



Richland County Council

3rd Reading – BUDGET MEETING
June 11, 2020 – 5:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Brad Farrar, Hayden Davis, Allen Brown, Randy Pruitt, Tommy DeLage, Ashley Powell, Ashiya Myers, Michelle Niermeier, Leonardo Brown, Marjorie King, James Hayes, Quinton Epps, Stacey Hamm, Tyler Kirk, Clayton Voignier, Angela Weathersby, Dale Welch, Kyle Holsclaw, Dwight Hanna, Michelle Onley and Kimberly Williams-Roberts

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.

Mr. Hayes stated we will be covering the Millage Agencies, Grant Recommendations (Discretionary Grants, Lump Sum Appropriations, County Grants – Coming into the County, Hospitality Tax, Accommodations Tax, Conservation and Neighborhood Grants), Special Revenue Fund, Transportation, Debt Service, Enterprise Fund, and the Capital Improvement Recommendations.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the motion list provided was erroneously labeled 2nd Reading, but it is for 3rd Reading.

2. **THIRD READING**

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (2nd Reading: \$14,833,254; Requested \$16,482,237)***

Ms. Newton stated it is her understanding that Midlands Technical College changed one of its request since 2nd Reading, and, if so, what would that reflect.

Mr. Hayes stated their original request was \$6,445,030, and their adjusted request is \$5,800,527.

Ms. McBride inquired if the motions list reflects a 10% reduction from 2nd Reading.

Mr. Hayes responded the aggregate total of the whole, from what the departments originally requested, was \$60.8M, and now the total requested is \$42.3M, which is more than a 10% reduction.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to accept the millage agencies request, based on the 10% reduction, with the exception of Columbia Area Mental Health. Given the circumstances with COVID-19, and other issues, and the low amount of funds Columbia Area Mental Health receives, that we fund them at the original amount.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to divide the question and take up Columbia Area Mental Health's funding separately.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, the total amount the millage agencies requested was \$460.8M, and the total request now is \$452.3M, which is a 1.8% reduction.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the proposed millage agency budgets, with the caveat that should our budget change, or we need to revise the budget, that we come back to the agency in the future.

Mr. Walker inquired if we have any real time data, as it pertains to the revenue side of our budget, which we could use to forecast, or understand better what the quantifiable impact of COVID-19 might be on the County's revenue.

Mr. Hayes requested Ms. Hamm to respond to Mr. Walker's question. He did note that General Fund, and the millage agencies, are heavily dependent on property taxes, which were received pre-pandemic. One of the issues has been the property tax category of taxable sales has been impacted.

Ms. Hamm responded we have not seen much of a turndown in the taxes because vehicles only make up about 14% of the overall taxes, which is the only tax revenue that has been affected. She noted the County received their first payment on the local option sales tax, and it was down about \$600,000 from where we normally are, which equates to about a 10% downturn. Going forward there may be a slight downturn of approximately 10 -20%.

Mr. Livingston stated he has had conversations with the Treasurer, homebuilders, and economic development professionals, and got much of the same information. The property tax revenue is the main driver of the funding we are discussing, and that has mostly been collected. He spoke to the Treasurer about the concern expressed regarding the sales, and he does not feel that will be a significant problem. It is clear to him there will not be a significant impact on the property tax revenue. In his conversations with the homebuilders, what was surprising is that April and May was more robust than last year, as it relates to home sales. There seems to be a minimal impact on overall property taxes, based on his feedback.

Ms. D. Myers noted the motion list says Richland District II submitted a no mill increase request. She inquired if every other millage agency's request would require a millage increase.

Mr. Hayes responded none of the agencies are requesting an amount that would require a millage increase. The millage will either remain the same, or even decrease.

Ms. D. Myers requested clarification on the notes section for Richland District II.

Mr. Hayes responded you will see on p. 124 of the Budget Book the amount requested is less for the Recreation Commission, Columbia Area Mental Health, Public Library, Riverbanks Zoo, and Midlands Tech than what a no mill increase would be.

Mr. Manning stated he is nervous about the motion on the floor. He is okay with the first part of the motion, but not the part of placing a caveat in there that if things change we could come back and revisit it. He believes that is the option of Council any time, without that being in a motion. If we do not put that in every motion tonight, could we get in a legal bind, if we want to adjust something else, but our minutes will reflect that we noted, for the millage agencies, we would do that, but no one chose to have that wording elsewhere.

Mr. Livingston requested a representative from Legal to address Mr. Manning's question.

Mr. Manning stated he is surprised this issue has never been raised before. He thinks we when have these meetings Legal needs to be invited to join us.

Ms. Roberts indicated that Mr. Farrar was on the line and got disconnected. She noted that he is attempting to reconnect.

Mr. Farrar stated implicit in every motion is that you can revisit it as circumstances change. You have the authority to make budget amendments, supplementals, so you do not need to include the caveat language. If you do it for one, you need to do it for all, but you should not do it for any. He also noted although there have been technical difficulties with participating in the meetings, Legal has been monitoring them.

Ms. Newton amended her motion to approve the millage agencies, with the exception of Columbia Area Mental Health, as presented. Ms. McBride seconded the motion.

Mr. Jackson requested verification that one of the huge influxes of property taxes, which will be starting this year, is from the Jushi plant.

Mr. A. Brown responded the County does expect tax revenue from Jushi this year. Unfortunately, we do not have an estimate, at this time, but an estimate should be available in the next couple months.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 2. Columbia Area Mental Health (2nd Reading: \$2,196,520; Requested: \$2,311,994)** – Ms. McBride moved, Mr. Livingston, to fund Columbia Area Mental Health at the original request of \$2,311,994.

Ms. Terracio inquired if they were originally requesting the no mill increase amount of \$2,311,994.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative, and then they amended it down to \$2,196,520.

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, we are now considering the FY20-21 no mill increase amount.

Ms. McBride responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the new amount will not require a millage increase.

Mr. Hayes responded their millage is so small that their no mill increase was the same as the cap.

Mr. Walker made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund Columbia Area Mental Health at the requested amount of \$2,196,520.

Ms. Terracio inquired if we have someone from Columbia Area Mental Health that can explain what the difference between the no mill increase and the FY21 amended requested amount would represent in their budget, in terms of staffing and services they will be able to provide.

The Administrator, Mr. Stephen Hatrich, Administrator, stated they have over 8 clinic sites in Richland County. Their total budget is \$17.4M, and for only Richland County it is \$16.1M. The clinic located at Hampton Street alone is \$1.9M so far this year.

Ms. Terracio inquired about what percentage of the budget Richland County's contribution represents.

