



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING BUDGET – 2ND READING (GRANTS) May 25, 2017 – 6:00 PM Council Chambers

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Beverly Harris, Brandon Madden, Sandra Yudice, Michelle Onley, Gerald Seals, Larry Smith, Ismail Ozbek, Tracy Hegler, Geo Price, Natashia Dozier, Quinton Epps, Nancy Stone-Collum, Ashley Powell, Latoisha Green and Donald Woodward

CALL TO ORDER – Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at approximately 6:01 PM.

AMENDED ORDINANCES FOR SECOND READING

- a. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2018**
- b. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2019**

Mr. Seals stated the purpose of tonight’s meeting is to take up the 2nd Reading of the budget, primarily the grants portion of the budget.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to take up Accommodations Tax. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to adopt the recommendations of the Accommodations Tax Committee, which is listed on p. 147 of the budget book. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to utilize a portion of the \$113,308 excess of revenues over expenditures for FY15-16 that grew the Accommodations Tax fund balance to \$345,270, as outlined in the May 11th Work Session companion document, to add an additional \$50,000 to the Columbia City Ballet (p. 147) and \$50,000 to the Columbia Classical Ballet (p. 148).

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what the Accommodations Tax fund balance was.

Mr. Manning stated, according to the documents Council received, the Accommodations Tax fund balance is \$345,270.

Mr. Malinowski stated his concern is that all Council members will not have an opportunity to fund their organizations. He suggested taking the fund balance and dividing it amongst the Council members.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion to divide the Accommodations Tax fund balance amongst the Council members. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Dickerson requested, for clarification, to have Mr. Manning to restate his motion.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to utilize a portion of the \$113,308 excess of revenues over expenditures for FY15-16 that grew the Accommodations Tax fund balance to \$345,270, as outlined in the May 11th Work Session companion document, to add an additional \$50,000 to the Columbia City Ballet (p. 147) and \$50,000 to the Columbia Classical Ballet (p. 148). The vote was in favor.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve the recommendations of the Discretionary Grants Committee (pp. 141 – 146, budget book). The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to allocate an additional \$25,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to the EdVenture Children’s Museum.

Ms. Dickerson requested clarification on the amount available in the Accommodations Tax fund balance.

Mr. Madden stated there was a \$345,270 available in the Accommodations Tax fund balance. Mr. Manning made a motion to distribute \$100,000 out of the fund balance, which would leave a balance of \$245,270.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to offer a friendly amendment to Mr. C. Jackson’s motion and allocate an additional \$25,000 for a total of \$50,000 to EdVenture Children’s Museum.

Mr. Livingston expressed concern about depleting the Accommodations Tax fund balance and there not being enough funds available to cover the projects approved by the Accommodations Tax Committee. He inquired if EdVenture Children’s Museum submitted an application for Accommodations Tax and if the funding could come from the Hospitality Tax fund balance.

Mr. Pearce stated there was a potential that a motion was going to be made out of Hospitality Tax to assist EdVenture due to their unique needs. Personally, he has no preference whether the funding comes out of Hospitality Tax or Accommodations Tax.

Ms. Dickerson requested Council members to be mindful of the amount of funding available.

The vote in favor of allocate an additional \$50,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to EdVenture Children’s Museum was unanimous.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to allocate \$30,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to the Historic Columbia Foundation.

Mr. Pearce stated to him this fund balance is not like the General Fund Balance wherein the County must have funds for critical needs. He does not understand why Council would not want to spend this money since it is intended to keep heads in beds.

The vote was in favor of allocating \$30,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to the Historic Columbia Foundation.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to allocate \$25,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to the SC Philharmonic. The vote was in favor.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to allocate \$25,000 from the Accommodations Tax fund balance to the Columbia International Festival. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to lock the remaining Accommodations Tax fund balance in the amount of \$115,270 in place. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to vote on the Hospitality Tax items on a line by line basis. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve Tier I – Debt Service at \$1,489,800.

Mr. Manning stated the word “waterpark” is listed on p. 193a. He requested removing the word “waterpark” and replacing it with land or the land designation.

Mr. Seals stated Council can do what they would like, but when the bonds were issued the word waterpark was included as a part of the naming of that particular bond issue.

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve Tier I.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve Tier II – Cost Allocation at \$1,000,000. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce stated the next item is actually called “Community Promotions” in the ordinance and not “H-Tax Committee”.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve Tier II – H-Tax Committee at \$347,516.

Mr. C. Jackson stated that the Sparkleberry Country Fair (p. 153) is underfunded and inquired as to how to increase the funding for this event.

Mr. Pearce stated this is a fixed amount of funding locked in by ordinance; therefore, in this particular section you would have to balance the funding out.

The vote in favor of approving Tier II – H- Tax Committee was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve funding the Columbia Museum of Art at \$765,872.

FOR

Pearce
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Myers
McBride

AGAINST

Rose
Manning

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve funding the Historic Columbia Foundation at \$385,143. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve funding of EdVenture at \$155,557.

