what was in front of us because we were only growing the General Fund balance by \$1 million, instead of \$2 million. When we approved the budget, there was also an amount, which he believes was \$2 million, that in this 2nd year of the biennial budget, to continue aggressively grow the General Fund balance. He inquired if that was correct.

Mr. Hayes stated the FY19 was already approved at a certain amount. This is a budget amendment. We opted to not increase what was already approved for the FY19 budget, in terms of fund balance. But in terms of amending the budget, no, we did not account for any adjustments to increase the fund balance. We opted not to use any more additional fund balance than was already approved.

Mr. Livingston stated, as he recalls, there was a projected amount for the fund balance for each year. The question is what is that projected amount in this current budget.

Mr. Hayes stated it was projected FY18 General Fund Balance would at 24%, and at the end of FY19 it would be 26%. Currently, at the end of FY17 it exceeded the total and it is 25%. So the number we were trying to reach by the end of FY18, which was 24%, we actually reached at the end of FY17.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, based upon the numbers, what he remembers last year, the results are now higher than what the projection was, which is a positive thing. So, the goal to reach the 26% should be very easy, and assuming it's a biennium budget, we should be on track to exceed that. The answer is we have already grown it, beyond the number, and we anticipate growing it greater.

Mr. Manning inquired if we can get a dollar figure related to that. He, like the Chairwoman, would like to track, but he would love to have the number of how many tens of thousands of dollars that we could still meet our goal of the 26%, in the General Fund balance, and how much additional money that would leave us available while we are working on this budget to help those 2 libraries to come online and seniors on waiting lists for Meals on Wheels. When it looks very clear to him that we are in a very positive financial position to, on June 30, 2019, to have our fund balance very nicely grown and still be spending money to take care of our citizens.

Mr. Hayes stated we can set something up for 3rd Reading. The only caveat he would put out is that the 25% number he gave was the fund balance as of the end of FY17. Keep in mind, we are still in the midst of FY18, so we are still spending money. We can make projections for FY18, but you do not know where you are going to end up at. You do not want to overtax yourself with that.

Mr. Manning stated he agrees with Mr. Hayes. When we were doing this last year, and as Mr. Hayes's said, we have done a lot better than we anticipated, this Council made the decision to only attempt to grow it by 1% instead of 2%. We all have been provided the revenue, in this fiscal year, after 3 quarters. There is absolutely every reason to believe that we are going to meet or exceed, this year, just like we have for the last 4 years. He stated he made the argument last year that every year our fund balance grew without us trying to grow it because we have been bringing in more revenue than what we have been expending in a budget, even when we take all of the millage agencies up to the cap.

Ms. Myers stated with Mr. Hayes projections, which are very conservative, are we on track to be ahead again.

Mr. Hayes stated he did not want to give an answer tonight. This works congruently with Ms. Hamm's office. Her office tracks that part every month, so he would like to sit down with her before 3rd Reading.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded Ms. Myers, to fund the Public Library at the millage cap, and in addition, we provide them with \$840,000, that does not include the proceeds from the sale of the Sandhills branch.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why \$840,000 when the Director indicated \$420,000.

Mr. Manning stated he believes the Director was mentioning for one of the branches. The reason he took down the amount to \$840,000 is the note under the companion motion is about retaining, in our fund balance, the \$100,000 rather than them retaining it in their fund balance.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

4. ***Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Requested \$2,300,241)*** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens at the requested amount.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. ***Midlands Technical College – Operating (Requested \$6,087,264)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to fund Midlands Technical College Operating at the requested amount.

Mr. Manning inquired if that is up to the cap.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

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

Abstain: Livingston

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

6. ***Midlands Technical College – Capital (Requested \$3,177,870)*** – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund Midlands Technical College Capital at the requested amount.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if this amount is less than last year, based upon the payments and reduction in the capital fees that were being paid.

Mr. Hayes stated the amount is different from last year because the carry forward dollars coming out of this year is less than last year.

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

Abstain: Livingston

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

7. ***School District One (Richland District 1 is asking for Council set the Cap millage rate of 263.4, plus look back of 3.4 or 266.8) NOTE: At the rate the district is requesting, the dollar amount is estimated by the District to be \$224,927,684.*** – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund Richland School District One at the cap and what they asked for.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, that Ms. Kennedy said she hoped Council would fund them at the cap and what they asked for. We have 2 different things here.

Mr. Hayes stated Richland One is asking for the cap and some look back millage.

Ms. Kennedy stated she hoped they would be funded at that.

Mr. Malinowski stated on p. 3 of the PowerPoint it shows FY19 at 257.6, yet on the motions list it shows 263.4. If you add the 3.4 look back millage to the 257.6, you are at 261, not 266.8.

Mr. Hayes stated if you add the millage cap of 263.4. Their current millage rate is 257.6. If they got a millage cap increase it would go to 263.4, plus look back millage of 3.4 give you a total of 266.8.

Ms. Myers inquired if we got a response back from the Legal Department as to whether we would do any damage to what we are required to do under law by providing the 2 districts their requests, which is fund the based on millage and not a dollar figure.

Dr. Yudice stated they met with the School Districts this week and Mr. Smith has been in communications with them, along with Mr. Hayes on this matter.

Mr. Manning moved to defer this under Mr. Smith is present to give a legal opinion on this matter.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Myers stated she is happy to move forward, but she is still confused. The Chair's question last week was, "Are we creating a slippery slope and then be in the realm where all of the millage agencies ask us to authorize them or mills, and not a dollar figure." And, does that violate the State statute.

Dr. Yudice stated there are some issues that we discussed in the regard to the ordinances. Mr. Hayes has a path forward that does not require an ordinance for each of the school districts. We are still in discusses with the school districts about that path forward.

Mr. C. Jackson stated that when that ordinance comes back up, at our next Council meeting, he is prepared to make a motion with regard to tabling that until that specific amendment, to what they are asking, comes forward.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 8. *School District Two (Richland District 2 is asking that Council set the millage rate at 331.6) NOTE: At the rate the district is requesting, the dollar amount will stay the same as the cap amount (\$152,286,785).*** –Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Richland School District Two at their requested amount.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

GRANTS

- 9. *Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendations)*** – Mr. Manning stated we asked earlier about the fact that the Accommodations Tax had been down 50%. The answer came back there were 4 or 6 motels that closed down. He inquired if that tracked right. If that dropped our

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

amount coming in by 50% then that sounds to him like we have 9 hotels/motels in the whole County.

Mr. Hayes stated as he reached out to the Department of Revenue, as he mentioned in a companion document, the answer he got was not 4 hotels closing. The young lady said in her email there were 4 accounts that were closed, which were 4 hotels. She did not specifically say those hotels closed. That explained why there was a differential in Accommodations Tax revenue.

Mr. Manning stated thus his question. If we had the solar eclipse. We had more people come into this town than ever in the history, staying in every hotel and motel. And 4 hotels closed their account, which he is guessing means closed down because I do not think a hotel can just say we are closing our account and not going to send you the Accommodations Tax. Then if the proceeds had dropped by 50% in the first quarter, then it seems like what happened to us was half our hotels disappeared, which would mean there is only 4 left. He got Mr. Hayes answer, and that is why he is asking for clarification because it does not make any sense to him that we dropped 50% because 4 hotels did not have an account down at the Department of Revenue. He inquired if that seemed to make sense to Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Hayes said he did not say it made sense to him. What he said was that is the answer she gave and that was all the information she had. We can only go off that. If Council would like for him to do additional research, he has no problem with that.

Mr. Manning stated he absolutely would because when he brought it up, he brought it up because he could not understand how we dropped 50% of our revenue from A-Tax. And, then it looked like the answer was 4 motels closed and that cost you 50% of all your A-Tax. If you agree with me that does not make sense, then whoever can help us try to make some sense.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if that would be because the City has annexed some properties. And, she also knows some other small towns have annexed some properties that would take those hotels and restaurants out of the unincorporated area and put them into the City.

Mr. Hayes stated that is a viable possibility.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he made a motion last year about annexation of properties such as that. He is not sure what happened with that motion, but one of his concerns was if the City decided to start annexing for Hospitality Tax purposes, then the County would not have any funding. And, we would do away with it if the County would not benefit from it. The County is the only one that can approve the Hospitality Tax, not the City. If it is shut down, then they would not benefit either. The motion he did, and went to committee, was to investigate and meet with the City to let them know we will not tolerate them trying to get all the Hospitality Tax dollars.

Mr. Manning inquired if he was recalling correctly, that if a municipality annexes, they do not get the money immediately. Does it not phase in?

Mr. Hayes stated he would have to research that.

Mr. Manning stated the drop off could not even be that immediate with the annexation. So, there is a good bit to be investigated.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve the Accommodations Tax recommendations in the amount of \$630,000.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 10. Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies at FY18 level) NOTE: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, EdVenture and Township** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this is the recommendation from the biennium budget from last time.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding levels are the same levels. He stated Council approved the same amount basic funding levels for FY18 and FY19, with the exception of \$38,000 difference between the 2 years. The funding levels are what was approved for FY18.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 11. Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the Hospitality Tax Committee recommendations.

