



Richland County Council
Regular Session
May 4, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Angela Weathersby, Kyle Holsclaw, Michelle Onley, Tamar Black, Ashiya Myers, Andrea Mathis, Leonardo Brown, John Thompson, Lori Thomas, Stacey Hamm, Mike King, Michael Maloney, Elizabeth McLean, Sandra Haynes, Michael Niermeier, Dante Roberts, Lauren Hogan, Michael Byrd, Brittney Hoyle-Terry, Jeff Ruble, Jennifer Wladischkin, Bill Davis, James Hayes, Dale Welch, Zachary Cavanaugh, Judy Carter, Randy Pruitt, Stephen Staley, Allen Brown, Paul Brawley and Clayton Voignier.

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 Cheryl English

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Cheryl English

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4. a. **Regular Session: April 20, 2021** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to approve the minutes as distributed.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to remove the following item: “Department of Animal Care – Animal Services Division – Intergovernmental Agreement with the Town of Arcadia Lakes” from the agenda and approve the agenda as amended.

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

Not Present: J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Regular Session
May 4, 2021

6. **REPORT OF THE ACTING COUNTY ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS** – No report was given.

7. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public –No comments were submitted.

8. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

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

9. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

a. Coronavirus Update – Mr. Brown stated from the period of April 13 – 27 the percent positive for the County was 3.7%, which remains below the 5% goal. We are still showing that we are in the moderate range; however, the overall number has come down.

As of April 29th, the County has approved \$528,000 in approved payments through the Rental Assistance Program. To show the amount of change in a few days, as of May 4th, we are over \$800,000 in approved payments. At the next Coronavirus Ad Hoc Meeting, there will be a graph showing payments by zip code, as well as a breakdown of AMI.

On April 28th, there was a Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Out of that meeting, staff was requested to review the mask ordinance in response to CDC guidance changes. There also was a request for staff to come up with a proposal for a COVID-19 Memorial. In addition, there are 2 programs that are going to launch: (1) the State's Rental Assistance Program; and (2) the City of Columbia/Cooperative Ministry.

Ms. Terracio inquired about the time between approval of assistance and the issuance of a check.

Ms. Hamm responded checks are processed once a week.

Ms. Barron stated she is concerned about the different programs going on with the same objective. She inquired if we have given thought to addressing the multiple programs, and how specific we need to be with the citizens of Richland County. In addition, if citizens are denied by the County can the citizen go to another organization and apply.

Mr. Brown responded, as soon as we heard about these other programs, we reached out to coordinate so there is no duplication of benefits, and people receive the service they need. In terms of whether a citizen can apply for another "pot" of funds, if they are ineligible or denied by the County, depends on what "pot" of funds it is.

Ms. Barron inquired about the status of the community outreach portion of the Rental Assistance Program.

Mr. King responded they are partnering with Richland School District Two and Lexington-Richland School District Five. Caseworkers at the schools are going to be provided training on the program so they can assist families in needs. They have reached out to Richland School District One, and hope they will partner with the County. They are also communicating with the State, and they are looking

at our outreach program. He just finished contacting the seven counties that were provided a direct allotment. They have contracted with the Spanish speaking media, and we are going to be doing a media blitz.

Ms. McBride stated she is still concerned with the numbers and the outreach. She has requested staff to look at the faith community, and doing something innovative with them. She would like to hear more about Richland School District One's response. She suggested we look at more progressive states to see what they are doing. She inquired if there is a breakdown by zip code of positive COVID tests.

Mr. Brown responded the DHEC website has several different maps regarding County-level data.

Ms. McBride noted there were certain areas where the tests were much higher than other areas. Overall the rate may be 3.7%, but it could be higher or lower in specific districts.

Mr. Brown stated they had an email blast out to the faith-based community to garner support from that perspective. In terms of our approval and payment rate, we have been told this program is a solid program from officials that do this around the country.

Ms. McBride stated she is not concerned about rates. She is concerned that this is emergency funding, and many people may be evicted while they wait for the emergency funding to come in. She noted she and Ms. Barron would be glad to work on this.

10. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – Ms. Mathis reminded Council of upcoming meetings.

11. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Livingston noted he had a brief conversation with the Department of Revenue Director regarding the Transportation Penny Program. As a result of the conversation, they agreed to a follow-up meeting to discuss the matter. If the meeting comes to fruition, he will report back to Council.

12. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

- a. Ordinance authorizing Quit-Claim deed of Olympia Alleyway to contiguous landowner (Hendley-104 Alabama Street) – No comments were submitted.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. Ordinance authorizing Quit-Claim deed of Olympia Alleyway to contiguous landowner (Hendley – 104 Alabama Street) [THIRD READING] – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Department of Public Works – Solid Waste & Recycling Division – Award of a contract for Landfill Gas Control System
- c. Department of Public Works – Engineering Division – CTC Funding Request for Intersection Improvement at Hobart and Farrow Roads

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mc. Bride, to approve Items 13 (b) and (c)

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider Items 13(a) – (c).