Mr. Hatrich responded it would be approximately 10%.

Mr. Manning stated Mr. Pearce used to always keep us apprised of mental health services being provided at Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center, which has been important to County operations. He inquired if that is still the case.

Ms. Denise Morgan, Executive Director of Columbia Area Mental Health, stated they still do outreach and are available to the Detention Center. They do not currently have imbedded staff, as they did previously, but that was the decision of Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center. However, if inmates are released, or need any kind of mental health services, our emergency services department is open to them. If they can transport the inmate, we will see them for evaluation or medication evaluation.

Mr. Manning stated he is curious if the decision to discontinue those services went through the Detention Center Ad Hoc Committee. He stated he did not recall that coming to full Council, even as an item for information.

Ms. D. Myers responded it did not come before the committee; therefore, they did not address it.

Ms. Newton stated she fully support mental health, and understand that mental health is especially critical right now. Her concern is that we have so many additional budget requests that are coming in an environment of uncertainty. She would rather have us see if we can support it at the requested amount, and there may be some other places in the budget where we can find funds and come back. As she has talked to agencies, every agency has indicated they are having increased expenses during this critical time, and she has requested them to share the load. She would entertain revisiting the amount at a later date when we have a firmer grip on our numbers.

Ms. McBride inquired about the clients that are mostly served.

Ms. Morgan responded we serve the residents of Richland County. She noted that because they are a healthcare agency they have not closed their doors. We have staff that is telecommuting from home, and we still have plenty of staff that are working in the 8 clinics throughout the County.

Ms. McBride inquired if Ms. Morgan would say if many of the clients served were underserved residents.

Ms. Morgan responded in the affirmative.

Special Called Meeting

June 11, 2020

Ms. McBride quoted Jim Clyburn, as follows: "A budget is more than expression of policies. It is a statement of moral principles." Right now we are dealing with more than equity. In fact, we are doing an inequity because it has never been funded at the level it should have been funded. More than ever, we need mental health services for those individuals who barely have access to them. To even think about not funding this at the requested level is unthinkable.

Mr. Livingston stated it is his intent to support this motion because of the uncertainties because the uncertainties is what is going to have a significant impact on our residents' mental health. He is not a strong supporter of across the board cuts because needs vary in different areas, and the need is greater in this particular area.

Mr. Walker stated, for the record, his motion is to fund Columbia Area Mental Health at the newly requested level.

Ms. Newton stated, again, she agrees with the importance of mental health. She believes there are other areas in the budget that can be trimmed where monies could perhaps be redirected here. Her question is, from a procedural perspective, once we approve the millage agencies, what is the mechanism, when we get to other areas of the budget, where we could say these funds could be redirected to Columbia Area Mental Health.

Mr. Livingston responded that would simply be a matter of a Council member making a motion to that effect.

Mr. Hayes stated, if he understands Ms. Newton's question correctly, he believes she is asking, from a procedural standpoint, if you were to approve Columbia Area Mental Health at \$2,196,520, could you direct funds elsewhere in the budget to make up the difference. He stated there is a precedence for that. The Public Library requested funds that were outside of the millage, and you funded them through the General Fund.

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

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, Manning and Myers

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Manning inquired if the general public is able to view the meeting and the screens that he is looking at.

Ms. Roberts responded citizens are able to view the meeting via livestream on the County's YouTube channel, but do not have access to be participants to the actual meeting.

Mr. Manning stated if we are going to have participants, and not general public, we have things like iPhone. He sees a State flag that says Utilities. He is guessing that is the Utilities Department of the State of South Carolina. We have first names. We have telephone numbers. He thinks if this is a formal be a part of this, but you are not the public, he thinks the public, and the other participants who have the ability to be a part of this should be identified.

Mr. Livingston requested anyone participating in the meeting that is not a Council member or staff to identify themselves.

Mr. Manning stated he believes the host has the ability to enter their names when they identify themselves.

Ms. Roberts responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning moved that we drop Donzetta and iPhone2 who have not been identified.

Mr. Livingston responded, if they cannot identify themselves, he is okay with dropping them.

POINT OF ORDER: Ms. D. Myers stated she thinks that motion would contradict that this is a public meeting, and when we generally have public meetings nobody has to sign in to identify themselves.

Mr. Manning stated, when he started, he asked if this is a public meeting, and if the public could come onto this. The answer was no. So, this is not the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Livingston stated this is not denying the public an opportunity.

Mr. Manning stated this is whoever we gave permission, but now we cannot figure out who they are, and they are not identifying themselves.

Ms. D. Myers stated we are a public body, and the information ought to be in the public domain. If people came into the Chambers and did not want to say their names, we would not ask them out.

Mr. Manning responded he is trying to get these 2 people in the public domain because the public is not allowed to see who these 2 people, who we, the County government staff, gave access to be here. The general public cannot be here.

Mr. Farrar stated this is a public meeting, so unless Council has gone into Executive Session, anybody should be able to dial in and listen to.

Mr. Manning stated he is requesting that we give access to this to the public because the public has not been given access to come into this Zoom room. We need to broadcast everywhere PIO puts information out the way for anyone to come into this current Zoom room. Until that occurs, we should not continue this meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated, if he understands this correctly, there are 2 format to access this meeting. For example, there were 2 formats for him to access the most recent Public Service Commission's meeting. He signed up to have the ability to speak to the Commission, and they gave him a separate access code for the Zoom meeting. It was a public meeting, but the public who were listening, and not participating, were given a different number (i.e. our livestream). It did not take away the public's ability to have access to the meeting, but it did restrict the public from having access to conversation and participating with the Commission. Only those who were given special permission were able to do so. He thought that was why we have this streaming live, so the public would have access to the public meeting, and the Zoom portion would be restricted to those to whom it was germane to speak to Council.

Mr. Livingston stated, if this was a regular budget work session in Chambers, and this is not a public hearing, those individuals would not have had an opportunity to participate. To move along, he requested Ms. Roberts to remove those individuals we could not recognize, and they can come on and listen as the other residents of Richland County.

3. **Public Library (2nd Reading: \$27,855,839; Requested: \$30,504,534)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.
4. **Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (2nd Reading: \$2,222,100; Requested: \$2,370,000)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.
5. **Midlands Technical College – Operating (2nd Reading: \$5,800,527; Requested: \$6,445,030)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.
6. **Midlands Technical College – Capital (2nd Reading: \$3,590,858)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.
7. **School District One (2nd Reading: \$234,746,954; Requested: \$238,077,254)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.
8. **School District Two (2nd Reading: \$161,106,497; Requested: No Mill Increase)** – This item was approved in the motion for Item #1.