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

The vote in favor is unanimous.

- 12. Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY18 level) NOTE: Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Visitor's Bureau & Columbia International Festival** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the Special Promotions Agencies at the FY18 funding level.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 13. Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level)** – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve SERCO at the FY18 funding level.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 14. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level)** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Famously Hot New Year's funding level.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Gateway to the Army Association [Council Advocacy Group]) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve the Gateway to the Army Association at \$100,000 level, as we did last year, with the initial approval for the three-year commitment.

Ms. Dickerson inquired about how many years we have left on this funding.

Mr. Hayes stated it is 3 years. He believes FY19 would be the 2nd year.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if that was the one where citizens, even if you were a taxpayer, could not be on the property if you had a felony. He stated that was a discussion and he did not support it last time. Even though you are a taxpayer, if you had a past felony, you could not enter on that property.

Mr. Hayes stated he would have to defer that to Administration.

In Favor: Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and Rose

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

The motion failed.

Ms. Myers inquired if we can get some clarity on that issue because that is pretty critical. We are allocating money, that is generated by taxpayers, for something they cannot all share.

Ms. Dickerson stated she will confirm that what Mr. N. Jackson said. The fact is the property is on Ft. Jackson and there are certain passes you will have to get to get on Ft. Jackson. And, some people will not qualify to go on Ft. Jackson.

Mr. Manning stated some of the other ones we passed pending more information. This one we did not pass. He inquired if that would take a reconsideration vote before we consider it next week, correct?

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor of reconsideration.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the Gateway to the Army Association funding.

Ms. Myers stated we are voting, contingent on getting the requested information, and having some confirmation that all citizens can access, in some way, the property.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- 16. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project)** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project at the FY18 funding level.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what this is and where it is.

Mr. Hayes stated this is something Council approved last year.

Mr. Manning stated he recalled this item and the next item about the Historic Corridor that the work, while we had talked about it at one point, was rolled into the Renaissance Plan. Then the Renaissance Plan got deferred. We had the funding from last year, and we are doing the funding this year. His thought would certainly be that even though it had been in a big program, the fact that the big program is not together, parts and pieces, like this part and piece that we started funding last year, and continuing to fund now, he is of the thought that staff would not be saying well the Renaissance Plan is not moving forward, but parts and pieces like this that we already started funding, and we are funding, are going to be moving forward.

Ms. Dickerson requested staff to clarify this for her. She has to make sure these 2 parts were actually a part of that package.

Dr. Yudice stated she will provide that information prior to 3rd Reading.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 17. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Historical Corridor funding level)** -- Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Historical Corridor funding level.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if this was the item where we said we were going to have provided to us all of the funding sources, so we would know the different pockets of funds that the agencies received.

Mr. Hayes stated the grants matrix should have been placed at each Council member's seat.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 18. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level) NOTE: Amounts to \$164,850 to be allocated to each Councilmember** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

19. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Conservation Commission funding level) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the Conservation Commission funding level.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

20. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Multi-purpose facility funding level) – Ms. Dickerson requested someone to explain this item.

Ms. Myers stated this was a part of the Renaissance Plan. It was for the multi-purpose facility that we were going to locate somewhere in the Southeast Corridor of Richland County. She respectfully requested that it not be thrown out with the Renaissance Plan, and allow staff to continue working on that.

Mr. Manning inquired if the funding will stay in the fund balance, if we approve it now.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding has actually been appropriated. It is not in the fund balance. It has been assigned a budget code and is accessible now. Fund balance are items that have not been budgeted by Council, but this particular item has actually been approved and is budgeted and accessible.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the multi-purpose facility funding level.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Rose

The vote was in favor.

21. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level) – Mr. Hayes stated these funds are currently budgeted. They are not in the fund balance.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, so we did that last year.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning inquired about what happens to the funding when this year ends.

Mr. Hayes stated those funds because they are being decreased in expenditures would roll into the fund balance.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, so what we did last year with this contingency is on July 1 is going to roll into this year. And, this would be approving a replacement of that to sit there for a year. He inquired as to what kind of things we could spend it on.

Mr. Hayes stated it was actually approved for both years of the biennium when Council passed the budget last year. He stated he cannot speak for why the previous Administrator put it in there, but it was for unplanned expenditures that would come up, but Council would have those funds at their discretion to use.

Mr. Manning stated if it was approved in the biennium budget, then it would not be before us tonight. Anything approved last year, for this year, is not before us. He thinks maybe this was recommended for each year, not approved. So, what we approved last year for this \$1 million contingency sat around this whole year, and will go into the hospitality fund balance. If we approve this, we in essence, we would be re-upping having a \$1 million, that would not take a budget amendment. That any Council member, at any point, could say "I move for \$500,000 to go to such and such parade" and if there were 6 votes the funding will go to such and such parade because it would not take 3 readings and a public hearing. We are putting \$1 million, just sitting there available for one vote.

Mr. Hayes stated the funding level was essentially the same. He is putting before you the items in FY18, that you did approve, for recommendation for FY19.

Mr. Manning stated he understands that what Mr. Hayes did, but his question is, is he correct, procedurally, that if we pass this \$1 million contingency tonight, for the entire FY18-19, there will be \$1 million, just sitting there, that with one vote of 6 people \$500,000 could just go somewhere without our usual because by calling it a contingency we are just parking easy money out there for year. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. Hayes stated he would not use that vernacular, in terms of just sitting there. He would say it is budgeted items that would be available for Council approval.

Mr. Livingston stated the description says, "approval of reserve for future years/contingency funding level."

Dr. Yudice stated this was included in last year's budget for FY18 for a contingency for those projects funded with the H-Tax that were related to Richland Renaissance. Since the Renaissance has been deferred, what we did is put it in here for any unplanned expenses for the Historical Corridor or multi-purpose facility.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, over the years, when we allocate Hospitality Tax funds, sometime you have a project that comes that needs some funding, and we would have to do a budget amendment. What we discussed last year was to put some money in a fund, so we would not have to do a budget amendment. He remembers some colleges wanted to have a football game or have a winning year and need some funding. We would have to do a budget amendment. If we had a reserve set aside, we would not have to do a budget amendment, and that is what that money was for.

Ms. Dickerson stated she thinks the purpose was what Mr. N. Jackson explained. She did not know if we would have set aside that money for what Dr. Yudice explained. She requested clarification prior to 3rd Reading.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve \$100,000 in contingency funding.

In Favor: Malinowski, Kennedy, Manning, Livingston, and Rose

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

The motion failed.

Ms. Kennedy stated, for clarification, she heard "if we come up with something we could use this money for", which means any Council member.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

14

Ms. Dickerson stated it would be available to all of the Council members.

Ms. Kennedy inquired as to types of projects because she has a Magistrate's Office coming in her district.

Ms. Dickerson stated you could not use it for that. It would be specifics it would be used for.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it could be used for promotions or tourism-related.

Mr. Manning stated Council has an ordinance, that we take very serious, that if we are going to change things, that we have a very good way to do that, which is 3 readings and public hearing. He stated he is uncomfortable with any money just sitting out there that we find a way to shortcut, and circumvent, 3 readings and a public hearing for our tax money.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to not approve any contingency funding.

Mr. Malinowski stated he has to agree with Councilman Manning on this because, if we are trying to pass the spending of additional funds beyond the basic budget, he believes the public should be invited to have input with the 3 readings and a public hearing. We should really hear what the public has to say. After all, we are spending their money.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve \$200,000 in contingency funding. He stated there are times we do have emergencies and do not have time to go through 3 readings and public hearing, so he would like to have some options for dealing with possible emergencies.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if this money was available this year.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to how much was used.

Mr. Hayes stated none of the funding was used.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, that is his point, it was there to prevent us from doing a budget amendment, but it was not abused or used. It is still there, so he does not see the problem why we cannot have it again because sometimes the Palmetto Classic, and they did not do it in the regular budget, and they need some money for a tourism-related events. We have to do 3 readings and a public hearing, and we do not have time for 3 readings and public hearing. But, if we can request it, and the Councilmember or the group requesting it will give an explanation why they need it.

Mr. Manning made a second substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve \$150,000 in contingency funding.

Mr. Livingston withdrew his motion.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what happens to the remaining money. How often can we continue to roll it over?

Mr. Hayes stated the fund balance is indefinite.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

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

Opposed: C. Jackson, Dickerson, and Rose

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Dickerson stated when you need something, and you exceed it, we are going to be doing 3 readings and a public hearing.

- 22. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level)** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Transfers Out funding level.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 23. Hospitality Tax (A one-time additional allocation of \$250,000 to the Columbia Museum of Art from H-Tax fund balance)** *NOTE: This is a carryover item that did not get taken up during the FY18 budget process.* – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the one-time allocation of \$250,000 to the Columbia Museum of Art from the unallocated H-Tax fund balance.