Ms. Myers made a friendly amendment to give an additional \$50,000 from H-Tax to EdVenture. Mr. Pearce accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Malinowski reminded Council that an additional \$50,000 from A-Tax was approved for EdVenture.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired how taking the additional funds will affect the H-Tax funds allocated for individual Council member disbursement.

Ms. Myers stated there was discussion at a previous meeting about another organization, which has not been discussed this evening. The suggestion is to reduce this organization's funding and use those funds to increase the funding to EdVenture.

Ms. Dickerson requested deferring the additional funding for EdVenture until the SERCO funding has been decided.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to what EdVenture's request was.

Mr. Manning stated the request was for \$160,000.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to defer the additional funding for EdVenture until Tier III has been discussed.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Township Promotions in the amount of \$300,000 and Township Maintenance in the amount of \$70,171.

Mr. Manning suggested clarifying the motion to ensure the funding is only for FY18.

For clarity, Mr. Pearce stated that was his intent.

Mr. Malinowski stated for clarification Mr. Pearce made a motion for Township Promotions, but the budget book uses the title Township Operations.

Mr. Pearce stated he is quoting from the ordinance, which is Township Promotions and will replace the wording in the budget book.

Mr. N. Jackson requested before Third Reading to know if the Township funding is for promotions or operations.

Mr. Pearce stated the funding has been historically used to promote shows and bring people in.

The vote in favor of funding Township Promotions at \$300,000 and Township Maintenance at \$70,171 was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce stated he would like to take action on Tier IV prior to taking up Tier III.

Mr. Seals stated for clarification that the H-Tax ordinance simply says Township Auditorium; therefore, it includes operations and promotions.

Mr. Rose stated on p. 153 there are two (2) allocations at \$4,000 a piece to an entity entitled SCALE, Inc. The Director of the organization has encountered some legal troubles. Therefore, he made a motion to move the \$8,000 allocated to SCALE, Inc. to the Sparkleberry County Fair. Mr. C. Jackson seconded that motion.

Mr. N. Jackson stated SCALE, Inc. is in the Lower Richland community. The Executive Director may be indicted, but she has not been convicted. Mr. N. Jackson is in receipt of a letter stating the Executive Director has been removed. The organization should not be punished based upon the Executive Director. You are taking the funding from Lower Richland and sending it to Northeast Columbia.

Ms. Myers inquired if the letter regarding the SCALE, Inc. Executive Director's removal been provided to the County Administrator and the Hospitality Tax Committee members.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is not sure, but he can provide it before Third Reading.

Mr. Seals stated he did not have a copy of the correspondence referenced by Mr. N. Jackson.

Ms. Myers stated she understands Mr. N. Jackson's concerns that one person does not an entity make and to not punish the entity for the person, but the information definitely needs to be provided through the proper channels. The entity has an obligation to provide the information to Council in order for Council to properly evaluate where the entity stands. She supported Mr. N. Jackson moving to set aside a fund to find a way to continue the programs continued, but until the Hospitality Tax Committee has been given some information it is just prudent in safeguarding taxpayer money to ask questions.

Mr. Pearce stated strictly on what he had heard he made an inquiry. It is his understanding the organization had been noncompliant with documentation and other things. He would support setting aside the funding, but does not feel comfortable arbitrarily approving money.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to what is to be clarified prior to Third Reading. (i.e. documentation or the legal issues).

Mr. N. Jackson stated the legal issue is with the individual and not the organization. He then inquired as to what legal issue Mr. Pearce is referring to.

Mr. Pearce stated he heard the Executive Director was indicted for misuse of the funds provided by Richland County.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the Executive Director was indicted for perjury and not misuse of funds.

Mr. Rose stated he is speaking on behalf of himself and his constituents; therefore, he will not be voting to allocate any funds to SCALE, Inc. It is not against the programs they purport to be doing in the Lower Richland community. There is another organization that can step in and fulfill that void. There is a criminal indictment that has come down on the Executive Director that oversees the operations of this organization.

Mr. Livingston stated he is looking for fairness. If the Executive Director of the EdVenture, Township, etc. were indicted would the County still fund them?

Mr. Manning stated as the representative for District Eight he would like to see the letter. Additionally, Mr. Manning made a motion to continue Second Reading of Tier IV until next week.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if doing so would allow time to follow the process.

Mr. Manning stated it is one Second Reading, but Council breaks it up into two separate meetings.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor of continuing Second Reading of Tier IV was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce stated he does not have a recommendation for Tier III since he is unable to determine what is actually in Tier III. He was under the impression Council passed an ordinance to address Tier III.

Mr. N. Jackson stated in what is considered to be Tier III there was be a line item annually for \$150,000 for Pinewood Lake Park Foundation, similar to Historic Columbia and the Columbia Museum of Art. It is recommended for \$87,000 for the upcoming fiscal year, but it was approved for \$150,000 in the last fiscal year.

Mr. Pearce stated he recalls a discussion, but has been unable to find anything in writing to corroborate the funding for Pinewood Lake.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he inquired about why Pinewood Lake Park was not a Tier II organization and was told it would be reviewed and updated accordingly.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve \$150,000 for Pinewood Lake Park Foundation for promotions.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why there is not a figure listed for what Pinewood Lake Park received in FY17.

