



Richland County Council
Regular Session
MINUTES
July 18, 2023 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Chair; Jesica Mackey, Vice-Chair; Jason Branham, Derrek Pugh, Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Allison Terracio, Don Weaver, Gretchen Barron, Cheryl English, and Chakisse Newton.

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Kyle Holsclaw, Aric Jensen, Patrick Wright, Leonardo Brown, Anette Kirylo, Chelsea Bennett, Lori Thomas, Michael Maloney, Stacey Hamm, Jennifer Wladischkin, Tamar Black, Zachary Cavanaugh, Thomas Gilbert, Angela Weathersby, Sarah Harris, Geo Price, Bill Davis, Callison Richardson, Venyke Harley, Sean Taylor, and Wayne Thornley

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Overture Walker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The Invocation was led by the Honorable Allison Terracio.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Allison Terracio.
4. **PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATIONS**
 - a. A Proclamation recognizing Senior Resources Inc. and declaring August 21st as Senior Citizens' Day [ENGLISH, BRANHAM, PUGH, McBRIDE, LIVINGSTON, TERRACIO, WEAVER, BARRON, WALKER, MACKEY, and NEWTON] – Ms. English presented a proclamation recognizing Senior Resources and declaring August 21st as Senior Citizens' Day.
 - b. A Proclamation recognizing the 2023 Miss South Carolina [MACKEY] – Ms. Mackey presented a proclamation recognizing Miss South Carolina 2023, Ms. Jada Samuel.
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. Special Called Meeting: July 11, 2023 – Ms. Newton moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.
6. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Pugh moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.
7. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION (Pursuant to SC Code 30-4-70)** – There were no items for Executive Session.
8. **CITIZENS' INPUT**
 - a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing
 1. Eric Friendly, 1601 Richland Street, Columbia, SC 29201 – Historic Columbia

Ms. Barron encouraged Councilmembers and citizens to download the Historic Columbia app to tap into the available resources. She noted that you can tour different facilities every 3rd Sunday from 1:00-4:00 PM at no cost.

Ms. English commended the staff for their support at her recent community events.

9. **CITIZENS' 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 this time.) – No one signed up to speak.

10. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

a. Updates for Consideration:

1. *Short-Term Rental Ordinance* – The County Administrator, Leonardo Brown, reminded Councilmembers to submit their comments pertaining to the ordinance to the Clerk's Office so they can be provided to the Business Service Director, so we can move forward on drafting a proposed ordinance.
2. *Classification and Compensation Study Report* – Mr. Brown stated this is the study where the County was going to put forth an effort to address a long-term strategy to concentrate on pay and compensation for Richland County. The funding was approved in the budget. Tonight's request is to move forward with discussions with the elected officials and department heads associated with these departments. Afterward, we will come back to Council with the actual plan for implementation. He noted the market peers were Aiken, Beaufort, Charleston, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Greenville, Lexington, Spartanburg, and York counties, cities of Charlotte, Columbia, Irmo, and West Columbia, East Richland County, private sector law firms and financial institutions, State of South Carolina, and the University of South Carolina. The County's pay plan study was not limited to the surrounding counties but to other outside agencies we compete against. He indicated the plan will be in constant motion and require continual review to ensure we stay competitive.

Mr. Livingston moved to authorize staff to proceed with discussions with the elected officials and department heads regarding the class and compensation study findings and report back to Council after discussions have been completed, seconded by Ms. Newton.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

b. Administrator's Nomination: Items in this section require action that may prejudice the County's interest in a discernable way (i.e., time-sensitive, exigent, or of immediate importance)

1. *Utilities – Eastover Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion Engineering Services* – Mr. Brown indicated the request is to approve the estimated engineering services for the Eastover Wastewater Treatment Plant expansion. We supported the department in getting grant funds from the State. The State approved the receipt of the funds, and Council approved the acceptance of those funds. Due to the way the Council meeting dates fall, we would miss the deadline for the grant funds.