GRANTS

9. **Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$320,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated this item and Item #32 can be taken up together. As you may recall, because of the pandemic and the reduction in Accommodations Tax revenue, we are requesting to reduce the budget for Accommodations Tax from \$565,000 to \$320,000. The recommendations from the Accommodation Committee total the \$320,000 and can be found in the Budget Book on pp. 52-58.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve staff's recommendation for Items # 9 and 32.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Walker and Myers

Abstain: Terracio

The vote was in favor.

10. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for the Ordinance Agencies; \$1,921,186)** – Mr. Hayes stated the Ordinance Agencies are as follows: Columbia Museum of Art, Historic Columbia, EdVenture and Township Auditorium. The Columbia Museum amount, which is \$890,872, included an additional \$125,000 that was recommended by former Councilman Pearce, and approved by Council. The funding was only for FY19-20. The amount would actually be \$765,872, if it were taken back to its original amount.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the funding levels referenced by Mr. Hayes, with the exception of the Columbia Museum of Art, and to fund them at \$765,872.

Ms. Newton inquired if Mr. Hayes was referencing to the original Budget Book.

Mr. Hayes responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired if the \$125,000 reduction get us to the FY21 recommended, or is the \$125,000 taken from the FY21 recommendation.

Mr. Manning responded the \$125,000 is a reduction from the FY21 recommendation.

Ms. Newton stated, as we look at approving the budget, there are some items where we changed our calendar and will be revisiting them in them in September. There are other items that we are having 3rd Reading on now because we are obligated to do so. She knows the millage agencies fell into that category. She inquired if the Accommodations Tax, Hospitality Tax and Grants fall into that same category where we are statutorily obligated to approve them now.

Mr. Hayes responded he does not think there is a statutory reason, but we generally notify the groups in July of their budget amount.

Ms. Newton stated she wants to understand what other items fall into the category that we have to do now, and we cannot delay them for better numbers.

Mr. Farrar inquired about what was going to be taken up in September.

Mr. Hayes stated all of the funds have been approved by Council in the Biennium, with the exception of the millage agencies. In the Fall, Council will be considering an amendment to the General Fund Budget, and associated items that are impacted by the General Fund (i.e. Victim's Assistance and School Resource Officers).

Mr. Farrar stated Council needs to get the budget in place by the end of this month. What you are doing tonight are all the required things. You do not want to put off to September things that you have to do right now, which is what you are taking up tonight.

Ms. Newton requested more specificity to make sure she is understanding Mr. Farrar's response. She stated we do have to approve the budget. Her question is what items are we required to approve right now, and what are things that are a part of the budget, but we have an option to approve later. As she mentioned earlier, there are many cases where we do not know what is going to happen, and what is going to be coming in. We are going to be coming back to the budget in a few months anyway, so she wants to be clear on the things that have to be approved right now, and what are optional.

Mr. Farrar stated under Sec. 4-9-140 it says, "County council shall adopt annually and prior to the beginning of the fiscal year operating and capital budgets for the operation of county government and shall in such budgets identify the sources of anticipated revenue including taxes necessary to meet the financial requirements of the budgets adopted. Council shall further provide for the levy and collection of taxes necessary to meet all budget requirements except as provided for by other revenue sources." He stated you need to make sure what you are doing in September is not impacted by this. This is budget time, and you have to get this done before the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Newton stated she does not know if Hospitality Tax or Lump Sum Appropriations would be determined as essential for the operation of County government. They are by definition discretionary funds that we are approving, as opposed to the required funds.

Mr. Farrar stated, if you take the position that this is not a part of the operating and capital budget, but you would also need to identify anticipated sources of revenue to meet the financial

requirements of the budgets adopted. If you are going to put things in the budget for various agencies, they need to be identified and adopted during this process.

Mr. Hayes stated Council has approved the funding level for Hospitality Tax in the Biennium budget. What you would be doing tonight is approving funding for specific groups within that. To answer Ms. Newton's question about what needs to take place tonight, in his understanding, by ordinance, you need to pass the Transportation Tax Project Budget. Then, there is a budget amount for the Utilities Enterprise Fund in place, but because of some revenue differences that amount needs to be addressed.

Ms. Newton stated she was under the impression we were going to also going to be talking about Lump Sum Appropriations, which would not be essential to the functioning of the County, and would not need to be voted on tonight.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, Mr. Hayes' intent was for us to vote on the Lump Sum Appropriations tonight.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the Township Auditorium received any recovery money. In addition, she would like to hear from the liaison, or a representative, for the Columbia Museum of Art about the impact the \$125,000 reduction would have on them.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Mr. Manning has requested that reduction because it is a reduction of funds they are not entitled to. He is correcting the record regardless of what impact that would have on them.

Mr. Manning stated, as one of the liaisons to the Township Auditorium, they had a board meeting, by Zoom, yesterday, and that was a question he asked. He inquired if the people from TetraTech, and the team looking at this been in contact with them, and the answer was no. So, we do not know, at this point, what opportunities there may be for them because the County, and our outside consultant has not gotten to them.

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

Opposed: Walker and Myers

The vote was in favor.

11. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee recommendations; \$500,000)** – Mr. Hayes stated the Hospitality Tax Committee recommendations can be found on pp. 61-72 in the Budget Book.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, there are additional items on p. 60 of the Budget Book. He inquired if those items need to be voted on.

Mr. Hayes responded those items will be covered in subsequent items.

Mr. Manning moved to approve staff's recommendation for the total amount recommended by the Hospitality Tax Committee.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to remove Hospitality Tax in Richland County.

Mr. Jackson made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Walker, that all budgetary items, from this point forward, with the exception of Special Revenue, be funded at the current level.

Mr. Jackson stated he has said it since the first budget meeting, since we cannot do a continuing resolution, which, in his opinion, would have been the most appropriate thing, and since we do not know what revenues are going to look like, and it appears we are making approvals with expectation of funds we do not know if we will get, it only makes sense that we should not be funding projects, or programs, at any level beyond the existing level, until we have a better idea of our financial stability.

Ms. Terracio stated she cannot look at the Council Hospitality Tax discretionary funding, without questioning that line item, at this point. She would like to see the number reduced in a way that would be more reflective of our current reality.

Mr. Jackson accepted the friendly amendment and requested the amount be reduced by 50%.

Ms. Newton stated she agrees with the spirit of the motion, which is not making large financial decisions for which we may not have the revenue. She inquired if we say we are going to keep it at the current level, but we are anticipating the funds that come in will actually be lower than where we are at the current level, do we position ourselves equally for running into a difficult situation. Or from a numbers perspective what would that mean if we kept it at the current level.