Mr. Seals stated it has been difficult to piece together because much of this is based upon memory and recollection. It appears there was \$150,000 allocated by motion. In addition, another \$80,000 in funding was allocated through the Council members' H-Tax discretionary funds for a total of \$230,000.

Mr. Rose stated the Conservation Commission will be taking over the Pinewood Lake Park on July 1st.

Mr. Rose made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to allocate \$75,000 in Hospitality Tax to the Conservation Commission for the purpose of developing tourism at Pinewood Lake Park.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if the operational authority and responsibility is going to shift from the Foundation to the Conservation Commission why would additional funding be provided to the Foundation.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it was his understanding that Pinewood Lake Park Foundation reported to Richland County itself. The motion was to put it under the Conservation Commission to oversee the Pinewood Lake Park Foundation. He did not know the Conservation Commission was going to go into the business of operating a park. He further stated, Council requested individuals to create Pinewood Lake Park Foundation. They developed a 501(c)3 organization to operate the park. There is a motion to shift it to report to the Conservation Commission, which is totally different.

Mr. N. Jackson further stated the intent of other Council members is to take the operations or promotions of Pinewood Lake Park away from the Lower Richland community by having the Conservation Commission operate the park. Historic Columbia , EdVenture, and Columbia Museum of Art all have their funding allocated to their foundations or organization for operations.

Mr. N. Jackson will be holding a community meeting in Lower Richland to discuss what his colleagues are planning to do. He stated he has been fighting for the funding and the park for the past 8 years. He will not allow others to undermine his efforts to promote Lower Richland.

Mr. Pearce assured Mr. N. Jackson that he has no desire to undermine the Pinewood Lake Park. It is his understanding Council voted for the Conservation Commission to begin managing the park with personnel on July 1st and the Foundation was going to provide activities in the park. The question is, how much does the Foundation need to provide activities?

Mr. N. Jackson stated he has been told the Conservation Commission had no intention of managing the park. He cannot trust the Conservation Commission if they tell him one thing and then do something totally different. Its fine if the Conservation Commission manages the park 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, but promotions is different from the operations of the park. The mistake was \$150,000 was allocated for operations, but because it was Hospitality Tax the Foundation had to utilize the money for promotions.

Mr. Pearce requested clarification on who is going to manage the park effective July 1st and what money is Council going to provide for management of the park.

Mr. Manning stated the motion addresses partially about promotions. Recently a public relations agency grant proposal was issued, which includes Lower Richland. Would a portion of that money and work of that group be doing some of the promotions?

Mr. Seals stated the promotions is broad and does include Lower Richland and a variety of other things. Council gave direction in that regard at the Council Retreat. The intention was to do a variety of things and cover a variety of promotions and/or issues with the County.

Mr. Rose stated Council voted to give the Conservation Commission the authority to run the park effective July 1st. His intent is to allocate funds for the Pinewood Lake Foundation, but to give the funds to the entity Council has voted to oversee the park.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the Conservation Commission is going to manage Pinewood Lake Park.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative. He has requested staff to provide the documentation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if promotion of the park is included in the management of the facility.

Mr. Seals stated there was a letter sent in February to the Foundation basically ending the contract the County had with the Foundation and explaining the responsibilities of the Conservation Commission. Those

responsibilities, as he recalls, would include promotion but Council left it up to the Commission to continue to use Pinewood Lake Foundation or other entities.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if promotional funding is going to be handled by the Conservation Commission or will an outside agency need promotional funding.

Mr. Seals stated, as he understands the direction of Council, the responsibility for management, which includes promotion, falls to the Commission. Council expressed concern that there are a variety of activities that the County is engaged in where it needed that kind of assistance, so that assistance will be solicited. And that assistance will be available to all of the County as needed, including the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Seals read into the record the letter to the Pinewood Lake Foundation dated February 15, 2017.

"This letter is to formally notify the Pinewood Lake Foundation of the action taken by Richland County Council related to its Pinewood Lake property management agreement with the County. On October 18, 2016, County Council voted to transfer the management and operational functions outlined in the aforementioned agreement that are currently performed by the Foundation to the County's Conservation Department effective July 1, 2017. Thus the County's contract with the Foundation will not be renewed once it expires on June 30, 2017. The Conservation Department will work with volunteers and non-profit organizations such as the Foundation to ensure that local community involvement with the property is uninterrupted during the transition. Please feel free to contact me or the Conservation Department Director should you need additional information."

Ms. Myers stated she shares wholeheartedly Mr. N. Jackson's desire to see the park become a thriving part of the larger Richland County community of parks and suggested moving forward as agreed upon, but to gradually scale back the Foundation's involvement to ensure continuity of the programs.

Mr. Livingston referenced a letter from the Conservation Commission dated March 15th that states "Pinewood Lake Foundation involvement in the park will continue as a sponsor of community involvement programs, special events and other promotional activities through H-Tax funding, other sources or volunteers." It would appear if the Conservation Commission is going to be in charge then a decision needs to be made whether they want to do this with Pinewood Lake Foundation, but Council has to make a decision on how much to give in terms of Hospitality Tax.