Ms. McBride moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. English.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

2. *Utilities – Lagoon Closure Project- Richland County School District 1 (RCSD1)* – Mr. Brown noted the County entered into a process whereby it closed down lagoons at schools in Lower Richland because they were ponds of "poop." The Southeast Water and Sewer Extension Plan replaced the lagoons. Part of this process was the lagoons had to be closed out. The request is to award the Lagoon Closure Project contract to AAA Utility and Construction, LLC, in the amount of \$2,534,449.50.

Ms. English moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Newton.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

3. *Grants & Community Outreach – 2023 Annual Action Plan and 2022-2026 Five-Year Consolidated Plan Substantial Amendment* – Mr. Brown stated to receive Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, and Emergency Solutions Grant funds, Richland County must submit an Annual Action Plan to the US Housing and Urban Development each year, the County must also submit a 5-year Consolidated Plan every fifth year. The Community Development Division recommends approval of the following plans for submission to HUD for the purposes of administering Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, and Emergency Solutions Grant funds: (1) The FY23 Annual Action Plan to administer and allocate \$1,723,394 in CDBG funds, \$941,966 in HOME funds, and \$148,882 in ESG funds for submission to HUD on or before August 15, 2023; and (2) The Substantial Amendment to the 2022-2026 Five-Year Consolidated Plan to incorporate newly awarded ESG funds for submission to the HUD on or before August 15, 2023.

Ms. Newton moved to approve the submission of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership, and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) plans, as well as the Substantial Amendment to the 2022-2026 Five-Year Consolidated Plan to incorporate the newly awarded ESG funds to HUD, seconded by Ms. English.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

4. *Road Paving Program Information* – Mr. Brown gave a brief overview of the FAQs document provided to Council.

Q: Is the County going to pave everyone's roads even if people on the road don't want them paved? No. The County's program was not designed to pave everyone's road. There seems to be some information communicated that the County intends to pave every road in the County, which is not the case.

Q: Why is the County looking at removing the 25% threshold for denying a road's paving? Staff was trying to find a way to reach out to the citizens that lived in those areas, get feedback and input, provide that feedback and input to Council, and then determine what would happen.

Q: Are all County roads now being paved with funds from the Penny? No. Before the Penny existed, the County still took action to pave roads.

Q: How does the County address the concern of possible increased traffic flow when a dirt road is paved, especially if that road is a "shortcut" between two streets? Per the current ordinance, the road to be paved cannot interconnect existing streets or serve developable vacant land, which would result in the potential of over 400 vehicles/daily. The road cannot serve existing businesses or vacant land zoned for business use that would generate traffic exceeding 400 vehicles/daily or truck traffic exceeding 24 vehicles/daily. In general, paving interconnecting roads will better serve the public during emergencies and road closures.

Q: How is the cost to pave a road determined? There is a formula: District dirt road paving funds = total dirt road paving funds x district dirt road mileage. Bid results determine the cost. Each road is unique in the need for drainage improvements, but a roadway's design indicates the specific needs of each road.

Q: If road problems, such as drainage issues, arise after the paving of a dirt road, is the County responsible for fixing the problem? The County maintained roads are in the County's inventory. Therefore, the County is responsible for the continued maintenance of the road(s).

Q: Does the County plan to dramatically increase taxes to fund said paving? There has been no discussion of increasing taxes. These revenues have already been set.

Q: Is the County paving roads so developers can build more housing? No. Richland County's efforts to provide safe, efficient, and quality transportation are continuous and are not tied to attracting developers.

Mr. Branham acknowledged his intent to make a substitute motion to amend the 25% to 50%. He noted the need to review the consent/denial letter to ensure there is an adequate description of the project.

Ms. Barron indicated that the Communications Team has done a fabulous job of better-communicating things the County is doing. However, she feels this topic needs to have been better communicated with the constituents. As noted, there was a lot of incorrect information floating around, but she is not sure we have done anything to correct the information. The FAQs document would have been something great to have been posted on our website and the County's social media accounts. She suggested adopting a model for how we handle pressing issues.

Mr. Pugh noted he had the opportunity to visit a few of his communities that are concerned. He believes we need to do a better job of speaking plainly to address some of the uneasiness in the communities.

