



Richland County Council
Regular Session
February 19, 2019 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Beverly Harris, James Hayes, Kim Williams-Roberts, John Thompson, Stacey Hamm, Eden Logan, Larry Smith, Dwight Hanna, Nathaniel Miller, Jennifer Wladischkin, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Brad Farrar, Michael Niemeier, Janet Claggett, Quinton Epps, Edward Gomeau, Shahid Khan, Ismail Ozbek, Geo Price, Michelle Rosenthal, Cheryl Cook, Bryant Davis, Christine Keefer, Dale Welch, Jeff Ruble, Nancy Stone-Collum, Jeff Kososki and Tommy DeLage

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The invocation was led by the Honorable Yvonne McBride
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Yvonne McBride
- POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE** – Ms. Kennedy expressed her gratitude to everyone for their support following the death of her brother.
4. **PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS**
 - a. **Resolution honoring Ms. Margaret DuBard’s service to Richland County and the Conservation Commission [DICKERSON]** – Ms. Dickerson presented Ms. DuBard with a resolution in recognition of her service on the Conservation Commission. Ms. Dickerson also introduced Mr. Tim McSwain, Ms. DuBard’s replacement on the Conservation Commission.
 - b. **Resolution Honoring Columbia-Richland Fire Chief Aubrey Jenkins on his 40th Anniversary with the Columbia-Richland Fire Service [LIVINGSTON]** – Mr. Livingston presented Chief Jenkins with a resolution and photograph in recognition of his 40th Anniversary with the Columbia-Richland Fire Service.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Jackson expressed his appreciation for the way Chief Jenkins has handled himself during the Allen Benedict Court tragedy. He stated it would have been so easy for individuals, who may be being accused of not doing their job, to retaliate in kind. The way Chief Jenkins handled the negativity that directed at him was in the most professional and positive manner, and never losing sight of the fact that people lost their lives. And, moving forward what could be done to correct that

Regular Session
February 19, 2019

and make sure it did not happen again. In areas where he was not personally, nor was his staff, responsible for doing things, they took it upon themselves, going forward, to do it so that this never happens again. Sometimes that gets lost because we debate about who should have done what, and we do not recognize that here is group of individuals that said, "We do not want this to ever happen again to our citizens; therefore, we are going to do whatever is necessary, regardless of whose role it is, or should be. We are going to take upon ourselves to do it."

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. Regular Session: February 5, 2019 – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to add the Blythewood Industrial Site item, discussed during Council's work session and the Economic Development Committee, to the agenda for action.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to remove Item 18(g): *"According to information provided for the 2019 Council Retreat, "On January 31, 2017, former County Administrator Gerald Seals advised the PDT that he could not recommend wage increases because the County did not grant cost of living increases to County personnel for 2016 and had not considered pay increases for County personnel for 2017." I move that Council be provided the answer to the following question: Did the County Transportation Staff get the 2% pay raise last month (January 2019) [MANNING]"* from the agenda.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the agenda as amended.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS** – Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.

- a. Personnel Matter: Assistant County Administrators

- b. Pending Litigation: Richland County vs. City of Columbia – Declaratory Judgment
 - c. Legal Update: Richland County vs. Program Development Team (PDT) – Mediation
 - d. Contractual Matter: Cedar Cove/Stoney Point Sewer Project
 - e. Contractual Matter: Meeting with City of Columbia
 - f. Litigation Update: South Carolina Dept. of Revenue vs. Richland County
8. **CITIZENS' INPUT: For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing** – Mr. David Edmond spoke regarding the Richland County Election Commission being compensated for their service, and the County overseeing the Commission instead of the Legislature.
9. **CITIZENS' INPUT: Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda**
- a. Ms. Valerie Marcil spoke regarding the management of the Penny Greenway projects.
 - b. Mr. Rob McCue spoke regarding the proposed massage ordinance amendment.

10. **REPORT OF THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. Cedar Cove/Stoney Point Sewer Project – Mr. Gomeau stated we are requesting to start the funding process, which will take 5 weeks. If we hold off until a later time, it is going to delay this project even further. If the County Attorney informs us that we have reached a stalemate, we can stop the process. We have approval from DHEC.

Ms. Myers stated, for the record, this is the budget amendment for \$2.5 million that staff has requested.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to begin the funding process.

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

Opposed: Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

- b. 2019 Budget Calendar – Mr. Livingston stated he was informed by the Clerk of a potential conflict on May 23rd. The committee meetings and Zoning Public Hearing are scheduled on that date, and the budget calendar lists 2nd Reading of the Budget for 6:00 PM. He stated one option is holding 2nd Reading earlier in the day, if we do not want to change the date.

Mr. Malinowski stated another potential conflict is July 9th since there is already a Council meeting scheduled.

Ms. Terracio pointed out that the July 11th Budget Public Hearing is scheduled to take place after 3rd Reading of the Budget. She inquired if the meeting dates can be held this way or if they were out of

order.

Mr. Manning stated that Ms. Terracio is correct that the meetings have been scheduled out of order because we will have 3rd Reading on July 9th, and then the Public Hearing is scheduled 2 days after we have approved the budget.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item to the March 5th Council meeting.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Restructuring Ordinance – Mr. Gomeau stated, in April 2017, Council gave 3rd Reading approval to the organization restructuring ordinance. We are requesting Administration and Finance take up Phase II of the restructuring. The restructuring is outlined on pp. 47-48.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve staff's recommendation.