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

14. **FIRST READING ITEMS**

- a. An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt an Annual Budget (FY2022) for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June 30, 2022. So as to raise revenue, make appropriations and adopt 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, 2021 and ending June 30, 2022 [BY TITLE ONLY] – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve this item.

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

Opposed: Pugh

The vote was in favor.

- b. An Ordinance authorizing the levying of ad valorem property taxes which together with the prior year's carryover and other State levies and any additional amount appropriated by the Richland County Council prior to July 1 2021 will provide sufficient revenues for the operation of Richland County Government during the period from July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 [BY TITLE ONLY] – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by O. Walker, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Providing for the issuance of refunding revenue bonds in one or more series, tax-exempt or taxable, in an amount not to exceed \$18,000,000 to refund the County's outstanding Village at Sandhill Improvement District Assessment Revenue Bonds, Series 2004, and other matters relating thereto – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

Ms. Terracio requested staff give an overview of this item for the benefit of the public.

Mr. Brown stated the purpose of this item is to reduce annual debt service an average of \$165,000, which equates to a total of \$2,475,000.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, while the taxpayers in the improvement district will benefit, is there any cost to the County to do this.

Mr. Cheatwood responded, just like any other financing, there will be a cost for the transaction. The savings figures, in the agenda packet, represent the net amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, any cost the County incurs would be paid for through the improvement district.

Mr. Cheatwood responded in the affirmative.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Providing for the issuance of General Obligation bonds in one or more series, tax-exempt or taxable, in an amount not to exceed \$13,000,000 to refund a portion of the County's outstanding General Obligation bonds, and other related matters – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

- a. Department of Public Works – Engineering Division – DHEC Grant Administration for Springwood Lake Community – Mr. Malinowski stated his concern with this item was that Legal had concerns with the agreement. He noted he would like to see the final language, and not what is included in the agenda packet.

Ms. McLean stated the grant agreement mentions a two-month timeframe for this, and it does not state what we are doing. In case there is an issue later, she wants the process and the agreement to match. Either the Legal Department or the State needs to update the language, prior to approval.

Ms. Barron stated she would encourage staff to move as expeditiously as possible to ensure the documents are aligned and the processes match. This community has been waiting for roads to be repaired since the 2015 Flood.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item, pending review by Legal to ensure the process and agreement language match.

Ms. Mackey inquired about how long it will take to amend the language.

Ms. McLean responded, as long as there is no kickback, it should take approximately a week.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to reconsider this item.

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Request from Chief Magistrate – Pontiac Magistrate Building Lease – Mr. Malinowski stated his concern with this item was that Legal and Mr. Pruitt had concerns related to the rental agreement. He noted he would like to see the final language, and not what is included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, O. Walker and English

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, Mackey and Newton

The motion for deferral failed.

Ms. McLean stated she does not believe we are ready to move forward with the lease. She noted she has some concerns with the agreement, and Mr. Pruitt has also expressed concerns. The lease has language that is geared toward the landlord, and not the lessee (i.e. County maintaining utilities).

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Pruitt reviews the County's contracts.

Ms. McLean responded he does not typically review contracts, but he does so when the contract deals with operations since his department is responsible for maintaining the building.

Ms. Newton inquired if Ms. McLean believes there are substantive changes that need to be made to the agreement that would need to come back to Council for approval.

Ms. McLean responded she believes we need more time, and would prefer to bring the agreement back to Council, but she is not opposed to the other route.

Ms. Barron stated, while she understands Mr. Pruitt's input is valuable, when it comes to assessing the building, she is concerned about him reviewing a legal document. She admonished Legal, if the contract is not sound, to tell us sooner rather than later, but to expedite the process. If the public and staff continue to go in and out of the existing building, we are going to have other issues to be concerned about.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to move forward, pending review of the contract by Ms. McLean, and to have the contract brought back to Council at the May 18th Council meeting.

Ms. Newton made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to authorize Ms. McLean to modify the lease agreement for the Pontiac Magistrate Office, and move forward with any ministerial changes. If there are any substantive changes, to bring those back to Council at the May 18th Council meeting.

Mr. Malinowski noted ministerial and/or substantive changes are personal opinions, and he does not feel it is fair to put the burden on Ms. McLean.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, O. Walker and English

The vote was in favor.