Ms. Dickerson inquired as to why an additional \$250,000 is needed for this item.

Mr. Hayes stated his understanding, in the email Mr. Pearce sent, it is a carryover item that did not get taken up during the FY18 budget process.

Mr. Livingston stated it is to assist with the renovations they requested us to support last year.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if we allocated them funding last year.

Mr. Hayes stated they only received their ordinance agency allocation last year.

Mr. Manning stated we have voted favorable on a couple other items, while we were wanting a lot of clarification for 3rd Reading. In Mr. Pearce's absence, he would respectfully request that we vote to move this forward to 3rd Reading and let him answer.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like additional information regarding how this will affect the 25%/75% (Incorporated/Unincorporated) split for H-Tax.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson and McBride

The vote was in favor.

- 24. Hospitality Tax (\$25,000 to Columbia Classical Ballet)** – Mr. Hayes stated Items 24 – 29 were sponsored by Ms. Myers.

Ms. Myers stated these are allocations for entities that benefit all of the districts.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve Items 24 – 29.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

Mr. Malinowski stated he does not know if he would say these benefit all of the districts; however, each one of these items that is here is already receiving Hospitality Tax. In the past years, individual Council members would give from their \$164,000+ allotment to these agencies, which gave them equal or greater than what they asked for. He thinks if an individual wants to do that, then they should do it, but he does not think one person should, for a few people, say let's give them this, then we do not have to take it from ours and ours is still available for something else.

Mr. Livingston inquired if that consistent with what we did last year for Items 24 and 25.

Mr. Hayes stated these would not be in the backup packet because they are individual Council motions.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we can see in the backup how much these agencies have been recommended for funding.

Mr. Hayes stated if you look at the grants matrix.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it is consistent with what we did last year for EdVenture, or are these additional funds to some other funds they are getting.

Ms. Myers stated EdVenture is consistently underfunded. They have issues with their building, and other constraints, they have asked us to help them with last year, and this year. She stated she is consistently amazed that EdVenture, the children's museum, is not funded comparably to what we do for the Columbia Museum Art. To the extent, that it is a museum, like the Columbia Museum, but just for children. They take their programs to all of the children, even those out in the unincorporated areas. They are constrained because of the ownership structure of their building, and they need additional resources. She requested that we fund them out of H-Tax fund balance this year, but next year to move them up to Tier 1 agencies, that get an additional allocation from the County, to sustain their programs and help them get to the point where they are not begging consistently for an additional allocation to meet their budget.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he has no problem doing that, but he is concerned because they already received \$155,000, and here is another \$200,000. There is a cap of 25% that is allocated to the City. He wants to make sure we do not go over the cap. The City gets twice as much as we get in Hospitality Tax funds, and we keep pushing so much into the City. He does not want the unincorporated area not to be served properly.

Ms. Dickerson requested a friendly amendment to reduce the request from \$200,000 to \$100,000. Then we can put it in one of the tiers for the next year. She stated she thought this was one of our ordinance agencies.

Mr. Hayes stated EdVenture is an ordinance agency.

Ms. Dickerson stated she thought EdVenture, the museum and the Township were ordinance agencies. She inquired as to how much EdVenture is already getting.

Ms. Myers stated \$155,557, which is really low. She stated the reason she is very concerned about this is EdVenture is in the City limits, but it is the only children's museum that we have within Richland County. It reaches every part of the County. They do programs in everybody's areas. They bus the programs out to all of the schools, and they are treated like a 2nd class museum because all of their patrons are tiny. She is advocating for their museum's patrons to be given the same kind of

consideration because this is an important museum, and they are perennially strapped for funding. She understands looking forward, but if we could not reduce it from \$200,000 tonight, but work together to get it in the Tier 1 groups, at a level, we are happy with. She requested that we please give them this funding to support children's programming. They do excellent STEM programming, arts programming, and with the schools cutting out those programs, we need them.

Ms. McBride stated she supports EdVenture, and the need for the children's museum. She stated it is Hospitality Tax funds, so you are limited in what can be done. She does not know whether the \$200,000 would profit the programs they have because of the limitations on the Hospitality Tax funds. She realizes it is to recruit more people coming to the museum, but she is questioning how useful that amount of money would be.

Mr. Manning stated there are many things they are funding that Hospitality Tax funding could fund. With this allotment, they would be able to use the money they are using now to do the programming.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Livingston requested an accounting of these items for 3rd Reading, so we do not run out of money.

- 25. Hospitality Tax (\$25,000 to Columbia City Ballet)** – Taken up under Item 24.
- 26. Hospitality Tax (\$15,000 to Olympia Granby Historical Society)** – Taken up under Item 24.
- 27. Hospitality Tax (\$10,000 to Annual World Affairs Council Dinner)** – Taken up under Item 24.
- 28. Hospitality Tax (\$10,000 to Annual International Festival & New International Student Welcome Event)** – Taken up under Item 24.
- 29. Hospitality Tax (\$200,000 to EdVenture Children's Museum)** – Taken up under Item 24.
- 30. Hospitality Tax: District 2 Allocations (Moving Forward Summit - \$10,000; River Community Foundation [Blues, Blueberry and BBQ - \$50,000; River Community Foundation [Broad River Community Best in Show Fall Fest] - \$25,000; Richland Music Festival - \$30,000; Capital City Lake Murray Regional Tourism Board - \$10,000; SC Philharmonic - \$2,500; Columbia Classical Ballet - \$3,500; Blythewood Historical Society - \$2,000; Famously Hot New Year - \$5,000; Midlands Tech Harbison Theatre - \$2,500; and Palmetto Capital City Classic - \$5,000)** -- Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the District 2 allocations.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this was coming from Ms. Dickerson's individual H-Tax allocation.

Ms. Dickerson stated it is coming from her individual allocation.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 31. Hospitality Tax (Move to approve \$150,000 for Promotions at Pinewood Lake Park by the Foundation which must submit a plan of events)** – Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve \$150,000 for Promotions at Pinewood Lake Park.

Mr. Malinowski stated he thought the Conservation Commission was in charge of the Pinewood Lake events and running of it. It was his understanding, they tried numerous times to have discussions with the Foundation, and the Foundation ignored them. In the memos Council received, the Commission stated they had tried to work with the Foundation, but they had not been successful. He requested some clarification on this matter.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that was for the operations and management of the park, not the promotions. The Foundation did the promotions, and the Conservation Commission was offered to manage and operate the park. Since 2008, he believes \$250,000 a year was for promotions for the Lower Richland community. That is why over the past years, he has allocated \$150,000 for promotion purpose. The Foundation was requested to submit a plan of events before it moves forward. It has nothing to do with the difference we are talking about with operations, that is totally separate.

Dr. Yudice stated, last year, Council approved \$75,000 for the Foundation for promotions, through the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission and the Foundation could not agree on the agreement, so the agreement was never executed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the Conservation Commission gave it back to the Grants Committee because they did not want to be responsible to distribute the funds. That is where the misunderstanding was, and why Administration had different understanding of what happened. The programs did happen, and there were some differences, but the Conservation Commission said they did not want the responsibility to disperse. The Grants Committee already has a process to do it, and that was relayed to Administration to relay to them, but it was never relayed.

Ms. Hegler stated Mr. N. Jackson's original statement is correct. The Conservation Commission was given the operations and management of Pinewood Lake Park, not the task of promoting it. It got compounded last year with a motion to allocate \$75,000 for promotions through the Commission to the Foundation. The agreement was never executed. She does not think it is the intention of the Commission to do promotions. It is the motion, and directive of Council, for the Commission to do the management and operations of the park.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this is about promotions, not the management and operations.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if promotions would come under overall management. He inquired how we can give money to a group that supposed to be under the authority of an agency within the County.

Ms. Hegler stated that was the motion from last year, you would have to ask Mr. N. Jackson if that was his intent this year.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the year before the Foundation got \$150,000 for promotions, and they had promotions for 12 months at the park. Last year, Council decided to give the funding through the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission said they did not want to be responsible for doing it because we have a grants committee that handles the entire process, so they sent it back to the grants committee to handle it. It did not make sense for them to go through that process. They are only responsible for making recommendations for promotions and operations, which is

totally different than Hospitality Tax promotions. The Foundation was designed for promotions for the park, and they own part of the park. They were doing promotions for the park. They have a list of what they are supposed to be doing, and Council, or the grants committee, will have to approve what they are doing. That is what they have been doing for the last 4 years.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if we ever used the \$75,000.

Dr. Yudice stated the funds are still available because the agreement was never executed.

Mr. Livingston stated it is his concern that since we have invested in the park that there are promotions. Is it not true, for some reason, the Commission could not work out an agreement with the Foundation?