Mr. Manning inquired, for clarification, why this would not be coming through the recommendation of the Administration and Finance Committee, rather than in the Interim County Administrator.

Mr. Gomeau stated the 2nd Phase has not gone to the A&F Committee yet. The 1st Phase was approved by the Council, at the recommendation by the A&F Committee. We are asking for the 2nd Phase, with the changes that are indicated in the proposed ordinance, which is included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to refer Phase II to the Administration and Finance Committee.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that Mr. Manning's motion is to send this item to A&F and then bring the item back to full Council.

Mr. Manning stated his motion is that, if Phase I was vetted through the A&F Committee, and then came as an A&F recommendation to Council, that we would handle Phase II the same way we handled Phase I.

Mr. Walker inquired if there is any time sensitivity to this matter.

Mr. Gomeau stated, if we can get it to the February 26th Administration and Finance Committee, and then on to Council for First Reading on March 5th, Second Reading – March 19th, and Third Reading – April 3rd.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, her understanding is, this document was accepted as Phase I, and the request for approval is only for the changes that have been redlined in the document.

Mr. Gomeau responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, full Council has already reviewed the entire document, with those modifications. Given that this is a document that was previously approved, and we are

essentially being asked to approve minor word changes, that the whole Council has received in its packet, is it required this matter be sent to committee.

Mr. Livingston stated, it may not be required, but he has to take up the motion made by the Council member.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in response to Ms. Newton's question, there is a process that we usually follow, and he believes that is what Mr. Manning has provided us. In addition, there are references to specific sections in these changes, but when you go to the actual sections that were given, there are no changes. When it comes to A&F those changes need to be in those specific sections.

Ms. Terracio stated, regardless of whether or not we vote on this ordinance tonight, or send it to committee, she would respectfully request that we change the gender reference to non-gender specific (i.e. "Councilmember" instead of "Councilman").

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Personnel Matter: Assistant County Administrators – *This item was taken up in Executive Session.*
- e. Utilities Rate Study – Mr. Gomeau stated this item was discussed at the Retreat. It is the new rate schedule for the Utilities Division. In order for us to proceed with the budget for next year, we need to have a direction on the rate increase that we are proposing for the FY19-20. Without the rate increase, we are not going to be self-supporting. We are requesting adoption of the rate increase that was presented at the Retreat.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to adopt the recommendation, as presented.

Ms. Myers stated, at the Retreat, we discussed some concerns with regard to a couple of years where there are extreme spikes. There was a request that we go back to the consultant to see if there was a way to level that out to protect constituents' ability to pay, and to make sure there were not dramatic spikes. She is favor of implementing the study, but her question is, have we refined it in the way that was discussed at the Retreat. If we have not, is there a mechanism that will allow you to do that over time, so we can provide citizens the assurance that there will not be dramatic peaks in the rates.

Mr. Gomeau stated when you tweak the model to do that you end up with a loss in particular year. You do not have enough revenue to cover it to try to make up for the loss. Subsequently, you are going to have additional increases in the following years, in order to do that. They did ask the Finance Director and Budget Manager to take a look at this to see if there were alternatives. One of the alternatives they came up with has a subsidy effect to it, which distorts the utility program standing on its own.

Ms. Hamm stated they did look at trying to not increase the rate as much, but there is not enough revenue to cover all the expenditures and needs for the system. An alternative they were looking at is a possible credit program, which would not cost the County very much. We could potentially offer a \$10 credit for up to 400 qualified low-income customers. The Lower Richland would only go up \$8/month; and the other ones would only go up \$1/month. Instead of going to \$55, it would go to \$45.

Ms. Myers inquired why would we have some rate payers whose rates would increase even with credit.

Ms. Hamm stated the Lower Richland rates are lower than Broad River, but now that they are combined their rates will go up to \$44 anyway. Legal has been researching the possibility of the County being able to provide this type of credit.

Ms. Myers stated she is very concerned with the spikes, which Mr. Jackson pointed out at the Retreat. She requested, when we look at the program, we make sure the way we draft it, drafts in fairness across the board.

Ms. Hamm stated we will have an application to apply, and we will have to look at all the aspects of it, but we think this would be the best deal. We would still get the revenue that we need to sustain the water and sewer system.

Ms. Myers thanked them for proactively looking at something that would meet the need without having to go back and expend additional money with Willdan.

Mr. Malinowski requested Legal give a detailed explanation because it has been his understanding that you cannot charge 2 rates for the same service. In addition, we are talking about raise prices on thousands of customers throughout Richland County, yet there is nothing in the agenda that shows what those rates will be and how much they will go up. He inquired how the public was able to look at this and know what their rate may be, so they could speak on this matter. He cannot support it because we have not given the public complete information.

Ms. Newton thanked staff for their proactive look into a subsidy. From a process prospective, we have been asked to approve the rate increase, yet there is pending information, in terms of what the subsidy might look like and how the program would work. Would we need an amended motion to get the additional information?

Mr. Gomeau stated for that portion of it, but the rate would not change. You cannot alter the rate. We have combine the systems, and we have the rates going forward. The rates will not change; it will be the subsidy that would offset the impact to a certain number of residents.