Mr. Jackson responded he was responding to a motion that was made and seconded that was about to approve them at the new level. In order to be more fiscally responsible, he recommended that we not approve the new level, but at the current fiscal year's level.

Ms. Newton inquired what the difference between the current level and the new recommended level would be.

Mr. Hayes responded, if you look on p. 60 of the Budget Book, the same amount recommended for FY20 is the same amount recommended for FY21. We did not alter any amounts. As a fact, the committee recommendations are still \$500,000. So, keeping it at the funding level is what the recommendation is. The only thing you are doing is approving the allocations for the groups, but the funding amounts were not increased at all. In terms of concerns about revenue, which is a legitimate concern, we did not reduce the amount for the Hospitality Tax Committee recommendations, even with a potential dip in revenue, because the Hospitality Tax currently enjoys a strong fund balance, we were confident any reduction in revenue could be offset by the Hospitality Tax Fund Balance.

Mr. Jackson stated what bothers him greatly is that we would even consider, in this pandemic climate we are in, using the fund balance for anything other than an emergency. He was prepared to recommend that all fund balances be frozen, and be held in abeyance, in the event that there was another pandemic outbreak, which seems to be happening right now in the County, and the State. That we would have funds to reallocate to assist our citizens, rather than loading up ourselves with a lot of dollars for discretionary spending, and not be able to meet a need that looks like might be inevitable. To suggest that we would use our fund balance for anything, other than an emergency does not seem to make good fiscal sense. He stated this is just a temporary pause, on any increases, until we know what the revenues are going to look like. He is not asking us to revert back to previous years. He is simply asking that we put a pause on it, until we have a better comprehension of where we are going to be in terms of the revenue dollars.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it is his understanding that Hospitality Tax and Accommodations Tax can only be used for specific items, and we are not allowed to transfer those over to any other use. It is strictly for hospitality-related matters, correct?

Mr. Hayes responded Hospitality Tax funds must be used for tourism-related items. Hospitality Tax, as you can see on Item #19 of the motion list, was a part of the funding level last year. Council approved the transfer out of \$4,485,000. Three million of that was to support the General Fund, and was to support public safety related expenditures, associated with tourism. Then there is the \$1.4M that is transferred to a debt service fund to repay a refunding H-Tax bond. Those items were approved in FY21, as a part of the total funding level.

Mr. Jackson stated, for clarification, his motion was not to use fund balance to support anything. He simply responded to what Mr. Hayes had mentioned. His motion was not to allow any increases, but to maintain the current level of funding, and, with the recommendation of his colleague, Ms. Terracio, to reduce the H-Tax Councilmember discretionary dollars by 50%.

Mr. Hayes stated on p. 94 of the Budget Book there is a funding breakdown that we projected for H-Tax, and could certainly change because of the pandemic. The revenue projections remained the same of \$7.4M, and there is \$2.6M reserved for use of fund balance, for a total of \$10.15M. What we were saying is that if the \$7.4M was not realized because of the pandemic, the \$2.6M could sustain an increase because it was a strong fund balance.

Mr. Jackson stated, again, for clarification, he is recommending that we not have that on the table for consideration. That if we recognize anticipating \$7.4M, we let that be the total and not have the door open for subsidizing the amount.

Mr. Manning inquired if we have clarified, as we have done in the past, about rollover funding for the agencies and the Council members' discretionary H-Tax funds.

Mr. Hayes responded, historically, a Council member has made a motion to effect that. In order for us to do that, a motion would have to be made tonight so that any unallocated H-Tax funds by a Council member, plus any unexpended grants funds, can be rolled over.

Mr. Manning stated he has a problem supporting the motion, as it is now, on the premise that because of the situation we are in, and the uncertainty about the funding, because this Council made the decision that even though the H-Tax has been collected, the people did not have to remit it. So, we put ourselves in a position to where we do not have any idea what the situation is. If voting on this motion is based on a premise of something that we are guessing, but we are only guessing because we made the decision to not know, he believes he is going to have to vote against the motion on a premise.

Mr. Jackson stated the motion is to reduce the Councilmembers' H-Tax by 50%, which equates to \$900,000.

Mr. Manning responded he understands, and respects that, it was just that it was stated, with the times, and that we do not know. Well there is a reason we do not know. We forced ourselves not to know because the money is there. It has been collected. We just said, "You can keep it." So, we will not know when we are doing the budget, but the money is there. The answer is there. We chose for us not to have the answer.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, if the recommendation, for reduction, applies only to the Council H-Tax, or all of the recipient agencies.

Mr. Jackson responded he was responding to Ms. Terracio's request. She did not give a figure, so he gave the figure of 50%. He has to assume Ms. Terracio was only talking about the Councilmembers' H-Tax allocation.

Ms. Terracio responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to divide the question.

In Favor: McBride, Terracio, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Livingston, Walker, Kennedy, Manning and Jackson

The motion to divide the question failed.

Ms. Newton inquired, if we vote yes on this motion, what effect will that have on our Lump Sum Appropriations. And, if the funds are held until we make some other determination.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, he thought we were only dealing with the Hospitality Tax groups. He inquired if this motion is impacting the Lump Sum Appropriations, as well.

Ms. Newton responded it was her impression the motion would affect the Lump Sum Appropriations.

Mr. Jackson stated his motion was to approve a budget for all remaining categories at the current fiscal year's approved funding level, with the exception of the Special Revenue Fund. As a part of that, to reduce the Council's discretionary H-Tax allocation by 50%.

Mr. Hayes responded, since the Lump Sum Appropriations are in the General Fund, if Council were to keep those at the current approved amount, that amount is actually more than the recommended amount, with the 10% reduction.

Ms. Newton inquired, since we are addressing the General Fund in September, are you saying we would make those final determinations then, so it does not really matter tonight.

Mr. Hayes responded we put the Lump Sum before Council tonight because those groups usually receive their budget amounts approved in July. If Council desires to hold that back, as a part of the General Fund discussion, the groups would not be notified of their awards until October.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, that was a part of Mr. Jackson's motion.

Mr. Jackson responded in the affirmative, and with the understanding that on paper it says it is greater than they are requesting, but that is still going to be decided in the Fall.

Mr. Livingston stated, remember now, staff recommended the Lump Sum, but they are recommending a 10% decrease in funding.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, this motion is basically throwing out the Administrator's recommendation for the lower amounts, and keeping it the same as last year's amounts.

Special Called Meeting

June 11, 2020

Mr. Livingston responded the 10% reduction only affects the Lump Sum Appropriations. The other amounts are the same.