Dr. Yudice stated she does not know the specific reasons why the Foundation could not agree to execute the agreement, but the fact is the agreement was never executed.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he believes the role of the Commission, as Mr. N. Jackson described, and their willingness to oversee the supervision and operation of the park, was what he remembers being discussed in great detail, last year. He also remembers the \$75,000 for promotions. If in fact that did not occur, and the Commission has no interest in it occurring, in terms of assuming responsibility, and it is not going to affect the Commission's operational budget, he is support of providing the funds to do a better job than we have done promoting that underutilized and under-advertised facility down there.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the funds were supposed to be available July 1. The Conservation Commission had discussions and sent it back to the grants committee, which was never relayed to the Foundation. The events did happen. They did all the events. They were never paid because it was said there was not a signed agreement, but the Foundation did do the events. He stated he guess they are in the red until something has been worked out with that part of the funding. The concern was that the Conservation Commission decided they did not want to do it because we had a grants committee handle, and was designed to handle it, so why should they do it. They sent it back. It did not come back to Council, and he thinks that's where the problem is, with communication.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, we approved them for \$75,000, but they did not get it because they did not enter into a contract with one of our Richland County entities. Will they automatically get \$150,000 this year, or will they still have to enter into some kind of contract?

Dr. Yudice stated they will have to enter into a contract. That is one of the requirements Council approved on the guidelines.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, before the \$75,000 is released to the Foundation, they have to enter into a contract for the funds to be funneled to the organization.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this was not through the Conservation Commission because they do not want to handle it. The Grants Department will have to handle it. He stated his motion is not through the Conservation Commission. His motion is how it was done previously because the Conservation Commission did not want to get involved in handling any grants for the park.

Dr. Yudice stated, since these are Hospitality Tax funds, it has to be through the Grants Department. The Foundation and the County will have to enter into an agreement to release the funds, with the proper documentation.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we have received a proposal, or anything, from the Foundation for \$150,000 for this year.

Dr. Yudice stated not to her knowledge.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this is a Council motion, and he does it every year.

Mr. Livingston stated we do not have anything from this, at this point, requesting these funds.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the motion says the Foundation must submit a plan of events.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what happened to the \$75,000 from last year.

Mr. Hayes stated it will roll over into the fund balance.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if we have a contract with the Conservation Commission to work with the Foundation.

Dr. Yudice stated she does not believe there is a contract between the Conservation Commission and the County for the management of the park. It was done through a motion.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, if they were allotted \$75,000 last year, for promotions, why would they need double the amount this year.

Ms. Dickerson stated that is what Mr. N. Jackson is requesting for the Foundation. This is a Council motion. The Foundation has not requested the funding. Basically, before these funds are released, they would have to submit documentation, sign a contract, and go through the procurement process.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is not double this year. It has been \$150,000 every year. What happened last year was \$75,000 went to the Conservation Commission, and \$75,000 was supposed to go to the grants committee. The Conservation Commission decided they did not want to deal with it, and sent it back to the grants committee. It was never relayed to Council of their decision. That is why \$75,000 lingered throughout the time. It was originally \$150,000.

Dr. Yudice stated that is her recollection. Council approved \$75,000 through the H-Tax and gave \$75,000 to the Conservation Commission for promotions.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what Conservation Commission did with their \$75,000. Was it operational/management or for promotions?

Dr. Yudice stated it was for promotions.

Ms. Myers stated she was going to call for the question, but she had one comment. We all know we have perennially had issues with this park, but if we are requiring them to execute a contract, and provide to our staff documents for approval before funds are released. It is important that any space in this County that bears Richland County's name be treated like other spaces, and that it be done

right. She would suggest we move this forward. We are on 2nd reading. There are a lot of questions. Those of us that have questions can get with the Conservation Commission and asks those questions. If next week we still have questions, we have another opportunity to have those answered.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by C. Jackson, to call for the question.

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

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

Mr. Livingston inquired as to who would approve the plan of events.

Dr. Yudice stated, according to the motion, the Foundation will have to submit the plan of events to the Grants Manager.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Rose

The vote was in favor.

32. Richland County Conservation Commission (RCCC recommended Historic Preservation Grants) Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the Historic Preservation Grants and Community Conservation Grants.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

33. Richland County Conservation Commission (RCCC Community Conservation Grants) – Taken up under Item 32.

34. Neighborhood Redevelopment (Neighborhood Redevelopment matching grants committee) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve Items 34 – 44 for the Neighborhood Redevelopment grants.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion to take them up individually.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Livingston stated he makes this point every year, so he is trying to be consistent because he has a lot of neighborhoods he would like to submit stuff for to, but he requests them to go through the normal process. He inquired if we have applications for these neighborhoods.

Ms. Hegler stated Fairwold Acres/Harlem Heights submitted their application late, and was not a complete application; therefore, it was unfunded. They received an application for \$1,500 for Atlas Road Community, and were funded through the Neighborhood Matching Grant Program.

Ms. Myers stated Atlas Road Community is working with the Planning Department on a park, which they have their own land. We are trying to help them figure that out. They needed a little more money to fund the development work we are working on.

Mr. Malinowski stated, like Mr. Livingston, he has concerns. We have a process to go through. If we, as Councilmembers begin to supersede that process, where is the fairness to all those follow the process. The one that was turned in, that was late, he recalled asking the question about that one back when it was brought up. There were 2 months to submit applications, yet they were late. He does not consider that an excuse for being late. In past years this has come, and we have pretty much agreed we are going to follow the process and not going to begin to put all these requests down at 2nd and 3rd reading. He thinks, if we do, then by 3rd reading he would welcome every Councilmember to bring every neighborhood they have and put it down.

Ms. McBride stated, if that is the case, we have circumvented the process the entire time with all of the different programs coming in. She stated she had lots of programs that she could have put on the motion list that have been placed on the motion list, and we voted on it. Lots of deserving programs. Our communities are the basis, the foundation, for us, for the Council, for government. These are the people that protect our community. We are talking about active citizens that are involved. This limited amount of money is so small, but they can do a lot with it. This is a part of the process. This is just like every other entity that has been submitted with this budget. She thinks it is totally unfair to the citizens of Richland County. Those citizens that volunteer their work, and you question \$1,500 for a neighborhood. We need our communities to grow our children. She is amazed that someone would question this after we look at the entire process. The person that sent in the grant late was a neighborhood that was trying to revitalize. The person got off her job. Ms. McBride told the lady about it because not everybody gets the announcements. The same people are usually funded over and over. This is an opportunity to bring more communities into the system, and to involve them. To actually do good for our children, our neighborhoods, and help make them safe.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Ms. Hegler stated she only received one application.

Ms. Hegler stated, of the neighborhoods listed in Items # 36-40 and # 42-43, they received the one late, that Ms. McBride mentioned. The others they did not receive an application for, at all.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to provide \$1,500 for every neighborhood in Richland County.

Ms. Myers withdrew her motion for Item # 41.

Ms. Dickerson stated we have a motion to approve all of them, including Item # 41, for \$1,500.

Mr. Livingston stated Ms. Dickerson needs to let Mr. Manning restate his motion because he thought it was something different.

Mr. Manning stated his motion is very different. After hearing what Ms. McBride said, he was thinking that was why we had the grant application, so they could apply and do all of that. Because all neighborhoods do like that. A lot apply. A lot try to apply, but they get off their job and did not know the deadline. Other ones are looking for money, that do not even apply. Based on the concept that all neighborhoods have good people, who love their County, we should give them all \$1,500.

Ms. Dickerson stated she is in agreement. When you work with the people in the community, they are not professionals. They do not get paid to do laborious jobs.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

23

Mr. Livingston stated we have absolutely no idea what that motion really means, in terms of dollar amount, and so forth. We do not even know which neighborhoods are considered neighborhoods. He got a list of neighborhoods that was over 300.

Ms. Hegler stated they have a running list of the neighborhoods they know of that totals 490.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Mr. Manning was referring to the ones that are before us, or to automatically give every neighborhood \$1,500.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, for those that apply, is there some criteria to be a neighborhood to apply for the grants. Like all of the ones that did apply for the grant. How could you decide if they could or could not?

Ms. Hegler stated they have to have by-laws established. They have to follow a number of different things. She would still hazard to guess there are quite a few of those.

Mr. Manning stated his motion is, given that, we are adding some to the list that did not apply. We are adding some to the list that applied, that was not quite complete. We are adding to the list because somebody got off work, and when they got it in there, were a little late. And, all the ones that did applications did it right. If we are going to do something like that, then he thinks all neighborhoods, who are eligible to apply for the \$1,500, that they all get \$1,500.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Ms. Hegler said there are about 400 on the list, and, if there are, at \$1,500 that is about \$600,000.

Mr. Manning inquired about how much we are already approving out of that, with the ones that did their application, got off work early and got their application in on time, and who filled out their applications correctly. There are a bunch of them that are already covered, right?

Ms. Hegler stated \$50,213 was already approved.