Mr. Walker stated his understanding was that when this item came before the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee in May, the concern was that we had roads that were a part of the Penny ordinance. A total of \$45M has been allocated for the paving of dirt roads enumerated in the Penny ordinance. In 2014, there was an amendment to the County's roads, highways, and bridges ordinance, which is separate from the Penny. The amended ordinance included the 25% threshold for denying the pavement of a road. As a result of that, you ended up with a minority of residents who could stop the pavement of a road, which overrode the will of the majority for the pavement of roads passed as a part of the 2012 Penny ordinance. His understanding is that the \$45M allocated has been decreased to \$20M, with a completion rate of 29%. Staff brought this to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee's attention to inform Council that we have an emergency on our hands. He noted that this ordinance will not affect you if your dirt road is not on the list of roads approved in the referendum.

Ms. Newton inquired if the proposed ordinance would only apply to the dirt roads approved in the referendum or all County owned and maintained dirt roads.

Mr. Walker responded that it would apply to all roads, but that is not the impetus behind the amendment.

11. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – Ms. Anette Kirylo, Clerk to Council, reminded Councilmembers of the Land Development Code Work Session scheduled for Tuesday, July 25th, at 5:00 PM.
12. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – No report was given.
13. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**
 - a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to 2019 Bull Street Owner, LLC, a company formerly known to the County as Project Urban Renewal; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.
 - b. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to Huger Flats, LLC, a company formerly known to the County as Project Wichita and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.
 - c. An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 21, Roads, Highways, and Bridges; Section 21-20, Road Paving Program; Subsection (i); so as to remove specific language
 1. Ms. Cynthia Shepard, 200 Back Acres Road, Chapin, SC 29036
 2. Mr. Chris Del Rossi, 1125 Stone House Road, Chapin, SC 29036
 3. Ms. Vanda Del Rossi, 1125 Stone House Road, Chapin, SC 29036
 4. Mr. Stuart Andrews, 120 Middlefield Lane, Blythewood, SC 29016
 5. Ms. Bridgette Craver, 1024 Bookie Richardson Road, Chapin, SC 29036
 6. Ms. Susan Grosslight, 335 Persimmon Fork Road, Blythewood, SC 29016
 7. Ms. Terry Rowell, 3635 Kennerly Road, Irmo, SC 29063
 8. Mr. Raymond LaPointe, 3635 Kennerly Road, Irmo, SC 29063
 9. Mr. Mike Ritchie, 100 Back Acres Road, Chapin, SC 29036
 10. Ms. Majken Blackwell, 4600 Old Leesburg Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
 11. Ms. Sarah Major, 148 Clamp Road, Blythewood, SC 29016
 12. Ms. Jennifer Mancke, 320 Clearview Drive, Hopkins, SC 29061
 - d. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Clayton Properties Group, Inc. d/b/a Mungo Homes (formerly known to the County as Project Foundation) to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.
14. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**
 - a. Case #23-009MA
Michael Bell
RU to GC (3 Acres)
S/S Garners Ferry Road
TMS # R21800-05-20 (portion of) [THIRD READING]
 - b. An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, License and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; by amending the Business License Class Schedule Table and the Business License Schedule Rates Table so as to make conforming changes [SECOND READING]

Ms. Newton moved to approve the Consent Items, seconded by Ms. Barron.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Barron moved to reconsider Item 14(a), seconded by Ms. Newton.

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

15. **THIRD READING ITEM**

- a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to 2019 Bull Street Owner, LLC, a company formerly known to the County as Project Urban Renewal; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Barron.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved to reconsider this item, seconded by Ms. Newton.

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to Huger Flats, LLC a company formerly known to the County as Project Wichita and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved to reconsider this item, seconded by Ms. Barron.

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

- c. An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 21, Roads, Highways, and Bridges; Section 21-20, Road Paving Program; Subsection (i); so as to remove specific language – Ms. McBride moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

Mr. Branham made a substitute motion to amend Section I(j)(4) as follows: "If fifty-one (51%) percent or more of all such property owners decline said road paving, then the subject road shall not be paved", seconded by Mr. Pugh.