Mr. N. Jackson stated Pinewood Lake Park Foundation owns a portion of the park. It was his understanding the Conservation Commission was going to partner with a non-profit organization (i.e. Pinewood Lake Foundation) to continue running the park, but the Conservation Commission was not going to get into the business of operating the park and have someone out there 7 days a week, 12 hours a day. If the Conservation Commission wants to operate the park that's fine as long as the services do not deteriorate and are uninterrupted to the Lower Richland community. His concern is the promotion of the activities at the park and that the service is uninterrupted.

Mr. N. Jackson further stated he cannot support giving the Conservation Commission \$140,000 for one staff person when the Foundation was provided \$150,000 for 3 staff persons and promotions.

Mr. Rose stated the motion was since the Pinewood Lake Foundation is no longer running the park effective July 1st, by a vote of County Council, we would not fund the positions of the Foundation to run the park. Instead the entity taking over would receive \$75,000 in funding. Individual Council members can allocate additional funding from their individual H-Tax disbursement, if they wish.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification if there was already funding in the Conservation Commission's budget for promotions.

Mr. Seals stated the Conservation Department has been given the responsibility to manage and promote the park. During the first year, the department and Commission feel they will need additional funding for promotions.

Mr. Manning inquired if the Commission has met with or studied the award to Brett SC and the promotions they have been hired to do.

Mr. Seals stated Brett SC has been retained to assist with promotional activities of all County departments.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion to provide \$70,000 for the Conservation Commission promotions.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. C. Jackson stated this has less to do with money and more with the integrity of the intent. He expressed concern about the kind of language used to suggest that anyone would do anything that would refuse to promote this park, or any other park, to the highest degree. He stated his only concern was if a particular organization was going to assume the responsibility for the management and the operations of the park that they be given the funds and resources to do the job. It appears we have gotten away from that and are discussing whether or not people have the right intentions and right motives to do what is practical in running and managing operations. To suggest that the Conservation Commission does not have the intelligence, integrity or the professionalism to do the right thing, quite frankly is insulting to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Livingston called for the question, seconded by Ms. Kennedy.

Mr. Pearce requested the motion to be restated.

Mr. Rose stated the motion was since the Pinewood Lake Foundation is no longer running the park effective July 1st, by a vote of County Council, we would not fund the positions of the Foundation to run the park. Instead the entity taking over would receive \$75,000 in funding. Individual Council members can allocate additional funding from their individual H-Tax disbursement, if they wish.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Kennedy
Myers
McBride

AGAINST
Manning

The vote was in favor.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by C. Jackson, to approve \$75,000 for the Pinewood Lake Foundation for promotions.

Ms. Myers requested Mr. N. Jackson to explain what he would see as non-duplication.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he was not sure what the Conservation Commission is going to do with their promotions funding and how they want to promote the park. Pinewood Lake Foundation was awarded \$150,000 for promotions and it has been cut in half. Half of it goes to the Conservation Commission. There is still \$35,000 available for the Foundation, who owns a part of the park and would need some funding for their promotions.

Ms. Myers inquired if all promotions would not need to be harmonized. It was her assumption the Conservation Commission would need to coordinate with the other owners. She further inquired, if Mr. N. Jackson was suggesting that the Foundation and the Conservation Commission were going to be on separate tracts.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there should be a meeting of the mind, but the Foundation has programs/events they would like to continue.

Mr. Manning stated he is in favor of this motion since there are already two groups (Brett SC and the Conservation Commission) working together to promote the park.

Mr. Pearce stated when the County purchased the property, they purchased everything with the exception of the dam. He inquired if the Pinewood Lake Foundation purchased the dam from the non-profit that owned the portion of the property with the dam.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the Foundation owns 5 acres and a part of the lake. The County has an easement on the dam.

Mr. Pearce stated the dam was hit hard with the flood and inquired if anything has been appropriated to repair the dam.

Mr. Seals stated the County does not own the portion where the dam is located.

Mr. Pearce inquired if there was any funding allocated to the Pinewood Lake Foundation.

Mr. Malinowski stated it was his understanding the Conservation Commission was going to receive the dam as a donation and then funds would be allocated for the repair of the dam.

Mr. Seals stated Mr. Malinowski was correct there is a proposal to reallocate a portion of the funds for Phase II to repair the dam. At this time, the County does not own the dam nor does the County own the property that encompasses the dam. The Conservation Commission apparently has some desire in that regard.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there is funding for the different phases of construction for Pinewood Lake Park.

Mr. Seals stated there is \$4.5 million for Phase II.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there would be funds available to do the necessary repairs required.

Mr. Seals stated it is the prerogative of Council to decide if you want to reduce the funding. A case has been made the \$4.5 million is necessary to carry out Phase II.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he supports Mr. N. Jackson's motion the \$75,000 for the Pinewood Lake Foundation since there is funding for other work. He challenged the Conservation Commission to be the best partners they can possibly be with the Foundation and staff to ensure the quality of the park.

Ms. Myers stated for clarification that Brett SC was retained for Countywide promotions.