Ms. Newton inquired, if we approve the recommendation, as is, when will the rates take place.

Mr. Gomeau stated the new rates will go into effect July 1, 2019. The new budget is calculated, in terms of the anticipated revenues, against the expenditures. It is the first time we have a Waste Management Budget that pays for itself.

Mr. Jackson stated it is commendable the work staff has done, in terms of trying to address a very serious issue, and a very serious problem for a lot of people. For some of us, having a rate increase of that amount would make a minor dent in our household budget. For others it is going to significant. He is not blaming anyone for it because he understands the necessity, in order to be able to do what needs to be done. The only way you can do that is to generate revenue. Having said that, he is still very concerned that in a matter of 3 months there is going to be a drastic spike in the amount homeowners will have to pay for their utilities. He would like to make sure that between now and then that every effort is made to get as much information out as possible. Even though we may not want to enjoy the pain of how people will react to it, he thinks it is only fair to the public to make them aware, now, regularly, and often, between now and July, what they can plan to expect, so

they can start making adjustments in their household finances to accommodate this increase.

Mr. Walker stated, at this point, given the information about the potential subsidies, he would either like to amend the motion, or make a substitute motion, to include the subsidy program.

Mr. Livingston stated, if the subsidy program is not a part of the Administrator's recommendation, we need to amend the motion.

Mr. Gomeau stated the subsidy program is not a part of the recommendation. All they are asking for is approval of the rates. Council can add the subsidy onto it because that money is not coming from the Utilities budget; it is coming from the General Fund. He stated staff agrees with Mr. Jackson to hold 1 – 2 workshops for the public, acknowledging this is Council's decision on the rates, so they would like to have Council with staff when they are doing the public session. As painful as this is, this something we have to do because of what happened in the past. We have not lived up to the obligation of paying for the system. Unknowingly to a lot of taxpayers, the General Fund has paid for this system over the years.

Mr. Smith stated Legal has not finished working out all of the details on the issue related to the subsidy. They are trying to address some of the concerns that Ms. Myers raised about how it is going to be applied, and who it is going to apply to, to make sure there is fairness throughout the system and we do not have a problem. Going back to what Mr. Gomeau said, the question, right now, is just the rate across the system. We can continue to work on refining the issue of the subsidy.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this is a First Reading item.

Mr. Gomeau stated this is the adoption of the rate, so it does not require 3 Readings and a Public Hearing. It is just to put in the budget, so the revenues will equal the expenditures.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this rate study only affects those citizens within Lower Richland.

Mr. Gomeau stated it affects the whole system.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this rate will affect all citizens throughout Richland County.

Mr. Gomeau stated it affects all customers. It is now one utility; therefore, all citizens have the same rate going forward.

Ms. McBride stated she supports having a hearing where we would give the other customers the opportunity to know what is expected.

Ms. Myers inquired as to when the rate study was first presented to Council.

Mr. Khan stated the first presentation was done at a workshop in early 2018. There have been numerous follow-up conversations.

Ms. Myers stated the Willdan Team came down and presented to Council. Subsequently, we had an additional work session and discussed it again at the Council Retreat. At which time, Mr. Jackson made some suggestions regarding publicity, and making sure that people knew. And now after a year and half, we are at the point where we need to implement.

Mr. Manning stated, in response to Ms. McBride's question, will this affect the rates of the East Richland Public Service District customers as well.

Mr. Khan stated, for clarification, all of the customers that are being served by Richland County Utilities will be affected by these rates.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to bring this item back at the March 5th Council meeting and include the proposed rate, in order for the public to see the rate.

Mr. Walker inquired if there is a time sensitivity to this issue, that will be affected by this motion.

Mr. Gomeau stated there is only a time sensitivity if we do not do it at the next meeting because we are running out time for the budget. We are not going to have time to recalculate this, and get Council to give us money from the General Fund to subsidize this. This is a vote on the rate. We are going to hold work sessions, which he did not mention earlier, but we cannot change the rate unless you want to say it is going to be subsidized from the General Fund. He does not know if you want to go forward with that understanding. We are running out of time on this, and we do not have any alternatives. We either pay for it now, or you are going to pay for it in the future. It takes money to run a sewer system the right way, and we are trying to do it now. He understands it is public sensitive, but if we do it and get it started, and you put enough pressure on Administration to run it the right way, you are not going to do this again. You will have a system that is running and maintained effectively, and replaced when it should be rather than waiting 30 years.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, he is not asking that the rate be changed. He is just asking that the public be made aware of the rate we are going to recommend.

Mr. Gomeau stated he did not want to get into the position of making it look like we are going to change it if we get outcries from the public.

Mr. Walker inquired, outside of this meeting, does the public have access to this information. Is it published somewhere where the public could see the current rates?

Mr. Gomeau stated the rates can be put online, with a proviso since the rates have not been approved by Council.

Mr. Khan stated they can also place an Executive Summary on this matter on the next Council agenda.

Ms. Terracio stated, at the Council Retreat, which was videotaped, Council was provided a packet. She believes the packet gave the rates, and was not a part of the Executive Session materials. Those materials could be published.

Mr. Gomeau stated there is no problem with releasing the consultant' report. It is long, so they may want to simplify it.

Ms. Terracio stated she would also strongly advocate for posting the Retreat video.