Mr. Rose stated, obviously, he is not going to support Mr. Manning's motion, but he understands the point he is making. The only way to be fair is to have a process in place. Perhaps we need to do better with advertising what that process is. He has nothing against any of these neighborhoods. He can appreciate what the Councilmembers are doing. The problem is when you get into the fairness of how this is going to work. Maybe that is us, as Councilmembers, doing a better job of letting our districts and communities know what is out there and available. In addition, to work with PIO. The only way to be fair, across the board, is to follow the process.

Ms. Kennedy inquired if the guidelines are put out publicly, so these communities will know what they are supposed to be doing, in order to get this money. She also inquired if they are advertised, so the communities know the money is available.

Ms. Hegler stated they post like the H-Tax, A-Tax, and grant agencies. They had 4 workshops, that were well attended. They are recommending more this year than they have in year's past. The process is improving, and our amounts go up. They have not, necessarily, ever capped the amount. They are funding all, but one, that applied. Staff is willing to sit down with the communities to assist with filling the applications out.

Mr. Livingston stated he is assuming the motion is for the funds to come from Neighborhood Development, which has a limited balance. He inquired as to how much is in the fund balance.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

Mr. Hayes stated there is \$1.8 million, as of FY17. Keep in mind, under Item # 35 - \$650,000 is to be approved already.

Mr. Livingston made a second substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to move forward with Items # 36-44, but to change the amount for Item # 41 to \$1,500, and to request the entities submit a complete and approved application prior to receiving any funding.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Manning and Rose

The vote was in favor of the second substitute motion.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the Neighborhood Improvement matching grants committee recommendations.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 35. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate funding to approve the Neighborhood Redevelopment Budget) NOTE: Includes using \$650K in Fund Balance** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the Neighborhood Redevelopment budget.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- 36. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Fairwood Acres/Harlem Heights \$1,384)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

- 37. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award St. Mark's Wood \$1,500)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

- 38. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Fountain Lake \$1,500)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

- 39. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Green Lakes \$1,500)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

- 40. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Yorkshire HOA \$1,500)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

- 41. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Atlas Road Community \$5,000)** – Taken up under Item # 34.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to provide \$3,500 to the Atlas Road Community from the Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance.

Mr. Manning stated this was reduced to \$1,500 with Mr. Livingston's substitute motion under Item #36, which he supports because \$1,500 for the Matching Grants is capped at that. He thought he heard our staff is working with that community to try to do something a little extra special with the park. If we got a \$1 million+ fund balance, he thinks if one community, and he is willing if someone wants to make an argument for another community that our staff is working with in a special and unique way to do something above and beyond what these matching grants do, he would be happy to entertain that. But, the one he has heard about, and have before him, is the Atlas Road park, which is why his motion is to provide them with \$3,500 out of the Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this will have to be a separate, new motion because \$1,500 was already passed for that, and this is something different. Do we have to give it like a 41(a) number?

Ms. Dickerson stated Mr. Manning, in his motion, mentioned that they were working with...who is working with whom on this.

Ms. Myers stated Ms. Hegler is working with Atlas Road Community. They own property that they want to turn into a park. The community bought the property, and the County has been working with them to turn it into a park. It will be a public park when it is done. They are going to donate it, and they are not asking for a whole lot from the County.

Ms. Dickerson inquired as to whose district this project was in.

Ms. Myers stated it is in her district. She stated the Atlas Road Community has a piece of property they bought some time ago, and wanted to turn into a community park. They wanted to give it to the County, but we never got to the point where we would take it from them and turn it into a park. They are now trying to figure out ways to turn it into a park, and Ms. Hegler has been working with them. She stated she is happy to take this off the table. At this moment, it is not critical path. It is a small amount, and we will figure it out with the community.

Mr. Livingston suggested having the Community Development office come back with a recommendation about that later.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to revisit the Atlas Road Community park issue when Ms. Hegler and her can come back to Council with more definitive information and a specific request from the normal, standard budget.

Mr. Manning made a second substitute motion, to approve \$3,500 of the fund balance as a contingency for this item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Mr. Manning was referring to General Fund or Neighborhood Redevelopment.

Mr. Manning stated he was talking about, as you recall back on the H-Tax, we said we would like to circumvent the whole budget, 3 readings and a public hearing. We put some money, so we could just do that out of contingency. He is saying, while we are getting this more information, he would like us to put this money in this free flowing contingency that when they come back with the information, if we like it, we can vote on it just like we are with \$150,000 H-Tax.

Mr. Malinowski stated he understood that, but he inquired if Mr. Manning was referring to the Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance.

Mr. Manning stated that is correct.

The second substitute motion died for lack of a second.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

42. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Belvedere Community \$1,500) – Taken up under Item # 34.

43. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award North 21 Terrace Neighborhood \$1,200) – Taken up under Item # 34.

44. Neighborhood Redevelopment (To allocate Neighborhood Redevelopment fund balance to award Pinehurst Neighborhood Association \$1,000) – Taken up under Item # 34.

GENERAL FUND

45. County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions) – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve this item.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

46. Computer Technology Replacement (To allocate GF Transfer to CTR fund to continue with the 3-year computer leasing program) – Mr. Hayes stated this is a companion of Item # 45. It has to do with the funds, that are funded through the General Fund, that is transferred to the Computer Technology Replacement fund where we have a 3-year lease program to replace computers. That will be approving a \$310,000 transfer from the General Fund to the CTR fund.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the transfer of \$310,000 from the General Fund to the CTR fund for computer leasing program.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

47. Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations \$123,652 in new recommendations, and \$76,348 in multi-year grants approved in prior years)

47(a). Discretionary Grant (Epworth Children's Home and New Economic Beginnings be reduced to the maximum allowable amount of \$10,000 and that Harvest Hope Food Bank and SisterCare each

receive \$10,000) – Mr. Hayes stated Items 47 and 47(a), which has to do with the Discretionary Grant Committee recommendations, which total \$200,000. Mr. Manning pointed out there was a discrepancy and 2 groups that had exceeded funding, Epworth’s Children’s Home and New Economic Beginnings, so he is making a motion to reduce their funding levels by \$10,000 and give those additional funds to the Harvest Hope Food Bank and SisterCare.

Mr. Manning stated the committee began by taking those organizations that had applied for multi-year, which allows for a maximum of \$10,000 over a 3-year period. The committee took that up, and approved, the continuation of the 5 – 6 that Council had approved last year. The committee recommended to Council for them to continue on their multi-year track, which has a maximum allowable of \$10,000. Then, we went into the new applications. Committee members had gone online and scored all the applications. When the committee met, we projected up on the screen the organization that had the highest score, the 2nd highest score, the 3rd highest score, etc. We worked down that list until we ran out of money. Then we adjourned the meeting. When the budget book was issued, he saw in there that Epworth’s Children’s Home and New Economic Beginnings, which are 2 organizations that were in the multi-year continuation, were listed at \$20,000 for this coming year. The maximum for one year is \$15,000, so the budget book was showing the recommendation from the committee as being those 2 organizations getting \$10,000 more than they were allowed. If that was talked about in the committee, no one remembers it. Apparently, there was a scrivener’s error. He contacted the Budget Office and asked for the listing we were working off of. He asked what the 2 organizations that were the next in the order of the scoring that had, as Ms. McBride and he thought, if we had not run out of money we would have continued down with the next 2 items. And, then we would have run out of run. To clarify, we went back and revisited what the committee was attempting to do, in its work. He believes, very strongly, this motion allows for a much more accurate representation of what the Discretionary Grant Committee was recommending to Council.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve Items 47 and 47(a).

Ms. Dickerson stated she recalled Epworth came to us with a one-time funding request. She inquired if we are funding them annually at \$10,000.

Mr. Hayes stated the General Fund has supported what they call overall LumpSum appropriations for quite some time. It is basically 3 categories: the Discretionary Grants, which funds \$200,000 annually, which groups can apply for funding in the manner that Mr. Manning offered; the C&S agencies, which there are a contractual or statutory obligation to; and then the “rest” LumpSum appropriations. The intent of Council, over the years, has been to fund these organizations at one year, but over time it just became multi-year funding. As it stands now, if you go forward, this Council approved a total \$3.1 million last year for General Fund LumpSum appropriations (\$200,000 – Discretionary Grant Committee; \$832,000 – C&S Agencies; and just over \$2 million – residual). There were 5 groups (Epworth Children’s Home, IT-Ology, New Economic Beginnings, JUMPS, and Healing Species) that were approved for 2 years of funding for the biennium. The rest of the groups would have to be approved by Council again.

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

Opposed: Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

48. Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

49. LumpSum (Appropriable funds in the amount of \$1,673,668) NOTE: \$410,000 has been recommended for the following: Palmetto AIDS Life Support - \$50K, Saint Lawrence Place - \$50K, SC HIV AIDS Council - \$50K, Sexual Trauma Services - \$60K, and Transitions Homeless Center - \$200K)

Mr. Hayes stated Council approved \$2,083,600 for the biennium. Of that amount, \$410,000 was approved for multi-level funding for Palmetto AIDS Life Support, St. Lawrence Place, SC HIV AIDS Council, Sexual Trauma Services, and Transitions Homeless, which leaves a balance of \$1,673,668.