Mr. Manning inquired if Brett SC was going to have ownership of one of the buildings on the property since they are assisting with promotions as well.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he met with the Conservation Commission and they requested him to speak with the Foundation about donating the dam for repair. The biggest part of the park is the lake; therefore, it is to the County's benefit that the dam is repaired.

Mr. Livingston stated he is concerned about how the Conservation Commission will delineate funds for Pinewood Lake and other promotions. (i.e. who would have to enter into an agreement with the Foundation to make sure what is promoted and what needs to be promoted).

Ms. Kennedy requested a copy of the correspondence regarding this matter.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the County owns the whole park. It appears part of the park is owned by the Foundation and part of the park is owned by Richland County. She further stated she was confused on what part the Conservation Commission is to manage/promote and what part the Foundation is responsible for. Is there one park or two parks?

Mr. Smith stated when this piece of property was purchased, Council purchased 44 acres. The property that was purchased did not include the portion of the property where the dam is located because there were maintenance and liability issues with the dam. At some point, that particular piece of property came into the hands of the Foundation. Whenever the property was purchase the whole piece of property was referred to as Pinewood Lake; therefore, there are not 2 parks.

Mr. Seals stated the portion that was acted on in October 2016 was the 44 acres. It did not include the portion that is the dam. He further stated he refers to the 44 acres as the park. Whereas Mr. N. Jackson and the Foundation refer to the park in its totality.

Ms. Dickerson stated the liability of the dam was a great concern, especially by Councilman Rose. Mr. N. Jackson stated when the initial discuss took place about the dam and Mr. Pope was the County Administrator and Mr. Rose was not on Council. Ms. Kit Smith was on Council at the time.

Mr. Rose stated he was on Council when the purchase of the property took place.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there was concerns the dam would fail. The County had a flood and the emergency spillway failed, but not the dam. The study by the engineers in Georgia was a sham because they compared a 12 feet deep dam (Pinewood Lake) to a 400 feet dam in Georgia.

Mr. Livingston called for the question, seconded by Mr. Pearce.

Mr. Livingston yielded to Ms. Myers before the motion to call for the question was taken up.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Rose, to instruct the Conservation Commission to use their \$75,000 in promotion funding in consultation with the Foundation. The Foundation will be the primary promotion engine for FY17-18.

Mr. Livingston expressed concern with instructing the Conservation Commission on who they should hire for promotions.

POINT OF ORDER – Mr. N. Jackson stated the motion to call for the question was made, but the maker of the motion allowed the substitute motion.

Mr. Livingston stated he did not call for the question. He stated he yielded to Ms. Myers and then the motion to call for the question was to be made.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the Chair was going to entertain the substitute motion without discussion.

Ms. Dickerson agreed to allow discussion on the substitute motion.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he agrees with Mr. Livingston that Council cannot tell the Conservation Commission they have the funding, but they have to use another organization. He stated he supports the original motion.

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

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	Manning
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
McBride	

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

Mr. Manning requested that Ms. Myers restate her motion.

Ms. Myers stated her motion was that the Pinewood Lake Foundation be named as the proper entity for promotion of Pinewood Lake Park and that the Conservation Commission be so instructed.

Mr. Manning requested clarification that the funding for promotion is the funding approved in Mr. Rose's previous motion for \$75,000.

Ms. Myers responded in the affirmative.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	N. Jackson
Rose	Dickerson
C. Jackson	Livingston
Malinowski	Kennedy
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Livingston stated the Conservation grants were listed on pp. 154-156.

Mr. Pearce stated the Hospitality allocations had not been completed.

Ms. Myers stated after consultation with SERCO, they have agreed they are more appropriately in Tier IV. Therefore, she moved, to move SERCO to Tier IV and allocate \$90,000 to them for FY18 rather than the \$200,000.

Mr. Manning requested clarification that the motion is to move SERCO to Tier IV.

Ms. Myers amended her motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to allocate \$72,895 to SERCO.

Mr. Malinowski stated the original motion was to move them to Tier IV. When it comes to the actual amount of funding, it was his understanding all of the Tier IV groups received their funding from the individual Council members. Therefore, the funding matter will need to be taken up later.

Ms. Myers stated on Tuesday there was a discussion about SERCO and what their role was within the County, what their funding level should be, and if they were an administrative agency. She stated she is acknowledging on their behalf that they have been misplaced, but they would like to retain their funding and move forward in future years to correct how they get their allocations.

Mr. Malinowski stated he recalled some talk about SERCO by Ms. Myers, but he did not recall there being a consensus by Council. He stated he stood by his statement that if they move to Tier IV, all Tier IV groups are then funded by the individual amounts provided by Council.

Ms. Myers recommended retaining SERCO in Tier III then.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to allocate \$72,895 for SERCO and they be retained in Tier III.

Mr. Malinowski stated if you refer to the previous year's budget, SERCO was a Tier IV group. Therefore, how can Council arbitrarily put them in Tier III. Their funding came from individual Council members. They did not receive separate funding.