In Favor: Malinowski and McBride

Opposed: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Manning, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Abstain: Jackson

The substitute motion failed.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, at the Council Retreat, in public session, we said what the rate. We have not posted that video yet. We are going to simplify the consultants' report, and post it, but we cannot say tonight what the rate is.

Mr. Walker requested Mr. Gomeau to state what the proposed rate is.

Mr. Khan stated the current rate of \$43.35 will increase to \$55.68 in FY20, \$64.00 in FY21 and \$72.00 in FY22. The recommendation, by the consultant, is that a rate study will take place every 3 – 5 years.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, he understands what Mr. Khan is reading, and he understands we got it at Council. His question is, is it anywhere in our agenda tonight. Is it correct that the rates are not in the agenda tonight for the public to review?

Mr. Gomeau stated that is correct.

Ms. Myers inquired if the rates been in any previous documents that have been publicly available.

Mr. Gomeau stated they have been available.

Ms. Myers inquired if there have been any changes since January 2018, when it was first presented.

Mr. Khan stated there have been some refinements.

Ms. Myers stated, as she recalls, the prices have been taken down.

Ms. Dickerson stated, for clarification, does that include the voucher staff spoke about earlier.

Mr. Khan responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Gomeau stated, as a reminder, this is one utility system. It has the water system encompassed with it. We can put everything together, and that may affect how we go forward with it. It may make a difference, in terms of the rate increases after 2020.

Mr. Khan stated the consultant did a deliberate attempt to compare the existing rates, and the projected rates. In all cases, our recommended rates are equal or lower than neighboring utilities.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson and Livingston

The vote was in favor.

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

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

Opposed: Terracio, Newton, Myers, Walker and Dickerson

The motion for reconsideration failed.

Ms. Myers inquired if staff will have the rebate/subsidy information prepared by the next Council meeting.

- f. Presentation of the FY18 Audit – Mr. Alan Robinson, Cherry Bekaert, presented the FY18 Audit. He stated staff is responsible for preparing the audit. His CPA firm audits it and renders an audit opinion. Their audit opinion says that the financial statements present fairly. Then, they communicate any matters that they are required to communicate. The process was much smoother this year. There will be other information, at a later meeting, about the document itself, which Mr. Gomeau and Ms. Hamm are going to review with Council. In summary, there was a new accounting pronouncement that had to do with retirement benefits that had to be adopted this year. There were no particular difficulties encountered, no disagreements, full cooperation and a clean opinion on the audit.

Mr. Manning inquired if the audit looks at anything related to the Program Development Team, in regards to the Penny Tax.

Mr. Robinson stated it does, but only with respect to the County. This audit does not go over into the Richland PDT entity. The monies that come in, from the Penny Tax, how they are collected, how they are transferred into the Capital Project Penny Tax Fund, including the bond activity.

Ms. Newton stated, in the case of material weaknesses that were cited, we have a management response that says how those items are going to be addressed. From a follow-up perspective, when does Council receive reporting that those items were corrected. Does that occur at the next audit, or is that a report that we get sooner?

Mr. Robinson stated, in this year's audit, there is follow-up reports on the prior year's findings. However, he believes they have already satisfactorily addressed it. There will be follow-up. Each audit has current year findings and follow-up on the prior year's findings.

Ms. Myers stated, on pp. 95, there are 3 recommendations, in one. We have responded to 2 of them, but not to the 3rd. She would like to know as to the last sentence, "...we recommend the County implement a policy to limit the use of budget transfers both in quantity and individual dollar value and to limit the number of employees with access to request budget and/or record budget transfers." if we have implemented something that speaks to their recommendation on that.

Mr. Gomeau responded that we have.

Mr. Hayes stated he submitted a response to Finance, in regards to budget transfers, so he is not sure why it is not in the documentation. He stated the vast majority of our budget transfers are necessary. What they decided to do was to take a more proactive look at some of those transfers that may not be necessary, so as to have staff to limit the number of transfers by being more proactive in looking at what they need to do on down the line. For example, there are several transfers that have been going on that are not necessarily needed because of the small dollar amount, so we have encouraged departments to be more proactive in looking down the road at their needs in order to limit the number of transfers. A lot of departments do small dollar transfers, so we are trying to get them to be more proactive, so as to limit the number of recurring transfers.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a cap on the amount of a transfer that can be made.

Mr. Hayes responded there is not.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks they are recommending there be such a cap. She inquired if we can consider that, and then respond as to whether or not a cap on an amount of a transfer would be helpful.

Mr. Gomeau stated they can certainly put together a transfer policy recommendation. Rather than dollar amounts, we usually do percentages.

Ms. Myers inquired, as to who can request a budget transfer, or record a budget transfer, have we limited, as Cherry Bekaert recommended, the number of people.

Mr. Hayes stated the Department Director specifies which of their staff members have access to the system to do the transfers.

Ms. Myers inquired if it is a position or does it fluctuate depending on who they choose today.

Mr. Hayes stated it is whoever the Department Director has assigned to handle their day-to-day budget.

Ms. Myers inquired if we can put some policy in place that removes that much discretion from it, so there is a position that is qualified to make these requests. This is a request here for any amount of money. There ought to be positions who are approved with that kind of authority.