Ms. Newton stated we would be holding it until we have the General Fund conversation, so it appears more on paper, but in reality those funds would not be dispersed, and when we have the real numbers we would be able to adjust them.

Mr. Brown responded that is his understanding. Council has the ability, at a later date, to amend its decision. So, the actions you are taking now, you would be able to come back with more data, more numbers at the end of the fiscal year, and make a decision, based on the data you have received at the start of the next year, and the end of this year to make a more sound decision.

Mr. Walker inquired, if Mr. Brown is in favor, or would he support the motion as presented by Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Manning and Newton

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, for Items #11, 20, 21 and 22, he is presupposing that would account for the groups being different.

Mr. Livingston affirmed that the groups recommended were approved under Mr. Jackson's substitute motion.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, that unexpended H-Tax funding allocated for FY20 be rolled into FY21.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the funding, for a group that was unable to hold their event, would be rolled over, as well.

Mr. Manning responded in the affirmative. His motion is for all unexpended funding in H-Tax for FY20 be rolled over into FY21.

Mr. Hayes stated normally we do groups, but there is a funding for the reserve account. He inquired if Mr. Manning's motion included the reserve fund account.

Mr. Manning responded he was not including what was in the reserve fund.

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

Opposed: Walker and Jackson

The vote was in favor.

12. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of recommended funding level for Special Promotions Agencies at FY18 level; \$255,091)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
13. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO – Tier 3 – funding level; \$67,895)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
14. **Approval of Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project (\$250,000)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
15. **Approval of Historical Corridor funding level (\$372,715)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
16. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of Famously Hot New Year – Tier 3 – funding level; \$75,000)** –
17. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax allocations funding level; \$1,813,350)** –
18. **Hospitality Tax (Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level; \$150,000)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
19. **Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level/Cost Allocation; \$4,485,000)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
20. **Community Conservation Grants (RCCC Community Conservation Grants; \$42,439) – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]**

This item was approved in Item #11.

Ms. Terracio inquired if there would have been any FY20 grants that would need to be rolled over into FY21.

Mr. Voignier responded there were 4 grants that needed to be rolled over.

Ms. Terracio inquired if Mr. Voignier needed a motion in order to do that.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Epps stated, for clarification, there were 6 grants, which totaled \$26,824 that needed to be rolled over.

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to roll over the 6 grants, at a total of \$26, 824, from FY20 to FY21.

Mr. Jackson stated he thought his motion he made earlier, and was approved, was a motion to cover all of the budget requests, with the exception of the Special Revenue Funds, at the current year's level of funding. He is not sure what we are now discussing, in regards to roll over dollars, based upon the motion that passed.

Mr. Livingston responded, even with Mr. Jackson's motion, we had a separate motion on rollover dollars. So, this is not current budget monies, this is rollover dollars.

Mr. Manning inquired if this was a staff recommendation to roll this over.

Mr. Voignier responded it was a request made by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Manning inquired if it was in the budget document, as such.

Mr. Voignier responded it was a separate document that was provided to Council by the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Newton stated she received some outreach from organizations that were in the middle of working on programs that had to be paused because of COVID-19, and they were not able to continue their work. She wanted to make sure that approving this motion is what effectively allows them to continue that work that was approved.

Mr. Voignier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is not sure now that he understands what the one motion was earlier. He thought Mr. Jackson's motion was for everything, with the wording "except Special Revenue".

Mr. Jackson responded that it was.

Mr. Livingston stated we did pull out Special Revenue, but we voted separately on the rollover part.

Mr. Jackson responded that his motion came after that.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, that we made a separate motion, when we talked about rolling over Hospitality funding.

Mr. Jackson responded that his motion came after that.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, what Mr. Jackson is saying is that his motion came after that and incorporated what we are discussing now.

Mr. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Hayes stated there are still some items that need to be covered, before we adjourn. We need to address the Transportation Tax, because those are project budgets, and Debt Service. The reason there is some confusion on his part is, if he is understanding Mr. Jackson's motion, the motion was to keep everything at the current FY20 amount. There are some items, like debt service, which are not at the FY20 level, which need to be addressed.

Mr. Jackson stated, he thinks Mr. Hayes needs to identify which ones those are specifically.

Mr. Hayes responded Item #23 – County Grants, which are grants coming into the County, so we would request Council to take action on those them. Many of those grants have a start date in October, so some of them could be pushed back until September, but we did highlight for Council the grants that start in July. In order for the County to receive those funds, Council would have to take action on those grants.

21. *Historic Grants (RCCC Recommended Historic Preservation Grants; \$207,561) – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]*

This item was approved in Item #11.

22. *Neighborhood Redevelopment Grants (Neighborhood Improvement Matching Grants Committee; \$77,146)* – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]

This item was approved in Item #11.

23. *Grants (Approve grants departments are applying for; \$1,017,603)* – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve staff’s recommendation.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the motion was to approve the recommended grants. She noted while she is delighted for us to receive these funds, she wants to make sure that we are not on the hook for future years of grants, where it says they would make a future request to County. Her recollection from the previous budget is that when we approve these grants request, the approval was to make the match for one year. She inquired if that is the intent of this motion, and that we are not agreeing to take on the personnel costs in perpetuity.

Mr. Hayes responded on pp. 86-92 it tells you if the grant requires a position pickup, and it appears the ones that start in July do not have any positions that require pickup.

Ms. Newton stated there is one on p. 88, from the Sheriff’s Department, where it is highlighted no, but the grant requires position pickup. Under the financial impact to the County, once the grant is complete, it says, “will request County funds to continue, if State funds become unavailable.” She just wants to make sure the motion is only approving the one-time cash match, and not making a financial agreement in perpetuity.

Mr. Hayes responded it does say, “will request County funds”, but it is not required.

Mr. Malinowski stated it is easy for them to say, when the grant ends, they will request County funds to continue that position. He also agrees that we need to be perfectly clear on that, and when grants are over they should not be coming to the County asking for funding to continue the particular personnel costs, especially now when we are trying to cut back because we do not know where we are going. Any grants that require a pickup, we should not approving. And, any grants that would be requiring additional County funding, at the end of that year, we should not be approving, unless the requesting entity is willing to say they will not request additional funding when the grant is over.

Ms. McBride stated we are not obligated to fund a position. That would still need to come back before Council; therefore, there is no future obligation.

Mr. Brown stated, in the example that was used on p. 88, it his understanding is that is body worn cameras. It is his understanding there is a mandate, issued by the State, for that to be utilized by law enforcement. If that is the case, while he understands that we do not want to approve things that require a pickup, but if the State is going to mandate the use anyway, and they are giving dollars right now, in that particular situation, that is not something that you would be able to decline, in terms of responsibility.