49(a). LumpSum (Move to have all FY18 approved amounts become FY19 recommended amount for FY19 LumpSum Appropriations) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve all FY18 approved amounts become the FY19 recommended amounts for FY19 LumpSum appropriations, not just those few that someone wisely, carefully made a motion that said they get approved in both years.

Mr. Malinowski stated there are few organizations that did not request funding for FY19. If they did not request it again, why would we provide it.

Mr. Livingston stated, unfortunately, there was some confusion from last budget cycle. There was an assumption that many of these were for both FY18 and FY19. Unfortunately, that ended up not being the case.

Mr. Manning stated he recalled last year that one of his colleagues, after they heard somebody astutely, carefully word that the motion was for the money in both years of the biennial budget, said, "Well that's what I thought was happening with mine, and the way they should all be." And, there seemed to be a response of, "Yes, that's understood." He thought his colleague, thought and understood, some wise person said, "Yeah, but you did not make that actual motion." So, he thinks there was even some confusion amongst this body. He does not think some of these organizations, were with any guidance from Council, would have thought you need to apply again. As a matter of fact, many of these are items that Council members made motions made for, and there was not even an application. This is not something we advertise for organizations to apply. There is no official request, but some of them thought in a 2-year this might not be as clear to everybody, as they think it is. So, they said, "Maybe I don't have to, but I'm going to put in for approval anyway."

Mr. Malinowski inquired, with all of the money provided to the library before, why are getting another \$325,000 here.

Mr. Manning stated, all he can say, is for the same reason they did last year.

Mr. Malinowski stated they all left thinking they got what they needed.

Mr. Hayes stated the \$325,000 could be used to offset the earlier increase they asked about.

Mr. Livingston stated that was for Edgewood Project last time.

Ms. McBride stated she agreed with what Mr. Manning said. In fact, she may the colleague that questioned the procedures that took place last year, and was told that it was done fairly; therefore, all of them would be considered for the biennium budget. Obviously, it got lost somewhere in the paperwork. She stated that Mr. Manning requested that we be funded from last year's level. Items 49(b) Antioch Senior Center and 49(d) SisterCare were recommended for \$25,000 and \$16,000 last year, respectively. She is requesting \$30,000 for Antioch Senior Center and \$20,000 for SisterCare this year. She requested Mr. Manning amend his motion to make those changes.

Mr. Manning stated he would prefer to take up his motion and then take up the other items. He is supportive of the items, but he believes it will be a little cleaner to fix what did not get right last year, and then take off the additional items.

Mr. Livingston stated before we move forward, keep in mind he thinks this motion will fix some of them further down.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Abstain: C. Jackson and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous, with Mr. C. Jackson and Mr. Manning abstaining from the vote.

49(b). LumpSum (Antioch Senior Center \$30,000) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve \$5,000 for Item # 49(b).

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

49(c). LumpSum (Columbia Urban League \$100,000) – This item was withdrawn.

49(d). LumpSum (SisterCare \$20,000) – This item was withdrawn.

49(e). LumpSum (To allocate \$50,000 to Garners Ferry Seniors Association) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Rose

The vote was in favor.

49(f). LumpSum (\$63,240 for Senior Resources Meals on Wheels) – Mr. Manning stated this item did have money from last year's lump sum. This is an additional amount. Last year, we took the number of our seniors, who had applied and were approved for Meals on Wheels, and were on a waiting list. As of right now, this year, we have a waiting list of 31 individuals. It is \$2,040, which equates to \$63,240. As soon as there is funding, the 31 individuals on the waiting list will begin to receive Meals on Wheels.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve \$63,240 to Senior Resources for Meals on Wheels.

Ms. Dickerson stated she knows Senior Resource Center gets a lot of funds from the COG. She requested a complete list of their funding.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 50. LumpSum (Therapy Place \$25,000)** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to provide an additional \$25,000 to the Therapy Place, which is the only center in Richland County for autistic children and their families.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 51. LumpSum (Award Joseph H. Neal Wellness Center [formerly the SC HIV/AIDS Council] \$50,000 – Withdrawn.**

- 52. LumpSum (Harvest Hope Food Bank \$50,000) – Withdrawn**

- 53. LumpSum (Town of Eastover \$100,000 for decommissioning of former school and Asbestos removal)** – Ms. Myers stated this is the old Webber Elementary School in Eastover. It was donated to the Town of Eastover, but when it was donated, it was donated with asbestos, and other problems, that made it uninhabitable and unusable. It has become a site for gangs and crime. The town does not have the money to decommission it, or remove the asbestos. It is creating serious blight and danger in the town.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve a one-time allocation of \$100,000 to assist the Town of Eastover in decommissioning the old Richland County School District One – Webber School, that is now an almost daily crime scene in Eastover.

Mr. Rose stated the thing he struggles with is the Town of Eastover accepted the building. Ms. Myers explained why this is an issue, and he wants to help, but he struggles the other way, and questions, would we do this for the Town of Blythewood, Forest Acres. Where do you draw the line, in that this was a decision that another governmental body made?

Ms. Myers stated we do it all the time through the Conservation Commission for the City of Columbia. She would support it. She thinks they are a part of the County just like other town and city is a part of the County. This is creating dangers for the County, not just them, because it is a place that foments gangs.

Mr. Malinowski stated he thought there were Federal dollars available to clean up these old brownstones and eliminate asbestos. He inquired if anyone has made the effort to try to find out about these particular grants. Secondly, Ms. Myers stated it was an old Richland County school. He

believes the School District has a fund balance of \$20 - \$30 million, and we cannot get a \$100,000 out of that for this. He would say there are a couple other options that need to be looked into first.

Mr. Livingston stated, at this point, he cannot support this. He is willing to consider it on 3rd Reading, if he can see how this is going to fit into the scheme of a total project. And, what is going to happen to the other project. Right now he is not sure of the total benefit of \$100,000, and where it would go.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Ms. Myers is just looking at demolishing the building, or just removing the asbestos.

Ms. Myers stated the funding is for removing the asbestos and demolishing the building. And, to answer Mr. Malinowski's question, they have been trying for about 20 years to find the funding for this. Her opinion is the School District should have never given them this building with the asbestos in it. She believes we bear some responsibility, and that is why she brought it to the County.

Ms. Dickerson stated one of the things she is very concerned about is how we preserve some building. She understands this is a very old school, in this particular neighborhood. She thinks we should consider that like we are some of the Rosenwald schools, and see if we can preserve it as a historical thing.

Ms. Myers stated the building is in such shape that there is nothing about it to preserve. She stated, honestly, it is an embarrassment for it to be in the County.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if Ms. Myers could have someone do an assessment, as to how much it would cost to demolish the building.

Ms. Myers stated she will be glad to bring it back prior to 3rd Reading.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson and Livingston

The vote was in favor.

54. Various (To allocate Lump sum funding to various groups that have historically been funded in multiple funds; \$53,000 Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 for Congaree River Keeper; \$75,000 Keep the Midlands Beautiful; \$53,295 River Alliance) – Mr. Hayes stated these are items that Council has historically approved. They are also considered LumpSum funding, but they are found in various funds (Solid Waste, Temporary Alcohol, Stormwater, etc.)

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

Mr. Manning inquired if we have any information about what the Columbia Chamber of Commerce for BRAC does. He stated he knows every once in a while when the BRAC gets fired up and they go around the country. We do a "dog and pony show", we dress the place up and we take people out to eat. He understands that and fully supports it. He is just curious what we did with \$53,000 last year, and what are we doing with \$53,000 next year for the Base Closure Commission work.

Mr. Hayes stated he could have the representative provide the information and provide it to Council prior to 3rd Reading.

Special Called Meeting

June 14, 2018

32

Mr. Livingston stated base closure came up and we tried to help make sure we support that, but that has not been an issue recently.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Livingston

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

55. Economic Development (To allocate funding to approve Economic Development's Budget) NOTE: Includes the \$775,000 transfer in from the GF – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to allocate the funding level for the Economic Development fund.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the recommendation is for \$1,715,000. He inquired as to what happened to the funding that was not appropriated.

Mr. Hayes stated those funds would be considered part of the General Fund Unallocated. The .5 mill that was not appropriated and transferred to General Fund would have been funds that went to fund the General Fund.

Mr. Livingston stated his question is, "Are they a part of this budget?"

Mr. Hayes stated the only thing that is a part of this budget is the .5 mill for FY19.

Mr. Livingston inquired about what motion he would need to make to put those funds back in the budget.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, so you want to make a motion to get those funds.

Mr. Livingston stated according to his notes that was \$834,000.