Ms. Myers stated last year was an outlier year for SERCO and that was a part of the discussion. It was her belief that Council was moving through where SERCO belongs. They no longer fund the smaller agencies and this was their request to have their funding for this year remain to move forward in future years because they did not properly make a request in a different tier this year.

Mr. Pearce stated his problem lies with the ordinance. He distinctly remembers Council taking action on organizations that annually receive funding, which is created Tier III. It is his recollection that SERCO and the International Festival was in it, but he has not been able to locate documentation about Tier III. He further stated he understands Ms. Myers' position, but if SERCO thought they were in Tier III they didn't apply because that's why Tier III was created.

Ms. Dickerson stated she wanted Mr. Smith to clarify that there was an ordinance that addressed this matter. It is her recollection SERCO was put in Tier IV in an attempt to prevent double dipping.

Mr. Smith stated his office received a request from Mr. Malinowski in regard to an ordinance related to SERCO. The Legal Department searched their files and they were unable to find an ordinance. Legal then reached out to the Clerk's Office to research the minutes to determine if Council passed an ordinance. The Clerk's Office was also unable to locate an ordinance, but there was an MOU in 2009 that was entered into

where SERCO was given \$250,000 from Hospitality Tax for that fiscal year. In any subsequent years, the Council would make a determination as to their level of funding.

Mr. Pearce stated it would appear the appropriate motion to fund SERCO is the one made by Ms. Myers.

Mr. Livingston stated last year SERCO was treated like a Tier IV organization. He recalls giving a portion of his funds to them in the last fiscal year.

Mr. Pearce requested the Chair to rule on where this item would be appropriately voted on.

Ms. Dickerson ruled, based on Mr. Smith's explanation, this will be voted on from year to year.

Mr. Smith stated the MOU indicated whatever amount SERCO received would be subject to the availability of funds on a year to year basis.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund SERCO at \$72,895 under Tier III and if individual Council members wish they may allocate additional funding to make up the difference.

Mr. Malinowski stated if the Council does this it's almost like double dipping. This is a community outreach group and they do not carry any more weight than any of the other outreach groups listed.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to place SERCO in Tier IV and individual Council members may make allocations as they wish.

Mr. Livingston stated some of the agencies in Tier IV were voted on by Council and not just simply funded with Council member hospitality tax allocations. (i.e. Famously Hot New Year, Pinewood Lake Foundation, Gateway to the Army). Therefore, if a majority of Council believes SERCO should receive a certain amount then Council may want to vote on the item as a body.

Mr. Manning made a second substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund SERCO in Tier III at \$67,895.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Myers

The vote was in favor of the second substitute motion.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to allocate \$140,091 for the Columbia Metro CVB.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to allocate \$169,895 to the Columbia International Festival.

Mr. Malinowski stated the Columbia International Festival requested \$151,000, which is why the motion was approved earlier in the meeting to allocate an additional \$25,000. Therefore, he moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to allocate \$151,000 to the Columbia International Festival.

Mr. N. Jackson stated even though the International Festival requested \$151,000. When staff saw the participation and activities of the International Festival it was recommended to fund them at \$169,985.

Mr. Manning inquired if the original motion was for \$169,895.

Mr. Malinowski answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning stated he was in favor of staff's recommendation. If the International Festival requested \$151,000 and staff reviewed the request and recommended the organization receive additional funding he is going to assume staff has good reason for the recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the recommendation is by staff or a committee that looks at Hospitality Tax applications.

Mr. Seals stated the recommendation comes from staff. Staff generally went back 3 years and looked at the average funding for that time period to arrive at a recommendation.

Ms. Dickerson expressed concern an organization requesting an amount and staff recommending more than the funding request while not fully funding other organization's request.

Mr. Rose requested clarification on how the \$25,000 allocated earlier in the meeting factors into the Columbia International Festival's request. It would be his recommendation to fund them at the requested amount.

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

Mr. N. Jackson stated the additional \$25,000 the International Festival received is the same as the other organizations receiving additional funding.

As a point of clarification, Mr. Manning stated the ballets requested more funding than what was recommended for them to receive.

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

FOR
Pearce
Rose
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
McBride

AGAINST
N. Jackson
McBride

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to provide each Council member with \$164,395 to be distributed to qualifying Hospitality Tax organizations of their choosing.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there should be an additional \$75,000 available due to Pinewood Lake Foundation not receiving the \$75,000 in funding they requested. If the additional \$75,000 is divided among the 11 Council members that would be an additional \$6,818 for each Council member.

Mr. N. Jackson made a substitute motion to add \$6,818 to the \$164,000.

Mr. Pearce amended his motion to allocate \$1,883,345 to be divided evenly among the Council members and to then be distributed to qualifying Hospitality Tax organizations of their choosing.

Mr. Smith stated the issue with EdVenture was deferred until SERCO had been taken up.

Ms. Myers stated she is withdrawing her motion.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund the Famously Hot New Year's event at \$75,000.

Mr. Pearce inquired if Mr. Livingston's motion negated the \$75,000 additional funding available referenced by Mr. N. Jackson.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to codify into the biennium budget the Gateway to the Army at \$100,000 in FY18 & FY19.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
N. Jackson
Malinowski

The motion was not fully carried. Council members were unclear which motion they were voting on as there were three motions on the floor.