Mr. Hayes stated he certainly agrees with what Ms. Myers is saying, but the individuals who do budget transfer go through formal training. We can make sure that Department Directors assign that to a specific position, so that it does not fluctuate.

Mr. Gomeau stated they will have a transfer policy for Council to adopt.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the other auditors referenced in the PowerPoint are auditors Cherry Bekaert are auditors that have been hired by Cherry Bekaert.

Mr. Robinson responded in the negative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we will be getting the results of the other audits, since it is County funds they are receiving.

Mr. Robinson stated they have the information, and use it to prepare the audit. It would be required to be available for each these entities.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why the library and the library foundation are listed separately.

Mr. Robinson stated, he believes, those are 2 separate audits. The Library Foundation is a board that is appointed by the Library Board. There are rules because it is a board appointed by the Library Board, which meets the test of being on this list, which either directly or indirectly is controlled by County Council, we have to collect it into this audit.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we get results of these other audits that they are within what they should be, or if there are corrective actions needed.

Mr. Robinson stated those audits stand on their own. If there were a finding in there that was alarming, or of concern, and he felt it needed to come before Council, it would also be reflected in the audit report.

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to accept the audit.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. Richland Renaissance – Mr. Gomeau stated they are requesting Council to take the 3 items out of deferment so they can either move forward, or decide not to do them. He stated staff is spending a lot of time examining all of these and trying to put them in a proper perspective so they can either move forward or stop in place.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if this is passed tonight, what are the next steps.

Mr. Gomeau stated they are going to develop a program for each one of them by priority and timing, and bring them back one at a time, so they can be considered. The blight would be the first one, and then the 911 moving over to Columbia Place Mall. The Administration building would be the 3rd one. It will take some time to do them because staff needs to work on funding, and other applications. As long as they know they have the authority to move forward with all three, they can tie them in together.

Mr. Jackson stated, regardless of what you call it, these are critical issues. Particularly the part that deals with blight. He stated he had a conversation earlier today with a news reporter about the widespread, rampant increase in blight that is occurring countywide. He would hope that we would not get hung up on the title, and not recognize the critical need. He was glad to hear Mr. Gomeau say that taking up blight and beautification, and cleaning up the County would be the first thing we approach, regardless of what we call the overall operation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there is a costs that goes along with the 3 elements.

Mr. Gomeau stated we have to develop the program, and have Council accept the program, then they can put the costs together for each one of them. They do not know the extent of the program that Council will allow them to do. They are looking at the blight and the ordinance, in terms of having a code enforcement section devoted entirely to that. They are working on funding alternatives for the shopping center, in terms of public/private partnerships. He stated we have to accept that these are going to cost money, and we need a commitment, both publicly and financially, that these are Council's priorities. He thinks we can make the public perception of what we are doing a lot better than what we have done in the past.

Mr. Malinowski stated pp. 116 of the agenda addresses the "Critical Care Facility", and it indicates it will require a public-private partnership. He inquired if we have reorganized the Consolidation Prioritization Committee.

Mr. Livingston stated that committee was on the list of those committees that were to be considered, so Council will have to decide whether or not we want to.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would think, with that statement, that is definitely one that we should re-staff.

Ms. Newton stated, when she was on a different side of the dais, there was a lot of confusion about what exactly the Richland Renaissance was. She wants to take a moment to clarify her understanding, to make sure she understands what she is voting on, as well as for the constituents that are watching and concerned. Voting to move Richland Renaissance forward is affirming that we are prioritizing the handling of our facilities appropriately, addressing some critical needs in the Southeastern part of the County and Lower Richland, and also addressing blight. This would give you the ability to come forward with a plan. However, this plan does not mean that what you present to us is done and delivered. It means that it is a starting point for us to talk about budgeting, process, and involve the community. Voting to prioritize our facilities, parts of Lower Richland, and blight is not the same as committing to a plan that the public will not have input on.

Mr. Gomeau stated the mainstay of this is to get the public input. You can hold your own workshops, or whatever, but we need the public cooperation. The blight program will not work without public cooperation throughout the County. If you accept these things, you will be there with them presenting, getting the public input, and making changes as appropriate. The citizens live there. They know what is going on. They are the best source of information for us to do this.

Mr. Livingston stated he recalled there were 2 properties the County purchased, in relationship to the Renaissance, that are not included in the proposal. He would like for them to at least be considered. One of them was the Haverty's property on Colonial. There was a clear purpose for that one for that community. And, there was the Old Antique Mall in the St. Andrews area.

Ms. Myers stated what we are looking at is empowering staff to engage a revitalization program for this County that would take in blight remediation, providing infrastructure in parts of the County, looking at the properties we have purchased, and engaging the public to get input on uses. The public is unaware, but some of the staff members are 3 to a closet, not an office. Looking at our future needs, and what we will do with the facilities, as well as engaging all of the stakeholders. After that process, coming up with a proposed budget, engaging private companies and committing some form of public investment.

Mr. Gomeau stated we are talking with 1 of the largest P3 companies in the country that has done this all over the country.

Ms. Myers stated this is not meant to be Richland County coming up with \$100 Million to throwing dollar bills across the County.

Mr. Gomeau stated they would not ask that.

Ms. Myers stated that was the last thing out there. The public thought this was Richland County coughing up all of its money out of its coffers. This is meant to be a public-private engagement. We are meant to be looking for partners who can help with the improvements of the County, which will hopefully put us ahead of everybody in the State for the next 10, 20, 30 years.