Mr. Hayes stated he would have to go back and look to get the specific number, but it would be equivalent to half of the mill value for FY16 and FY17.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to include the funds from FY16 and FY17 that were not received by the Economic Development fund.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

56. Public Defender (To allocate funding to approve Public Defender's Budget) NOTE: Includes increasing transfer in from GF by \$400K – Mr. Hayes stated, if you recall, he mentioned in the work session this particular fund was not fully funded and they were experiencing a shortage. The recommendation was to transfer an additional \$400,000 from the General Fund to cover those new positions that were added last year.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the allocate the funding level for the Public Defender's budget.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the new positions were approved.

Mr. Hayes stated Council approved them. When he looked at the position control, they are on the position control. It is just they were not funded, so right now the fund is running a deficit.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

57. Fire Service (To approve downward adjustment to Fire Services Budget that the millage will support) – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Fire Services Budget.

Mr. Malinowski stated Mr. Hayes has \$26.3 million on p. 65, and they requested \$10.4 million.

Mr. Hayes stated they were asking for an additional \$10 million.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

58. Emergency Telephone System (To allocate funding to approve ETS Budget) NOTE: Includes funding for 5 new positions as a part of the Council approved RCSD takeover of Call Center – Mr. Hayes stated the recommendation is to allocate the ETS funding, which includes funding for 5 new positions as a part of the Council approved Sheriff's Department takeover of the Call Center.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have a full blown plan, including timelines, for what we are doing. She did not think this was underway. She would not like to have those 5 positions in the budget now; therefore, enlarging the budget and have to pay for them before we are ready.

Dr. Yudice stated they have worked with the Sheriff's Department, and the 5 new positions are ramping up the efforts.

Ms. Myers stated they are ramping up, but there is no plan in place, correct?

Dr. Yudice stated we have not brought the plan to Council, but Council approved taking over the communication center.

Ms. Myers stated this is the same question we had earlier about the Lower Richland temporary library. You have to build the building before it is time to employ the people. She would not like to be paying to employ the people until there is someplace for them to go and to be employed. You certainly are not going to train them the whole time you are building. She is confused as to why we are paying for everything right now because once that headcount is in the budget, by State law, we cannot decrease the number. She does not want to enlarge it. She definitely wants to be safe and have someone pick up and answer if she calls 911, but these are people that are basically "ladies in waiting".

Major Polis came forward to answer Ms. Myers questions.

Ms. Myers stated she is curious as to why the headcount is already in the budget without the plan and the place having been developed. It seems to her, at least 12 months ahead of when we ought to be paying for the headcount.

Major Polis stated those positions are needed in order to develop the policies and procedures. We are presently working with the County.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, there is currently nobody in the Sheriff's Department that can develop policies and procedures for the 911 Center.

Major Polis stated, "No, ma'am." We are working with the County. We have those positions and they are working, presently, on developing the plan moving forward with 911 Communications.

Ms. Myers inquired if the headcount is already in the Sheriff's Department.

Major Polis responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, so they are reallocating headcount.

Major Polis stated, "No, ma'am." It is his understanding these positions have already been funded.

Ms. Myers inquired as to why they are being funded here.

Mr. Hayes stated these are new positions the Sheriff's Department has requested.

Ms. Myers stated Major Polis said they already exist and are being paid for. Her question is, if that is the case, are we paying for them again here.

Dr. Yudice stated what Major Polis is referring to is, the Sheriff's Department budget is paying for those positions. The new money is for FY19.

Ms. Myers stated if we are not yet prepared to provide this service. We do not have a plan. We do not have bricks and mortar. We do not have anything. Why are we already paying for the headcount? She stated, for clarification, that the cost per person is \$89,000 with salary and benefits.

Major Polis stated it is approximately \$88,000.

Ms. Myers stated we are almost at \$100,000 a head for heads that we are not ready to use. She is all for them. She is just questioning the timing. If this has to be in the budget today, and we have to allocate the money today, or we wait until we have a plan, building, facilities, etc. for which you would use the people. We do not have a use for them right now. The 911 system is being handled a different way right now.

Major Polis stated those positions already exist and those people are already presently working.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, they are being accommodated by the current Sheriff's Department budget. This would enlarge it, and theoretically provide an additional space for 5 new headcounts. So, that not only do we have the 5 we are paying for, you could add 5.

Major Polis stated he does not have an answer for Ms. Myers tonight, but he can get her an answer.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was going to echo a little bit of what Ms. Myers said. However, quite frequently, particularly when they are building a new school, they may hire the Principal and Administrators up to a year before the building is built because those people will be the ones in the building once it is built. They need to make sure the building is built to their specifications. What he

thinks he hears Major Polis saying is the people that are going to be in building, actually doing the work, are already board developing the plan. Ms. Myers is saying, if you are already paying for them now, keep on paying for them. When they are ready to move into the building, then pass the bill onto the County.

Mr. Hayes stated those funds are actually being accounted for, not in the Sheriff's Department's General Fund budget, but in the Emergency Telephone System budget. Because they were new positions they were brought before Council. They will need approved funding for a full year.

Ms. Myers stated, from a budgetary standpoint, she would like to make sure we do not overdo. To the extent, they are already being paid for out of another fund, she does not know that it is necessary to allocate new money until...

Mr. Hayes stated this fund is not currently able to support it. He brought the number back to Council, so that we can appropriate additional funding. We are currently paying the City of Columbia, so this fund could not continue paying the City of Columbia the \$3.2 million for the Call Center, as well as, supporting the positions.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are getting any money back that we are paying.

Mr. Hayes stated he did not want to step on Administration. His understanding was the Call Center was supposed to continue to be in operation through FY19.

Ms. Myers stated that Call Center is not going down until we have something to take over, and there is a window in which both of them has to run because you cannot have a mistake with a 911 Center.

Dr. Yudice stated we are not decommissioning the Call Center. The 5 positions are to put in place a plan to develop the Communications Center. They are already working on that plan.

Ms. Myers stated she was saying whoever was paying for them, could continue paying for them until such time as we have a plan.

Mr. Hayes stated the fund currently supports 2 positions, Michael Byrd could speak more clearly to it, but he believes it is 2 GIS related positions. The fund is not currently able to support these 5 additional Sheriff's positions. In order to do those, we had to go into the fund balance. He had to bring it to Council, not only for you to approve the 5 positions, but also to approve the additional funding.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Hayes was saying we have already enlarged the staff. Essentially, what you are coming for is our blessing. We have essentially had to say, where will we find the money. We will go into the fund balance and do it. These people are working. We will come back and get approval for it from fund balance. Either they are working and being paid for, or they are not. If they are being paid for, where is the money coming from.

Mr. Madden stated the 5 positions are being paid for out of the ETS fund. What is before you now is to enlarge the fund by using the available fund balance to fully fund the fund. If you approve the funding level that is before you, you approve using the fund balance to fully fund it. And, you will approve the 5 positions. The 5 positions are already there.

Ms. Myers inquired if they are getting money today for coming to work.

Mr. Madden responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated that money has been approved out of some pot because they are not showing up for free, right?

Mr. Hayes stated because they were brought onboard in May there was enough funding left in residual FY18 funding, but it is not enough to support them for a full year.

Mr. Rose stated these positions are already being paid for. The Sheriff's Department is not paying for them. The County is paying for them.

Mr. Hayes stated they are paid for out of the Emergency Telephone System fund.

Mr. Rose stated the positions have already been approved, and they are at work now.

Mr. C. Jackson stated when he approved this, he approved it in concept. We talked about this Emergency effort in concept. We never talked about the specific details of how much it would cost, how many positions would be hired, and what it would cost to construct. Now he hears tonight, sort of like we heard in the past, about approving things in concept and then it becomes reality. Now he hears tonight, for the first time, these positions are already in place, already been hired, already working, and already being paid by the County. And, now we simply need to identify the funding source for positions for a project that we approved only in concept.

Ms. Dickerson stated she thought this was all predicated on buildings, etc. We need a little bit more clarification as to whether or not these people are working, where are they, etc. There are a lot of conceptual questions that we need to get an answer to.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to allocate funding to approve the Emergency Telephone System budget.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to the dollar amount.

Ms. Dickerson stated it is \$6,252,352.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, C. Jackson and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

59. School Resource Officers (To allocate funding to approve SRO Budget) NOTE: As indicated budgeted revenues have not kept pace with actual revenues and we have had conversations with the RCSD and plan to convene a committee in the fall to include all stakeholders and bring a corrective plan of action back to Council – Mr. Hayes stated Council requested for him to do a report on this item, which was submitted in a companion document. The actual revenues are not keeping track with budgeted revenues. Of course, these funds are experiencing a shortage.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if this included the one that was controversial.

Mr. Hayes stated it is still included in the budget.

Ms. Myers stated the private school is in District 10. She spent a lot of time with them to figure this out. They are paying the cost of that headcount. They get a headcount for 180 days, and the headcount belongs to the Sheriff the rest of the year. In fact, they are over paying by \$6,000. She has talked to Chief Cowan about it and he is in full agreement that was a slight misrepresentation because we did not have numbers before us. They are not getting a free ride on the County's back.