Ms. English indicated the Lower Richland residents pushed the Penny Tax because of the dirt roads in that area. If you look at the topography, all the water drains down to that particular area. When the 2015 Flood occurred, that was one of the hardest-hit areas, and they have not recovered yet. Ambulances and fire trucks do not have access because the roads are in terrible condition. She maintained that not all the roads need to be paved, but many do.

It is Ms. Barron's understanding, based on the motion on the floor, that citizens' rights are not being taken away. We are putting in a majority vote. She inquired where the citizens' belief their rights are being taken away is coming from. In addition, does this automatically mean a single-lane road will become a two-lane road when paved?

Mr. Walker replied the only change to the ordinance would be the threshold to determine if the road would be paved.

Mr. Weaver asked if we go back to the drawing board if the motion fails.

Mr. Walker responded if the motion fails, we go back to the status quo, which means we go back to a process whereby we are already behind on paving dirt roads. We have been unable to pave the roads at the pace necessary to satisfy the mandate voters voted for in 2012.

Mr. Weaver inquired if it would allow staff to rework some of the concerns in the ordinance.

Mr. Walker stated if the motion fails, someone will have to make a motion for it to come back up again. He noted no one had an issue with the ordinance until we started talking about making the ordinance more consistent with democratic rule, which is going from a minority to a majority.

Ms. Newton inquired if the consent/denial process is a procedure they can work with staff on or something we need to dictate in the motion.

The County Attorney, Patrick Wright, stated the consent/denial process is included in the ordinance and would require a future motion to address.

Mr. Branham indicated in the execution of the ordinance he would like to see a clear consent/denial letter that explains the proposed project.

Mr. Walker stated this item did not develop in a vacuum. Staff did not willy-nilly decide it wanted to do something about dirt roads in Richland County. This was brought to Council's attention via the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee. Before items make their way to Council, they typically come through a committee. Director Maloney, doing what your taxpayer dollars pay him to do, which is preside over the Department of Public Works and includes the Transportation Department, discovered we were grossly behind on getting roads paved and losing taxpayer dollars. Over half of the \$45M allocated has been expended, and only 29% of the roads have been paved. If he were to sit on that information and not share it with Council, it would be a dereliction of duty. If there is any political will, it is the will to do the right thing, honor the will of the voters, and protect the taxpayer dollars.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- d. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Clayton Properties Group, Inc. d/b/a Mungo Homes (formerly known to the County as Project Foundation) to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Mackey

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

16. **SECOND READING ITEMS**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina, and Vista Depot Holding, LLC, among other of its affiliates, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of one or more fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreements by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Growth to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Mr. Weaver.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. **REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

- a. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Vista Depot Holding, LLC, among other of its affiliates; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Ms. Terracio noted Council gave Second Reading approval to an ordinance for the execution and delivery for Vista Depot Holding. She inquired if this item was a new negotiation with Vista Depot Holding.

Mr. Livingston responded that a resolution simply identifies the project.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved to reconsider this item, seconded by Ms. Barron.

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
The motion for reconsideration failed.

18. REPORT OF THE RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

a. NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS

I. Employee Grievance Committee – 6 (Two (2) Member Vacancies and Four (4) Alternates)

Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended appointing Mr. Shep Headley and Mr. Kevin Bland to the member vacancies.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

In addition, the committee recommended appointing Mr. Kenneth Kinney, Ms. Clarissa Dickerson, Ms. Tameka Barczak, and Ms. Keisha Bell to the alternate positions.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

Ms. Barron noted during this process, the committee learned there are some discrepancies in the Employee Handbook. In the handbook, a quorum for the Employee Grievance Committee is five (5), but by law, it is four (4). There are also some additional revisions for this committee that will come before Council through Mr. Brown.