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

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, O. Walker and English

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, Mackey and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

16. **REPORT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Curb to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Ms. McBride stated this is a proposed FILOT to support the expansion of an existing manufacturer of packaging materials located near Blythewood. This expansion represents a capital investment of \$21M, and the creation of 165 new jobs at an average wage of more than \$17/hr. The committee recommended First Reading approval.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County and a company known for the time being as Project Coyote; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Ms. McBride stated this is an inducement resolution that officially recognizes the project to allow the company to include an investment as a part of their project before any incentive documents are finalized. The committee recommended approval of this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and a company known for the time being as Project Coyote; to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Ms. McBride stated this is a proposed FILOT for an existing manufacturer of building materials, which is considering the consolidation of operations in Richland County, and an expansion of existing operations. The new project represents an investment

of \$4.8M, and the creation of 20 new jobs with an average wage of \$21/hr. The committee recommended approval of this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. REPORT OF RULES & APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

a. NOTIFICATION OF VACANCIES

I. Community Relations Council

- a. William Zachery Riley
- b. Derrick Fickling
- c. Maranda J. Williams
- d. Rhonda S. Williams
- e. Linda Grice
- f. Keshia McNeal
- g. Reenea R. Harrison
- h. Jeffrey Hunter
- i. Kira Person
- j. Heather Singleton
- k. Yvonne Murray-Boyles
- l. Demestress “Dee” Bell-Williams
- m. Jonnieka Farr

Mr. Malinowski stated due to the one of the applicants having a medical emergency the committee deferred appointments to the Community Relations Council until the May 18th Rules and Appointments Committee meeting.

18. REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE

- a. City of Columbia Bikeway IGA – Mr. O. Walker stated the City of Columbia is requesting funding through this IGA, which will support 5 City of Columbia bikeway projects. The IGA includes 10 bikeway projects that are in the Penny referendum. The City of Columbia will perform all design and maintenance activities. The County will provide \$824,332 in funding for the projects. The committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski noted, on p. 351 of the agenda, letter “e” states, “This agreement will not create any duty or responsibility to anyone other than the Parties to the Agreement, nor does it create any rights enforceable by anyone other than a party (third party beneficiary) to the agreement.” He inquired as to what a third party beneficiary is, how this would come into play in this situation, and are they responsible and bound by this agreement.

Ms. McLean responded a third party beneficiary is someone who might benefit from this agreement. This agreement is between the City of Columbia and the County; therefore, no one else could claim the benefit.

Mr. Malinowski noted letter “i” states, “Written notice to the City shall be made by placing such notice

in the United States Mail, Certified, Return Receipt Requested, postage prepaid and Addressed to: City of Columbia, P.O. Box 147, Columbia, SC 29217” He inquired if the County could also be included.

Ms. McLean responded she does not have any objections to that being added to the IGA.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the “COMET” is a branding name, or if is it a new entity and the CMRTA is no longer in existence.

Ms. McLean responded, to the best of her knowledge, the “COMET” is a branding name and the CMRTA is the legal entity.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, these bike paths were previously approved per the referendum.

Mr. O. Walker responded in the affirmative. He noted the projects are located in the City.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- b. Modification to Innovista Phase 3 De-scope and Funding Approval – Mr. O. Walker stated the City of Columbia has requested \$150,000 of Innovista transportation-related project funding for the City’s FY22 budget. They are also seeking a letter of commitment to the City of Columbia’s request for up to \$4,088,663 of future Innovista project funds to support the City’s efforts to secure outside Federal funding for the Innovista Phase III Project (Williams St. Connector). The committee recommended approval of this item.

Ms. Newton stated, it is her understanding, in bringing our Penny costs down, we de-scoped various programs, and this was one of those programs. We are being asked now to undo the de-scope and add the funds back.

Mr. O. Walker responded, it is his understanding, the City of Columbia is seeking a Federal grant of approximately \$20M. In order to secure the grant, they have to get a commitment of at least 20%. In the event the funds are granted, it is a gain for the County. As a result of investing \$4M, we are looking at a \$16M grant to be used for infrastructure improvements.

Ms. Newton stated these were funds that we were planning on putting into the Transportation Penny “pot” for other things. As it relates to the \$4M, are we saying these are dollars we were not originally going to pay because we had removed that part of the Innovista project in our de-scoping?

Mr. Niermeier stated, since this was a part of the de-scoping, and Phase III was removed by Council approval, this action is essentially re-scoping the Innovista project, adding Phase III as a potential project by giving the letter of commitment to the City of Columbia for the \$4M, and the \$150,000 FY22 budget request.

Ms. Newton inquired if that would still leave other funds that would go back to the Penny Program.

Mr. Niermeier responded, based on updated estimate for Phase III, we anticipate \$7M - \$8M to remain in the \$50M referendum amount for the Innovista transportation projects.