Ms. Terracio stated her motion to roll over the grants from the Conservation Commission was never voted on.

Mr. Livingston stated, it was his understanding that was included in Mr. Jackson’s motion; therefore, there was no need to take action on it.

Ms. Terracio stated she will be voting no these grants simply because she sees a lot of items here for things like School Resource Officers, body armor, and things like that. At this point, she knows we

are not expending dollars, but grants we are receiving, but she has to fundamentally disagree with a lot of these items, in terms of bringing more law enforcement into schools. She thinks we could do better bringing different kinds of resources into our schools.

Mr. Malinowski stated, when it is time to vote on this item, he would like to ensure that any grants that are approved do not include any grants that are under the column "Number of Continuation Positions". All those should not be considered at this time. As far as body worn cameras, unless things have changed, he is not sure that is something we must do or not.

Ms. McBride stated she does not understand Mr. Malinowski's motion.

Mr. Malinowski stated he wanted to make a friendly amendment that states that the grants can be approved, with the exception of grants that require a continuation of positions when the grant is over.

Ms. McBride stated they cannot require a continuation of a position. They can ask that you continue it, but they cannot require it.

Mr. Malinowski stated he wants to make sure they cannot, because there is an awful lot of positions in there, which say they must be picked up as a requirement of the grant.

Ms. McBride stated the grant can ask you to support picking you up, but they cannot require you because they cannot force you to do anything after the grant ends.

Mr. Hayes stated the Grant Accountant is on the line, and she can address this.

Ms. Marjorie King stated these are grants that we have been using for quite a few years, and they do ask that we keep these persons on staff, as they are helpful in the minority and lower income populations. She is not aware of any that are new; therefore, she asked for clarification of what Mr. Malinowski's concern is.

Mr. Malinowski responded he is looking at these like they are first-time grants, and that we are required to pick up positions. He stated there are probably 10-12 positions that we are required to pick up. In his reading of this, we are not funding these positions now, but at the end of the grant cycle we would be required to add funding for those positions. In the situation we are in, with trying to tighten the belt, he does not know why we would consider adding more employees, in order to spend more, when we possibly do not have it.

Ms. McBride stated she has been working with grants for years. They can ask for your support, and commitment, but they cannot mandate that you hire.

Ms. King responded she will do some further research on this, and include it in the document that follows this meeting.

Chief Cowan stated, in reference to the grants, most of the grants you are talking about are continuation grants. They are things that have been going on for several years, and we are asking that they be approved year to year. If there is personnel, as the clarity was stated earlier, the specific verbiage was placed in there, that if a position is needed, we would have to come back to Council and get approval. The grants we are speaking about are related to continuation grants, and grants that are not requiring additional positions to the County, at this point and time. As far as the body cameras are concerned, those are mandated by law. They do get supplemental funding from the

State to offset some of those costs. Again, that is a continuation of a program Council voted on to enact, when the State mandated body cameras for transparency in law enforcement.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the ones that are highlighted in yellow are the ones that do not require us to pick up positions.

Mr. Hayes responded since we are calculating the General Fund later, we highlighted the ones that did need Council's attention tonight because those grants would begin in July. The other ones, which have later start dates, Council can take up in the Fall.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to accept the grants, as recommended by staff.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, Ms. McBride's motion is to approve all of the grant requests.

Ms. McBride responded only those that we will not have time to come back to approve, and do not require positions.

Ms. Newton stated, if all of these grants were approved, the cash match would exceed what we have budgeted in the line item.

Mr. Hayes responded the Transportation Fund would handle its portion. If the Airport Fund has the ability, those grants would be supported by them. Often they receive funds from the General Fund. The total amount impacted by the General Fund would be \$745,882. Currently, we have budgeted \$400,000. A lot of times, because of the timing of when a grant comes in, or if a grant is accepted, we do have enough matching funds to cover it, but Ms. Newton is correct. At this point and time, the \$745,000 required would be higher than what we have budgeted in the General Fund, which is why he separated them out from what would be entertained now versus what could be entertained later, once Council took up the General Fund.

Ms. Newton inquired, historically, when we are looking at this, do we tend to come in under this number. She would feel uncomfortable obligating the General Fund for funds that we do not have a source for.

Mr. Hayes responded, historically, depending on the timing when the match is needed, or if the grant is actually accepted, we have been able to sustain what we currently have in the match.

Ms. McBride amended her motion to approve the grants that are highlighted in staff recommendation. Mr. Livingston seconded the motion.

Mr. Malinowski inquired where the figures Mr. Hayes provided can be found in the Budget Book.

Mr. Hayes responded on p. 91 of the "revised" Budget Book is the Cash Match page. He simply took out the matching portion for the Transportation.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Manning and Terracio

The vote was in favor.

GENERAL FUND

24. **County Departments (Approve as presented in budget work sessions; FY1 - \$177,913,578)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
25. **Transfer Out (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; FY21 - \$8,787,488)** – This item was approved in Item #11.
26. **Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations; \$160,000 in new recommendations, and \$40,000 in multi-year grants approved in prior years)** – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]

This item was approved in Item #11.

27. **Contractual & Statutory Grant – Central Midlands COG, City Center Partnership, LRADAC (Approve as presented in Budget Work Sessions; \$842,477)** – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]

This item was approved in Item #11.

28. **LumpSum Allocations (Base amount approved FY21; \$2,110,828)** – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]

This item was approved in Item #11.

- 28(A). **Various (To allocate LumpSum funding to various groups that have historically been funded in multiple funds: \$53,000 – Chamber of Commerce for BRAC; \$20,000 – for Congaree River Keeper; \$42,900 – Keep the Midlands Beautiful; and \$55,000 – River Alliance; 2nd Reading: \$170,900)** – [THIS ITEM WAS RECONSIDERED AT THE JUNE 16, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING]

This item was approved in Item #11.

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

29. **Victim's Rights (Allocate funding to approve Victims Assistance Budget; FY21 - \$931,021)** – No action needed at this time.
30. **Fire Service (Allocate funding to approve Fire Service Budget; FY21 - \$29,049,480)** – No action needed at this time.
31. **Hospitality Tax (Allocate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget; FY21 - \$10,015,237)** – Funding level already approved.
32. **Accommodations Tax (Allocate funding to approve Accommodation Tax Budget; FY21 - \$320,000)** – Approved as discussed at the Budget Work Session.
33. **Transportation Tax (Allocate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget; FY21 - \$69,000,000)** – Mr. Niermeier stated the anticipated revenue is \$69,000,000. They anticipated a rollover amount of \$24,310,020, which will tend to trend down since we have been making payments, and the rollover of the \$78,384,670.67. The request for new money for next year is \$85,024,321.01. The money we currently have on hand, plus the new revenue will more than cover the requested amount.