Mr. Gomeau stated there are companies that do this a lot better than we do, which is why we are

talking to them. They are going to help us move toward that direction.

Ms. Myers stated that includes engaging the Bar, and other stakeholders, to figure out what we do going forward. Staff will be front and center on how we propose to pay for it, and bringing that information forward for another vote. This does not mean we go and encumber funds. It means we go and develop plans.

Ms. McBride thanked Mr. Gomeau and staff for the work they have done, and for bringing this back to Council to make a decision. She stated work has already been done to develop a framework. Now, as Ms. Myers suggested, you are taking this into the development of plan. In certain areas, we know what needs to be done, and work has been put into those areas. We had a Property Management Committee last year, and we vetted a number of different properties and projects for the Columbia Mall area. That was one of the areas that almost anyone you talked to supported. It addressed so many needs of the citizens of Richland County, and staff also. If we look, from your framework and elements, there is probably a priority area in each element that we could immediately begin to move on. We could phase in priorities on all of these programs, notwithstanding what Ms. Myers said, in terms of developing a plan. We are not pulling numbers out of the sky. This is a well-defined plan, and a lot of work has already gone into this already. If we decide there are areas that we may not deal with now, we will have that opportunity once we are given the plan.

Ms. Terracio stated we can all agree that the Richland Renaissance name has been on public relations journey. She would hope that as we reintroduce this program it would have an opportunity to have a new life. She thinks it would be helpful to have a statement from the Administrator, or a staff member, related to why these elements are best addressed on a holistic basis rather than an ad hoc basis. For example, why would we not just do the facilities plan on its own. Why are they all 3 together?

Mr. Gomeau stated they are interrelated in different ways. We are talking about the blight program, or the Revivification Program, which ties into the area that we are looking at where the shopping centers are that we are going to move people out to. There is a lot of common denominators running between all 3 areas. We want to take advantage of that with the public. When we are presenting this, if someone looks at this and says, "This is a good idea because we are going to clean up the semi-trucks that are out there on Two Notch Road, in addition to moving people out there." We are not saying you have to do all 3 at once. We can do individual things as we go along, but he thinks the fact is these are the 3 most important ones.

Mr. Manning thanked Ms. Dickerson for making the motion for us to revisit the Renaissance, and staff for all of their work. In harmony with Ms. Myers, Ms. McBride and Ms. Newton, and the Interim County Administrator, with wording like "public input as a mainstay", "engaging the public", "engaging all the stakeholders", "robust citizen involvement," "public involvement". He in favor of us looking at how we meet the needs of the citizens with meeting those needs based on robust citizen involvement, public input as a mainstay, engaging the public, engaging all of the stakeholders, and public involvement. With his understanding, and his colleagues, that is the mainstay of what we are voting on tonight. To go back and revisit some things that we have looked at long before many of you got here, in terms of there is a need for a new courthouse. He wholeheartedly supports this kind of public involvement and engagement. Again, it was stuck, and it was Ms. Dickerson that made the motion to get this back before us in a revisit at the Council Retreat.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the staff's recommendation to bring this matter out of the deferment, with the 3 priorities areas being revisited.

Mr. Livingston stated he had mentioned a couple of other properties (i.e. Haverty's and Old Antique Mall).

Ms. Myers restated the motion to adopt the staff's recommendation, and to include those Richland County properties identified by Mr. Livingston that need a resolution, as to use and implementation.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson thanked her colleagues for thinking about this. She hates that it took us so long to get back on track.

11. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL**

- a. Engage Richland: Making Government Work for You, February 21, 6:00 – 7:30 PM, Decker Center/Sheriff's Annex – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming "Engage Richland" event schedule to be held at the Decker Center/Sheriff's Annex.
- b. Upcoming Penny Tax Project Public Meetings: – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Penny Tax Project Public Meetings.
 1. Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway, February 21, 5:00 – 7:00 PM, Earlewood Community Center, 1113 Recreation Drive
 2. Lower Richland Boulevard Widening, February 28, 5:00 – 7:00 PM, Lower Richland High School Sheriff's Substation, 2615 Lower Richland Boulevard
 3. Broad River Corridor Neighborhood Improvements, March 7, 5:00 – 7:00 PM, Virginia Wingard United Methodist Church, 1500 Broad River Road
- c. SCAC Mid-Year Conference (February 20) and Institute of Government Classes (February 21). Embassy Suites – Columbia – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Mid-Year Conference and Institute of Government Classes.

12. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

- a. Contractual Matter: Meeting with the City of Columbia – *This item was taken up in Executive Session.*
- b. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator – *This item was taken up in Executive Session.*
- c. Administrator Search Update – *This item was taken up in Executive Session.*

Blythewood Industrial Site – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to authorize staff to proceed with the purchase process of the property described as the Blythewood Industrial Site, which was discussed in an earlier work session, by extending the purchase contract for 3 months and depositing the

required \$25,000 earnest money for this extension. Also, to allow staff to continue work on securing additional commitments from other partners to assist with this purchase. And, finally, to finalize the financing recommendations and bring them back to Council for approval on March 19th Council meeting.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to reconsider this item.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 18-046MA, Kenyatte Jones, GC to RM-MD (.4 Acres), 5406 Monticello Road, TMS # R09310-04-14 (Portion of) [THIRD READING]
- b. 18-047MA, Inga Black, RS-HD to GC (1.21 Acres), Bluff Road and Harlem Street, TMS # R13509-02-07, 42 & 43 [THIRD READING]
- c. An Ordinance Amending the Fiscal Year 2019 Fire Service Fund Annual Budget by \$368,410 to cover the personnel expenses for the 11 positions under the SAFER Grant from January 1 to June 30, 2019 with funds from Fund Balance in the Fire Services Fund [SECOND READING]
- d. An Ordinance Amending the Fiscal Year 2019 Broad River Utility System Fund Annual Budget to fund a corrective action plan in the amount of \$3,103,000 incident to a South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Administrative Process responded to by the Department of Utilities with funds from the unassigned funds from General Fund Fund Balance [SECOND READING]

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the consent items.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

14. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

- a. An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 18, Offenses; Section 18-3, Noise; so as to limit noise in the unincorporated areas of Richland County – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approved as presented.

Mr. Malinowski stated again that on pp. 139 of the agenda, 2(a)(vi) & (vii), states that “Any noise resulting from activities sponsored or co-sponsored by the county”; “Noise created by any

government-sponsored events or privately organized sports, recreation, or athletic events” are exempt from this ordinance. He does not believe the government should be above the taxpayer in these matters. If there is an event being held, he does not care who sponsors it, if you have a noise regulation then everyone should come under that regulation.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if we are talking about football stadiums vs. communities. To her that would have a significant difference. She would not think it would have the same relevance. If she is at a football game, or a designated area for noise...she thinks this is referencing noise that is relevant to communities.

Mr. Farrar stated it is a policy issue, and not a legal issue.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks the proposed language on pp. 139 is exactly what Ms. Dickerson said, and speaks to Mr. Malinowski’s concerns as well. It says, “...within the limits of the unincorporated area of the county, except where the activity generating the noise is permitted by lawful authority (e.g. a permitted event).” So, that would be a private event that follows the regulations to allow noise above normal levels, which would include Ms. Dickerson’s example, as well as not exempting the government differently than private citizens.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, (vii) states, “Noise created by any government-sponsored events or privately organized sports, recreation, or athletic events.” It does not say it is a government one. It says it is privately organized, so he can get a group of people together and say we want to play a basketball game, and at midnight we are still playing the game, the radio is playing, and there is screaming and yelling. It is a privately organized sporting event. That is exempt and he does not believe it should be.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

15. **REPORT OF RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

I. ITEMS FOR ACTION FROM RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

- a. Move that the Rules and Appointments Committee review the current County Council Rules and offer amendments for consideration by Council that would clarify exactly how County Council voting will occur with specific reference to how a non-vote (i.e. not a “yes”, “no” or “abstain” vote) from a member present at the meeting shall be counted or not counted [PEARCE] – Ms. Newton stated the committee recommended approving the following proposed language: “If a member is present and does not declare a vote or an abstention, his/her vote shall be recorded as “present but did not vote.”

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Revisit the bed and breakfast ordinance to increase the number of rooms up to 20, so the business can be profitable and flourish. This would be in line with keeping the rural character and allow opportunities for small businesses. [N. JACKSON] – Ms. Newton stated the committee recommended forwarding this item to the D&S Committee for vetting.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. I move that the Magistrate’s Office on Wilson Blvd. be constructed with brick siding and not metal [KENNEDY] – Mr. Niermeier stated staff was asked to identify funding for brick options for the building, as well as, to find economies across the projects. He stated they did not have all of the data prior to this meeting. According to the memo in the agenda packet, he is proposing 2 options. Both are thin brick options. One is a full thin-brick on the magistrate, with a wainscot 48” wall running across the remainder of the building, except for the warehouse portion. The second option, which allows us to do more with less, would be to put the wainscot across the sides of the magistrate and the 2nd portion of building, except for the warehouse. This would also allow them to install a storefront on the 2nd portion of the building with an awning to make them congruent, which will make it look like a planned out building. He did get an estimate from the General Contractor, but he does not know if it is appropriate to give those figures publicly.

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Niermeier has had an opportunity to meet with Judge Edmond.

Mr. Niermeier stated he met with Judge Edmond onsite Friday.

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Niermeier had an opportunity to meet with Ms. Kennedy.

Mr. Niermeier stated he has not seen Ms. Kennedy.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item until the March 5th Council meeting.

Ms. Kennedy stated she was told that the Sheriff was not moving into the Magistrate’s Office and Animal Care was, which will not be. She stated that she and the Judge have conferred on this, they have agreed and spoken with the community and Sheriff about it. They are looking forward to having the Sheriff there, and he is welcome.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. A Resolution to appoint and commission James E. Bostic and Maurice A. Hudson as Code Enforcement Officers for the proper security, general welfare, and convenience of Richland County {Solid Waste & Recycling Division} – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. FY19 – District 7 Hospitality Tax Allocation – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve this item.

Ms. Terracio inquired, for clarification, if the funds will go directly to the facility, and the facility will be holding an event there. She stated she would like some additional information on what the funds are being allocated for.

Mr. Livingston stated this is a recommendation from District 7. Ms. Kennedy or Mr. Hayes can provide additional information.