Ms. Newton noted she understands the opportunity to leverage our funding with the grant, but she does not know what the process will be if we move forward. We were intentional when we were de-scoping projects, so if we are going to go back and re-scope she wants to ensure we are putting in safeguards and are clear that we are protecting the savings we originally made. She noted there may be other projects that could also benefit from using these funds.

Ms. Terracio stated this grant would be an opportunity to leverage Federal funds in order to afford something that would have previously been beyond our original budget.

Mr. Niermeier stated the original estimate was significantly higher than the current estimate of \$20M. With this we are leveraging the funds that could be available to complete the project.

Mr. Malinowski noted initially they were told de-scoping Phase III would create a savings of \$5.7M. He inquired as to what happened to the remaining funds.

Mr. Niermeier responded the remaining funds would be held in the bikeways portion of the Penny Program.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if it is fair to the other projects that were de-scoped to approve this item.

Mr. O. Walker stated, it is his understanding, by applying for these funds, we lose nothing. If the City is not successful in receiving this grant, the County does not lose anything.

Mr. Niermeier responded the only funds we will be investing upfront is the \$150,000.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the City has approached us about any other projects they are applying for.

Mr. Niermeier responded there has not been anything recent. The County has partnered with the City for the North Main Project, which is currently underway and nearing completion.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- c. Transportation Improvement Contract 2 – Old Garners Ferry Rd. – Mr. O. Walker stated this is a transportation improvement contract to repair Old Garners Ferry Road. The project is 1.1 miles. The committee recommended awarding the contract to Palmetto Corporation of Conway in the amount of \$471,916.45, with a contingency amount of \$70,787.46 for an aggregate amount of \$542,703.91.

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

Opposed: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

Mr. O. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider Items 18 (a) – (c).

In Favor: Malinowski and J. Walker

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

19. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. A Resolution to appoint and commission Kyle Hughes as a Code Enforcement Officer for the proper security, general welfare, and convenience of Richland County – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve this item.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

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

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Taylor's Community Improvement Funds – Mr. Brown stated this item was previously before Council. At this point, there are a couple options Council can take. He stated they reached out to the Recreation Commission, and they did not have any recommendations on how to apply these funds.

Ms. Newton noted, in the agenda packet, it was mentioned that there is a Recreation Commission park nearby. She inquired if this park was built subsequent to us receiving the \$300,000, and how the park is being used.

Mr. Brown responded, during the course of conversations about the community, he and Dr. Thompson drove the area, and came upon the park. The park was not open at the time due to COVID, but it appears to be a relatively new park.

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Brown heard from the Recreation Commission after the agenda packets were distributed.

Mr. Brown responded he reached out to the Recreation Commission Director and noted there had been no communication from the Recreation Commission on this item. Ms. Watkins indicated that was correct, and they had not given any feedback on how the County should utilize funds for the community.

Mr. Crooks stated, to address Ms. Newton's question, there is a park in this area. It appears there have been renovations and additions made to it recently. He noted the park is located in the area for which these funds are to be utilized. He stated staff has two (2) recommendations:

- (a) To move forward with developing a detailed project plan for the expenditure of the \$300,000 allocated to the Taylor's Community, in developing and implementing the Rail-to-Trail Art Alley;

(b) To move forward with developing a detailed project plan for the expenditure of the \$300,000 allocated to the Taylors Community, in implementing the beautification measures, i.e., public art, gateway signage, and community scavenger hunt, in a coordinated manner.

Mr. Malinowski stated his concern is we have a private company that is giving money to private community. He does not see why the County has gotten in the middle. He believes the money should be turned over to a responsible party in the community (i.e. HOA).

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. J. Walker, to provide the funds to the community for them to use as they see fit.

Ms. Terracio inquired who in the community would receive the funds.

Mr. Malinowski responded it could be given to the HOA or an official organization representing the community.

Ms. McLean noted this funding came to the County through an economic development agreement. If we are going to undo that, we need to take that into consideration.

Mr. J. Walker stated, it is his understanding, when we investigated this transaction there was no formal agreement that came through our EDC Department. The EDC Department was just as confused as everyone, as it pertains to the \$300,000, and its appropriate use, which is what has created the confusion we are dealing with today.

Ms. McLean responded, when we previously discussed this issue, that is what everyone thought. At that time, Ms. Hamm did some research, and found the language in the economic development agreement with Project Reign.

Mr. J. Walker withdrew his second.

Ms. Newton noted she had a lot of questions she would like to have addressed before moving forward. For example: (a) Is there a HOA; and (b) What are the community expectations.

Mr. J. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item to the May 18th Council meeting.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

20. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – There were no items for Executive Session.

21. **MOTIONS PERIOD**

- a. Redistricting will need to be done by the election in 2022. I request the Administrator to begin the process toward that end so we are not behind when the time arrives to provide the needed information [MALINOWSKI] – This motion will be addressed by Administration.

22. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:06 PM