Special Called Meeting

June 11, 2020

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, we have already approved the funding, so what is before is the projects.

Mr. Niermeier responded that is correct. On the supplemental information you were provided, it shows the three (3) funds we have through the Admin/Operations, Roadway Improvements, and Greenway/Pedestrian Improvements, with a breakdown of all the projects, and their anticipated costs. If you look at the last page of the spreadsheet, the colors of the numbers coordinate with what is in the supplemental budget guide that was provided.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve staff's recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski stated the total amount for Transportation Administration is in excess of \$138,000 over last year's budget. He thought we were bringing this in house and we were going to be saving money, so he does not understand why we are spending more money in this area.

Mr. Niermeier stated that accounts for some of the increases in staff. He believes that \$1.1M that you are seeing in that first section is conservative. It will tend down due to some of the hiring we cannot do right now. In general, it accounts for increase in staff over last year. Bear in mind, the budget before you for this year, is here to baseline our real needs of the department moving forward, as we do move it in house. He does not want to underestimate, and then have to request more down the line.

Mr. Malinowski stated we are not really saving any money by bringing it in house.

Mr. Niermeier responded we will because what you are seeing is less contractor costs and there is no profit on the money being paid. On the second part, the big "bogie" is under Professional Services, which will support our staff augmentation.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, there are figures that are not here that would show the cost savings, but we do not have those here.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride stated on several different occasions we have requested that there be an annual fiscal analysis showing the cost savings of bringing the Transportation Department in house. She thinks this was also discussed when we voted to bring Transportation in house. She wanted to remind Council members that we have requested that financial analysis, and to make sure that we get that at the appropriate time.

Mr. Manning stated that he is totally concerned, alarmed, and disconcerted that we are working on budget that shows that it is costing us more to do this in house, but we are being told that it really is not, just the budget shows it is, and there are other places to show that it is not, we just did not put it in here. It fascinates him that we would do a budget process, and show to the public that we are hiding the cost savings, and we are being conservative to show that it is costing us more. That is nonsensical to him, and he is sorry that was the way we decided to approach this written budget process.

Mr. Jackson stated bringing the program in house began last October. Therefore, it has not been in house a year yet. One of the major objectives on the list of activities for the committee, is to show the cost savings. He does not think Mr. Niermeier did a good enough job explaining, so he left Mr. Manning and others with the impression that there is some hidden number that is not being

revealed. The comparison to show that there is a savings occurring, by bringing it in house, would be based on what it is costing us to do it in house versus what it costs us when we contracted it out. There is nothing mysterious or hidden about that. He would hope that Mr. Niermeier would make those numbers readily available, even if it is for less than a 12-month period, to demonstrate, and satisfy not only our colleagues, but the general public. That the money that is being saved by bringing it in house, by not having as many inspectors and engineers on staff as when we were contracting it on the outside, will immediately show a savings, while we work on a greater analysis that would show the greater savings.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- 34. School Resource Officers (Allocate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget; FY21 - \$6,316,005) – No action needed at this time.**

DEBT SERVICE

- 35. General Debt Service (FY21 - \$13,906,265) – Ms. D. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve this item.**

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, there were some items that were addressed that are Special Revenue Funds (Hospitality Tax, Accommodations Tax, Conservation and Neighborhood Redevelopment).

Mr. Jackson inquired about the School Resources Officers.

Mr. Hayes responded we did not take that up. It will be taken up with the General Fund. He stated Victim's Assistance, Fire Service and School Resources will be taken up in the Fall with the General Fund items.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to why the SROs would not be approved tonight, as a Special Revenue, since it is listed on the motions list.

Mr. Brown responded that those items are items that have a significant relationship with the General Fund, and that is why those would be more appropriately handled with the General Fund. That also includes the charge that he has to meet with the Fire Chief and the City Manager to discuss the contractual process that is outlined regarding the Fire Service.

Mr. Jackson stated, it was his understanding, of this process, that the SRO budget was covered and bore by the school districts, so it would not be a fund that is uncertain on our part.

Mr. Hayes stated the SROs are funded through the school districts, but there is a portion that is funded by the General Fund, and because the amount currently budgeted for SROs needs to be increased, we decided to hold it back.

Ms. McBride stated, if the members of the school district are still on, while we are supporting the SROs, she would like for them to continue to give strong consideration hiring more counselors and social workers in school. She hopes we will be able to come back within a couple of months and address the mental health issues in our County, especially for those living in underserved communities.

Chief Cowan stated the increase that has been requested for the SRO budget center is actually a reduction to the General Fund for next budget year. The heavy impact that has been discussed over the last several months, is not accurate. The fact is the cost of the SRO Program has gone up, as a result of TRS, and some other things, but those costs are being passed off to the district, and it is actually a reduction to the General Fund. It is a Special Revenue, as Mr. Jackson pointed out, and it is heavily impacted by the reimbursements that come from the school districts. As much as 75.9% of the overall costs of the program are passed off to the districts.

Mr. Manning stated he is total agreement with Ms. McBride, and her comments, particularly about social workers. He thinks it is important that social workers to be involved in all things that affect people's lives.

- 36. RFC-IP Revenue Bond 2019 (FY21 - \$1,604,234)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 37. Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S (FY21 - \$1,488,013)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 38. Broad River Sewer 2011A (FY21 - \$2,135,563)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 39. East Richland Public Svc Dist (FY21 - \$1,438,560)** -- This item was approved in Item #35.
- 40. Recreation Commission Debt Svc (FY21 - \$3,237,425)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 41. Riverbanks Zoo Debt Service (FY21 - \$2,663,973)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 42. School District 1 Debt Service (FY21 - \$43,022,192)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 43. School District 2 Debt Service (FY21 - \$61,529,744)** – This item was approved in Item #35.
- 44. Transportation (FY21 - \$127,523,750)** – This item was approved in Item #35.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

- 45. Richland County Utilities (RC Sewer Reduction; \$11,248,138)** – Mr. Hayes stated this is actually going to reduce the funding for the Sewer Utility. He believes there was some discussion about holding the utility rate, until January. Along with approving the budget, Council will need to approve the rates not changing.