Mr. Hayes stated he could only answer in the generic sense. Typically, the group will complete an online application in Zoom Grants stating what they are going to use the funds for. The Budget staff compares that to the H-Tax guidelines to make sure that it does comply with the guidelines. Then, an award agreement is submitted to them. The group can then submit a request for up to 75% of the funding upfront.

Ms. Terracio inquired if backup documentation would be available to Council or the general public. For example, if she filled out a form and requested H-Tax funds, would Council members or the public have access to those requests.

Mr. Hayes stated they do not typically post the requests online, but it is available with a FOIA request.

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

Abstain: Terracio

The vote in favor was unanimous with Ms. Terracio abstaining from the vote.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

17. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.
Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.

- a. Personnel Matter: Assistant County Administrators
- b. Pending Litigation: Richland County vs. City of Columbia – Declaratory Judgment
- c. Legal Update: Richland County vs. Program Development Team (PDT) – Mediation
- d. Contractual Matter: Cedar Cove/Stoney Point Sewer Project
- e. Contractual Matter: Meeting with City of Columbia

**Regular Session
February 19, 2019**

- f. Litigation Update: South Carolina Dept. of Revenue vs. Richland County
- g. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator
- h. Administrator Search Update

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to go into Executive Session.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 8:14 PM and came out at approximately 10:20 PM.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to come out of Executive Session.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The vote in favor of coming out of Executive Session was unanimous.

- a. Personnel Matter: Assistant County Administrators – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the recommendation of the Interim County Administrator as to the salaries.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Terracio, with regard to these positions and what was advertised, to do equal pay for equal work.

Ms. Myers stated she is in favor of equal pay for equal work, but by definition that also means you are looking at 2 people that are equally the same.

Mr. Jackson requested Mr. Manning to restate his motion.

Mr. Manning stated, based on what was advertised for the Assistant County Administrator positions, his motion was equal pay for equal work.

Ms. Newton stated she is concerned about the wording of this. The wording of the motion does not allow her to vote on this, and she is not sure what her parliamentary options are. She will vote all day for equal pay for equal work, but she will not vote that people with different qualifications who are doing different things be paid the same.

In Favor: Terracio and Manning

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson and Livingston

Abstain: Jackson, Myers and McBride

The substitute motion failed.

Ms. Myers restated her motion as follows: to take the recommendation of the Interim County Administrator that we equally, and fairly, pay the Assistant County Administrators.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to accept the Interim Administrator's recommendation.

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

Abstain: Terracio

The vote in favor of the substitute motion was unanimous with Ms. Terracio abstaining from the vote.

- b. Pending Litigation: Richland County vs. City of Columbia – Declaratory Judgment – *Received as information; no action taken.*
- c. Legal Update: Richland County vs. Program Development Team (PDT) – Mediation – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to authorize the County Attorney to mediate only those issues originally agreed upon for the mediation, and not to expand the mediation to additional requested by the PDT's counsel.

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

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- d. Contractual Matter: Cedar Cove/Stoney Point Sewer Project – *Received as information; no action taken.*
- e. Contractual Matter: Meeting with City of Columbia – *Received as information; no action taken.*
- f. Litigation Update: South Carolina Dept. of Revenue vs. Richland County – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to direct the Legal Department to go forward and enter into a formal negotiation with the Dept. of Revenue and return to Council with a written, proposed agreement.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- g. Personnel Matter: Interim County Administrator – Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to extend the offer of the contract extension, as discussed and presented in Executive Session, to the current Interim Administrator.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Manning and Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

- h. Administrator Search Update – *Received as information; no action taken.*

18. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. Resolution Recognizing March as Bleeding Disorders Awareness Month [LIVINGSTON] – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the resolution recognizing March as Bleeding Disorders Awareness Month.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. With regard to Section 5 in the Richland County 2019 Council Retreat and the presentation on Reintroducing and Revisiting the Renaissance Plan, specifically Page 5-11, reference is made under Element III: Revivify Richland to Blight Remediation. I move that Blight Remediation be removed from the Richland Renaissance and staff be directed to initiate code enforcement and ordinances immediately and Council provide the necessary resources to carry out the enforcement of Richland County Codes and Ordinances that address blight remediation [MANNING] – Mr. Manning moved to remove this item from the agenda.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Resolution Recognizing February as Black History Month [MYERS] – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the resolution recognizing February as Black History Month.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- d. Resolution Honoring the 30th Anniversary of the Harambee Festival [McBRIDE]] – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the resolution recognizing February as Black History Month.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- e. I move to amend Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations by adding Section 16-23, Health Massage, Bodywork Therapists and Massage Establishments [MANNING] – This item was referred to the D&S Committee.
 - f. I move that Council be informed in regard to the attached figure provided by Richland County Administrator on February 13, 2019 whether 1 or 2 Assistant County Administrator position vacancy(s) were advertised [MANNING] – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.
 - g. According to information provided for the 2019 Council Retreat, “On January 31, 2017, former County Administrator Gerald Seals advised the PDT that he could not recommend wage increases because the County did not grant cost of living increases to County personnel for 2016 and had not considered pay increases for County personnel for 2017.” I move that Council be provided the answer to the following question: Did the County Transportation Staff get the 2% pay raise last month (January 2019) [MANNING] – *This motion was removed during the Adoption of the Agenda.*
19. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:35 PM.