Ms. Kennedy stated they are paying for it, but is the money coming out of our budget.

Ms. Myers stated they are paying the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Kennedy stated the Sheriff's Department's money is coming out of our budget.

Ms. Myers stated what she is saying is, whatever money they are getting for SROs, because that money is being replenished, there is no impact to the budget on this one school.

Ms. Kennedy stated the Sheriff's Department is getting money from us to pay for it, and the Sheriff is giving it to them.

Ms. Myers stated that is an issue with the Sheriff's Department, not the school.

Ms. Kennedy stated it is an issue with the Council that we are allowing private schools to get money.

Ms. Myers stated she respectfully disagreed. The school is not getting any money. They are paying money. They pay \$6,000 more than the cost to have that officer. Now, she does not know where the money is going. She cannot account for when the checks get paid to the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Kennedy stated the County is picking it up from the Sheriff's Department, which is the same thing that we have been talking about all along.

Mr. Hayes stated it is true the schools pay the Sheriff, and those funds are submitted into our General Fund. He did want to issue a point of clarification that it is not 100% reimbursement. Not all of the officers are 100%. Heathwood Hall overall costs is much smaller than what Richland One and Richland Two is, but each of those funds did experience a deficit in FY17.

Ms. Kennedy stated whether it is completely funded or not, you are still funding part of the money.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated what the Sheriff's Department is funding is the days during the school year when the children are not at a school, and the officers do not work there. The Sheriff's Department, rightly, pays them to come to work when they are working somewhere other than the school premise because they then belong to the Sheriff's Department, and not the school. She stated Chief Cowan and she had a long conversation about this, and he confirmed what they are paying for dollar for dollar, because those school resource officers do not go to those schools more than 180 days unless they pay outside of the contract. If you do the math, Heathwood Hall is not underpaying for the one officer they are getting. She stated she could forward the information that was provided. The school has been told by the Sheriff's Department they will experience 4% increase year over year to cover the entire costs of the officer. Their question was, will the officer come for 365 days a year, and not just 180, because that is what they are getting. They are essentially getting ½ a head.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the school districts are paying between 65 – 75% of the costs for the SROs. The school districts have the SROs for 180 days. They do not have them during the summers, holidays, and if there is an emergency, they are relieved of their duties at the schools. The Sheriff is paying for the difference between the time when they are not physically at the school. There is a cost sharing that goes on, and the request here is basically asking for a 3% increase (\$384,829) over what they are getting in revenues right now, which will take them up to the \$6 million. The Sheriff's Department has received requests from some of the school districts, where they have added new schools; therefore, they had to add a new school resource officer. We did not add any additional money to the process, and that is why this deficit has occurred. New schools have come online. They have to have a SRO there; therefore, the Sheriff's Department has eaten the difference.

Ms. Kennedy stated she wanted to make it perfectly clear she is not against resource officers being in public schools. She was an Administrator, in a public school, for almost 50 years. She is favor of anything that is going to improve education of the students in Richland I, Richland II and Lexington-Richland V. She has no problem with having these people paid fully, and kept there all year, if necessary. Her problem is when her taxpayer's money is put into a private entity. She strongly supports anything that goes to the school system, but she is not supporting anything where taxpayers' money is going to a private entity. If I want my child to go to a private school, then I'll pay for one.

Ms. McBride stated she is still rather confused because she heard Ms. Myers and Mr. Hayes comments. In Mr. Hayes answer, it was not completely yes or no whether they are paying. From what she received, they are paying most, or part of it, but there is a part that we are still supporting through the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Hayes stated he will concur with both Mr. C. Jackson and Ms. Myers. On average, the SROs are funded from 55 – 75%, but because they are not in the school year round there is a deficit. There is a time of year when we are not getting funds for it. Traditionally, the deficit has been taken care of by the SRO fund balance, but based on projections the fund balance will be whittled to nothing at the end of FY18. He wanted to do his due diligence to bring this Council.

Ms. McBride stated she knows there is a shortage in the public schools with some resource officers. The particular officer we are partially funding there could help with our shortage in the public schools. In addition, when Mr. Hayes said they were partially funded, she realized they are not there the entire school year. However, these officers are paid fringe benefits. They are part of our retirement system. She is not sure those funds, they are being paid, includes those fringe benefits, so the costs could come out to be much more or less. Either way, the public schools need more resource officers.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, the deputies are being reimbursed a percentage of funds for the time they spend there. The rest of the percentage that they are not there, and they are doing Sheriff's work and duties, it seems to him that should have been in the Sheriff's budget all along. If not, why cannot they send reserve deputies to be SROs or see if there are enough retired deputies that would like to have a part-time job. What he is seeing here is, while we are getting 50 – 75% reimbursement for the time they are in a SRO status, they are telling us we have a \$6 million shortfall.

Mr. Hayes stated last year this fund lost a little over a \$1 million, but that was taken up by fund balance. If the funds continue to trend that way, because you are always going to have a deficit in revenue because what you budget in revenue, you are not actually going to get in actual revenue because the deputies are not in the schools year round. The deficit will continue to grow, but the

fund balance will not be there to absorb it anymore. At some point in time, a corrective action will have to be put in place. It could be you decide to subsidize that through a transfer into the General Fund. He just wanted to point out that the deficit will continue, but the fund balance will not be there to absorb it.

Mr. Malinowski stated they need to figure out, in their own budget, if these deputies are working the other percentage for the Sheriff's Department, then that should be somewhere in their budget. It also says they are going to bring back a corrective plan to Council. When is this going to be here?

Mr. Hayes stated Administration and himself met with Chief Cowan. We did say we were going to sit down and try to put together a plan of corrective action with all the stakeholders, including the school districts, and bring it back to Council.

Ms. McBride stated we are talking about 2 different issues going on. We are talking about the deficit, and we are talking about the private school. She spoke on the private school officer. She fully supports funding for public school resource officers.

Ms. Dickerson stated, if you can figure out between now and Third Reading, whether or not we are or are not paying any portion.

Mr. Hayes stated, on the report he gave Council, of the \$1 million deficit, that particular deficit amounted to \$19,000. It was a very small percentage of it, but that \$19,000 deficit was absorbed in the fund balance last year. What he is saying is, the trend will continue, but the fund balance dollars will not be there to absorb it.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired about what type of duties, tasks and responsibilities the SROs have when they are not in the schools.

Major Polis stated the SROs work the road and answer calls for service for all the citizens of Richland County. They are out there taking 911 emergency calls, and interacting with all of our citizens. He also stated Mr. C. Jackson's earlier statement is correct. The Sheriff's Office's priority is to provide a safe environment for our schools, so that any increase that is needed to keep officers in the school is the ultimate goal of the Sheriff.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund the SROs, in the public schools, at the rate they are requesting, and that the private school fund the SRO position at 100%.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, in reviewing this there is also another school district that is in here that is autonomous agency. Therefore, Richland County provides no funding whatsoever. He inquired if they are included in the motion too. He does not know why we would include them, if they are not a part of our taxpaying system.

Ms. Dickerson stated we have to do District 5.

Mr. C. Jackson stated his motion stands like he stated it.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, if the SROs provided in District 5 within Richland County, because they go across the line into Lexington.

Major Polis stated the SROs in Richland County stay in Richland County.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Myers

Abstain: Rose

The vote was in favor.

60. Transportation Tax (To adjust the Transportation Budget to match projected Revenue and approve funding levels for the various Transportation related projects) NOTE: This represents the 65.1M projected to be brought in by the Sales Tax Revenue in FY19; the total recommended Transportation Budget is \$148,978,756 including BANS drawdown – Mr. Hayes stated they adjusted the revenue up from what was previously approved for FY19, which he believes was \$63.8 million. They are recommending the Transportation Penny Tax revenue portion be increased to \$65. 1 million, which is what it is coming in as.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to adjust the Transportation budget to match the projected revenue.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Hayes stated the other portion of that is, there is a Transportation BAN out there. Those are projects that have been slated to be worked on FY19. We are asking Council approve the total funding level for the Transportation Penny in the amount of \$148,978,756.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the Transportation Penny total funding level of \$148,978,756.

Mr. Malinowski stated we do not have that as a separate motion on this list.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Hayes stated, there is one other item (Debt Service), that historically has not been on the motions list. It has just been approved as part of the budget ordinance.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, is not this the budget ordinance we are working on now.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative. He was just saying that historically the debt service has not been on the motions list.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the debt service in the amount of \$389,960,321.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Hayes stated the last item, the Capital Improvement Needs for FY18-19, is just for information.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, the Third Reading process will only be those items that were passed tonight, but we had questions on. Everything else we approved, would be lump sum approved, unless someone wanted to do a reconsideration. And, the motions list would just be brought down to those things tonight that we said, "well I'm voting to approve, but we are going to have information come back." We would have those items on a Third Reading motions list.

Mr. Livingston stated on the regular list, highlighted, would be better for him.

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