Mr. Pearce restated his motion to allocate \$1,883,345 to be divided evenly among the Council members and to then be distributed to qualifying Hospitality Tax organizations of their choosing.

Mr. Livingston stated he made his motion for the Famously Hot New Year event to be funded the same way it was in last year's budget and to leave the \$75,000 out of the allocation that is to be divided among the Council members. He inquired if Mr. Pearce would be willing to amend his motion to not include the \$75,000.

Mr. Pearce amended his motion to allocate \$1,808,345 to be divided among the Council members and to then be distributed to qualifying Hospitality Tax organizations of their choosing.

Mr. Manning requested a friendly amendment to reduce the amount by \$67,895 and move SERCO to Tier III.

Mr. Pearce accepted Mr. Manning's friendly amendment.

Mr. Livingston stated the \$67,895 should be added to the total and not subtracted.

Mr. Manning amended his friendly amendment to add \$67,895 to the amount of Hospitality Tax to be divided evenly amongst the Council members. In addition, to include an allocation of \$100,000 to the Gateway to the Army for FY18 and FY19.

Mr. Livingston stated funding for the Gateway to the Army is already included in the budget.

Mr. Manning made a friendly amendment to add an additional \$5,000 (SERCO – Tier III) to the overall Council allocation.

Mr. Pearce accepted the friendly amendment. The total to be allocated is \$1,813, 345.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor was unanimous to allocate \$1,813,345 to be divided equally among the Council members and to then be distributed to qualifying Hospitality Tax organizations of their choosing.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund the Famously Hot New Year's event at \$75,000 from Hospitality Tax fund balance.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if Famously Hot New Year could be funded from the Accommodations Tax fund.

The Chair stated Council voted to freeze the funding of the Accommodations Tax.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor was unanimous to fund Famously Hot New Year in the amount of \$75,000.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the Historic Preservation Grants recommendations listed on p. 154 of the budget book.

Ms. Myers pointed out there is a recommendation for funding for Historic Columbia and additional funding was allocated earlier in the meeting to this organization.

Mr. Pearce stated the funding allocated to Historic Columbia earlier in the meeting is for their operations. Whereas this is a grant for a project.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to where the funds for the historic grants are collected.

Mr. Seals stated the Conservation Commission receives ½ mill and is levied Countywide.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	N. Jackson
Rose	Malinowski
C. Jackson	Kennedy
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Myers	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of approving the Historic Preservation Grants recommendations.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the Community Conservation Grant recommendations listed on p. 156 in the budget book.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	N. Jackson
Rose	Malinowski
C. Jackson	Myers
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of approving the Community Conservation Grant recommendations.

Mr. Livingston requested to take up the Outside Agency requests listed on p. 137 of the budget book.

Mr. Pearce stated the only item listed on this page that needs to be taken up tonight is the Columbia Museum of Art, which is requesting \$250,000 to reinstall the original base exhibit.

Mr. Livingston requested to add EngenuitySC at \$45,000 to this section. They were funded from the Economic Development fund last year. In discussions with the Economic Development Director it was recommended only to fund them \$25,000 out of the Economic Development fund.

Ms. Kennedy requested staff to provide her an answer as to why the County is funding City projects.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there is an ordinance and/or policy not to spend more than 25% of the unincorporated Hospitality Tax funds in the City. Staff was requested to re-calculate the funding allocated to ensure the funding is being spent according to the rules of Council.

Mr. Malinowski requested a recommendation be provided for each organization prior to this item being taken up. In addition, the Hospitality Tax allocations currently equate to 75% being spent in the unincorporated area; therefore, if anything additional is to be spent there will need to be deductions to organizations located in the City.

Mr. Manning stated he does not have one registered vote in the City of Columbia; however, many of the school children in his district go to programs at EdVenture, Koger Center, etc. All though where the programs are held may be in the City does not mean that Hospitality Tax funding given to these organizations are only serving the City.

Ms. Myers stated focusing on the whole County and looking at our approach to how and where we spend money, as a policy matter, does not mean that people do not drive all over the County to go to events. It would be nice for the County to take the lead on making sure there are venues in other places across the County. She further stated the funding has been slightly imbalanced and the funding for the smaller entities will have to be funded through the Councilmembers individual appropriations or they will not be funded.

Mr. Pearce suggested those Councilmembers that have concerns review the ordinance that says the 75%/25% applies to the County Promotions portion of the budget and that requirement has been met. He further suggested if they wish to pursue the other parts of Hospitality Tax to make a motion and debate the issue.

Ms. Dickerson stated the organizations (i.e. EdVenture, Columbia Museum of Art, etc.) need to bring events out to the unincorporated area by coming into the schools, parks, etc.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the facilities in the unincorporated areas are visited by people from the City. People visit the sports complex on Garners Ferry Road, Adult Activity Center, and Pinewood Lake Park. The residents he has spoken with resent having the Hospitality Tax dollars collected in the unincorporated area being spent in the City, but the City does not spend Hospitality Tax funds in the unincorporated areas. He further stated he will be making a motion to address this issue in the future.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grant Award recommendations listed on p. 157 of the budget book.