Mr. Brown stated, based on other Council actions we are taking, related to COVID-19, while Council had already approved a process of rate increases that were to take effect July 1, 2020 and July 1, 2021, that given the circumstance we were currently facing, we would not increase rates, in the sewer line item. We would do that for an initial period of 60 days, with 90 days being the look back. We did look at a total of 6 months, but the recommendation, at this point, was based on a 90-day

period. Mr. Hayes and Ms. Hamm looked at how long we could possibly sustain that freeze on the rate increase, so initially his recommendation is for 90 days, and then we can look at it to determine whether that is something we can continue to sustain. The reason you need to address this tonight, is because there is a budget implication, and, as a result, it requires Council action.

Mr. Hayes stated, because the budget currently in place for FY21 is \$12.8M, we are asking that adjusted total be brought down to \$11,248,138, due to the revenue implications the County Administrator just outlined, plus some other issues.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. D. Myers, to approve staff's recommendation.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (CIP)

46. Detention Center (Phase 5 Sprinkler Upgrade; \$150,000) – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Capital Improvement Projects.

Mr. Malinowski stated in reviewing the companion document, in regards to Item #54, that particular piece of equipment, over the last several years, has been used 25 hours per year. He inquired why we are going to spend \$100,000 to buy a piece of equipment that is used 25 hours per year, and has anyone looked into renting the equipment.

Mr. Maloney responded there has been a change in the item, as far as replacing a backhoe with a backhoe, to a backhoe with a mini-excavators. It is the same overall costs, but with the change in the landscape, as far as what Roads & Drainage Maintenance is doing. They are getting more efficient with the fact that are working in more urban settings. Small equipment and less impact on the residential properties, and the surrounding roads, is changing, so they did recognize that the large backhoe did have few hours on it, and we changed our gears, as far as what type of equipment is being purchased.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the new equipment will be used more than 25 hours.

Mr. Maloney responded the one mini-excavator they currently have has exceeded that in just a month.

Mr. Malinowski requested a list of the items they are replacing the equipment with.

Mr. Maloney stated he sent an email that had that information, but he can send that out again.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Jackson

The vote was in favor.

47. Detention Center (Dormitory Shower Upgrade; \$80,000) – This item was approved in Item #46.

48. **Detention Center (Security Camera Upgrade; \$1,200,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
49. **Detention Center (Laundry Upgrade; \$50,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
50. **Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Eastover Building; \$225,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
51. **Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Single Axle Dump Truck – Replacing AJ001 [1999 Chevrolet Dump Truck]; \$125,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
52. **Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Tandem Dump Truck – Replacing AP006 [2005 Chevrolet C8500 Dump Truck]; \$125,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
53. **Road & Drainage Maintenance Division (Slope Mower – Replacing AP008 [2005 CAT Challenger]; \$185,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
54. **Roads & Drainage Maintenance Division (Backhoe – Replacing AK004 [2000 Caterpillar 416C Backhoe]; \$98,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
55. **Stormwater Management (Update inventory SI assets: structures and pipe type, size, condition and age; \$2,000,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
56. **Stormwater Management (Melody Garden Stream/Ditch Stabilization Project Construction; \$500,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
57. **Airport (Taxiway Rehabilitation, Access Roads, Perimeter Fence: Phase II; \$28,500)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
58. **Airport (Airfield Lighting Rehabilitation [Design]; \$8,750)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
59. **Engineering (Roadway Repair-Design; \$100,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
60. **Engineering (Roadway Repair-Construction; \$400,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
61. **Solid Waste (Landfill Gas System: This is top priority. This was exchanged for the trash compactor listed in the budget. Required by SC DHEC; \$750,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
62. **Solid Waste (Excavator; \$350,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
63. **RCSD/Coroner (Security Fencing, Cameras, and Gates – Powell Road; \$100,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
64. **RCSD/Coroner (Aviation Unit End of Life Cycle Replacements – Replacement Parts; \$350,000)**
65. **RCSD/Coroner (Security Fencing and Lighting – Region Seven Substation; \$85,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
66. **RCSD./Coroner (RCSD Additional Equipment and Vehicles; \$2,600,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
67. **RCSD/Coroner (Coroner Equipment; \$250,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.

- 68. **ESD/EMS (New Ambulances; \$1,000,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 69. **ESD/EMS (EMS Equipment Needs; \$2,800,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 70. **ESD/EMS (ESD Equipment Needs; \$500,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 71. **ESD/Fire (ESD Fire Needs/Equipment and New Construction; \$7,000,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 72. **Information Technology (IT Equipment Needs; \$1,500,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 73. **Operational Services (Various Facility Needs; \$5,000,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 74. **Operational Services (Security Upgrade Project; \$500,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 75. **Operational Services (Township Parking Lot –Est. Cost; \$1,802,350)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 76. **General Information Systems (Countywide Orthoimagery – Flight; \$268,500)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 77. **Magistrates (Various Magistrate Needs; \$8,000,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.
- 78. **Assessor (CAMA System; \$1,500,000)** – This item was approved in Item #46.

An Ordinance to Amend the FY21 Budget Ordinance passed by Richland County Council July 18, 2019 which was entitled “An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a Biennium Budget II (FY2020 and FY2021) for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021.” So as to raise revenue, make appropriations and Amend the General Fund, Millage Agencies, Special Revenue Funds, Enterprise Funds, and Debt Service Funds Budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2020 and ending June 30, 2021

Mr. Manning inquired, for clarification, what was the date read for the approval by Council.

Mr. Hayes responded it was approved on July 18, 2019.

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

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

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

Mr. Manning stated he sent out an email earlier today, and Mr. Hayes responded, in writing. The date for which Mr. Hayes says he needs for this to ultimately to be approved is June 18th, which is next Thursday. We have a regularly scheduled Council meeting on Tuesday, at which time we would have the minutes from this meeting, and by approving the minutes then, there would still be 2 days before the deadline the Budget

Director indicated. The fact that we covered so much ground, and doing it on a Zoom meeting, he thinks it would not be wise for us to, when it is not time-sensitive, since we have the scheduled meeting. He would hope that we would vote no, or Ms. Dickerson would remove her motion.

Ms. Roberts stated, from the standpoint of the Clerk's Office, it would be almost impossible to turn the minutes around from tonight's meeting, and have them ready for Tuesday's meeting, especially since the agenda is supposed to go out tomorrow.

Mr. Livingston inquired if our Rules will allow us to get our minutes later than tomorrow.

Mr. Manning responded it would think so. He believes it is the agenda that needs to be posted, and not all the attachments.

Mr. Farrar responded the minutes can go out anytime you want them to go out.

Ms. Dickerson withdrew her motion for reconsideration.

4. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 PM.