Mr. Manning stated funds were appropriated based upon the recommendations by the Hospitality Tax and Accommodations Tax Committees for several organizations in the unincorporated area. The organizations are not only funded by what is allocated by the individual Council members.

Mr. Jackson made a substitute motion to add the Hickory Ridge Neighborhood Association, Rose Cliff Neighborhood, and St. Mark Wood Neighborhood Association in the amount of \$1,500 each.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION - Mr. Malinowski stated this was done years ago when Councilmembers came in making motions to fund all of these neighborhoods that did not take the time to apply. It was decided the last couple years not to fund those neighborhoods that did not take the time to apply. He further stated he did not want to hear it was a Councilman's prerogative to bring these in. It's a penalty to the ones that did apply.

Mr. Jackson stated it is his understanding Council members had an opportunity to send in a motion list for those things that fall through the crack. He also pointed out that until recently he was not aware neighborhoods in the City were eligible to receive funding.

Ms. Dickerson suggested Council members submit their motions to Administration prior to Third Reading and continue with what's before Council tonight.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grant Award recommendations.

Mr. Livingston inquired if any action needed to be taken on the items listed on p. 162 in the budget book.

Mr. Seals stated these items are grants the County departments are pursuing, but have not been received. The reason to put them in the budget is that Council will not have to come back each time, but would automatically move forward.

Mr. Livingston stated he was going to have to give this further thought. There may be commitments that he may or may not agree with. He stated his concern is there may be a grant that requires the County to continue to fund it at the end of the grant and he's not sure he wants to make a commitment without knowing that.

Mr. Seals stated Mr. Livingston's concerns are valid; however, as a matter of practicality this is the typical way it is done. It is brought to Council at budget time in anticipation of the funds being received. Expenditures cannot take place because it is specifically tied to the receipt of the monies. Council has options on how to proceed: (1) Not approve during the budget process and have the grant item come before Council to appropriate the funds; or (2) Ensure when the items come in there is a mechanism in place to report receipt to Council. Council will have the option at that time to not move forward with the grant or to proceed.

Mr. Livingston pointed out on p. 164 the following statement "Will request County funds to continue if grant funds become unavailable", which means the County will automatically continue the funding once the grant runs out. He stated he's not sure he wants to make that kind of commitment.

Mr. Malinowski moved to have the agencies bring these items to Council on an individual basis.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Livingston stated if voting to appropriate the funding will help move things faster he's willing to do that, but he would like to have the award of the individual grants come back to Council for a final vote prior to acceptance of the grant or expenditure of the funds.

Ms. McBride stated she does not think the County is legally bound to continue the funding once the grant has ended.

Mr. Seals stated that Ms. McBride's statement is generally true; however, there are some grants where there is a stipulation there will be an aggressive number of years the agency will take up funding. There are a few grants that are given conditionally on whether or not they will continue. He further stated he does not believe any of the grants listed fall into the two categories outlined.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to defer this to the budget meeting on May 30th.

FOR

Pearce
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Kennedy
Manning

AGAINST

The vote in favor of deferral was unanimous.

Mr. Jackson inquired if the items on pp. 134 – 137 are a part of the grants also.

Mr. Seals stated these are outside agencies that do not submit applications.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to fund the Sparkleberry County Fair, LR Sweet Potato Festival and Kingville Historical Foundation at \$30,000 each out of the Hospitality Tax fund balance.

Ms. Dickerson stated that has already been addressed.

Ms. Myers stated Council agreed that if Council members wished to make a motion they could and she wished to have the motion entertained.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if this was not in Tier IV, which has been taken up.

Ms. Myers stated these organizations were not approved. They will be approved if individual Council members find money to get them. Only one or two of the organizations were pulled out (i.e. Famously Hot).

Mr. Malinowski stated he realizes Ms. Myers was not here previously for the budget, but this is what starts individual Council members making motions for organizations in their districts. And before it's over Council has funded \$100,000 out of fund balance and the Council members still have their \$164,000 for other things.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to how much funding has been appropriated for these agencies.

Ms. Myers stated they are small amounts ranging from \$3,000 to \$11,000.

Mr. Pearce, Ms. Dickerson, and Mr. Livingston stated they give funding to the Kingville Historical Foundation each year. Mr. Pearce suggested Ms. Myers allow the Council members to make their Hospitality Tax allocations and see how much the organizations receive.

Ms. Myers stated she is amenable to that and withdrew her motion.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about p. 138 in the budget book.

The Chair ruled that those items will be taken up at the May 30th budget meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:24 PM.

X

Joyce Dickerson
Chairwoman

X

Bill Malinowski
Vice Chair

X

Calvin "Chip" Jackson
District Nine

X

Norman Jackson
District Eleven

X

Gwendolyn Kennedy
District Seven

X

Paul Livingston
District Four

X

Jim Manning
District Eight

X

Yvonne McBride
District Three

X

Dalhi Myers
District Ten

X

Greg Pearce
District Six

X

Seth Rose
District Five

The Minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley, Deputy Clerk of Council