19. REPORT OF THE CORONAVIRUS AD HOC COMMITTEE

Mr. Walker noted he is a board member of the Lower Richland Alumni Foundation; therefore, he will be recusing himself from the discussion and vote pertaining to this organization.

a. American Rescue Plan Application Review and Recommendation:

1. Workforce Training – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended funding all of the applicants but to reduce the allocation proportionately to the requested amount so as to not exceed the available funds. Each allocation will be an up to amount and will be pending any desk reviews.

Mr. Livingston maintained he believes it would be better to fund the organizations that will significantly impact workforce training in the community.

Ms. Barron indicated we hired a third-party vendor so that Council would not get in the weeds of making decisions on these organizations. We had to make some adjustments in some categories, and this was one where the scores were close. Moreover, when you look at ARPA dollars, they are designed for particular areas of the County. When we start to look at the impact, we are not being objective in the process, and we start to imply personal preference.

Ms. Mackey suggested approving the top four (4) agencies at the requested amount.

Ms. Mackey made a substitute motion to fund the following entities up to the amount notated and pending any desk reviews: Alston Wilkes Society - \$54,381; US Columbia Technology Incubator - \$462,507; Midlands Fatherhood Coalition - \$33,988; and Richland County Public Library - \$56,930.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Mackey, and English

Opposed: McBride and Barron

Recuse: Walker and Newton

The vote was in favor.

2. Education Assistance – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended funding the following entities up to the amount notated and pending any desk reviews: the Richland Library – up to \$64,000; Lower Richland Alumni Foundation - \$155,931.75; Lynn Brown Inspires: Young CEOs and Leaders of Tomorrow - \$50,000; SC Thrive - \$179,740; Planned Parenthood South Atlantic - \$100,000; United Way of the Midlands - \$200,000; and the Boys and Girls Clubs of the Midlands - \$182,250.

In Favor: Pugh, Livingston, Barron, Mackey, English, and Newton

Opposed: Branham, McBride, and Weaver

Recuse: Terracio and Walker

The vote was in favor.

3. Food Insecurity – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommending funding the following entities up to the amount notated and pending any desk reviews: Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services, Inc - \$58,256; Senior Resources - \$548,046; Midlands Housing Alliance - \$419,986; Prisma Health Midlands - \$348,189; and Serve and Connect - \$77477.

Ms. McBride went on record that it was not that she did not support the grantees, but she has concerns about the overall process with the grants; therefore, she will be voting against the allocations.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Mackey, English, and Newton

Opposed: McBride and Livingston

Recuse: Walker

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Barron stated the committee still needs to address the Small Business category. She noted this was a major project, and we had good intentions when we started. She believes we did good work, even though we may not have all agreed with how we got there at the end of the day. We set out to have a transparent process and get the funds into the hands of local non-profits that COVID-19 negatively impacted.

Ms. Barron moved to reconsider Items 19(a)(1), 19(a)(2), and 19(a)(3), seconded by Mr. Livingston.

In Favor: McBride

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, Livingston, Weaver, Barron, Mackey, and English

Recuse: Terracio, Walker, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

20. **REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY IMPACT GRANTS COMMITTEE**

- a. **Fiscal Year 2024 Grant Application Review** – Ms. Mackey stated the committee met regarding our FY24 Grant Application review. She noted the Community Impact Grant Application and Guidelines have been approved, and the grant application process is currently open and scheduled to close on July 31st. Two (2) public information sessions were held for individuals to obtain information on how to apply. This information is also available online.

During the process, there were questions brought up by the committee and Councilmembers about how the applications would be reviewed. Since the Community Impact Grants Committee is a newly formed committee, no stated review process exists. The committee recommended procuring an outside party to review the applications. This third-party vendor will review the applications and provide the committee with a report. The committee will then review the report and provide recommendations to Council. The County Administrator and staff have been directed to identify an outside vendor to meet the timeframe advertised to award the grants.

Ms. Terracio noted there will be a small cost for this service, which will be taken out of the overall funding.

In Favor: Branham, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

Opposed: McBride,

The vote in favor was unanimous.

21. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. FY23 – District 5 Hospitality Tax Allocations: (Main Street Latin Festival - \$1,500; CMD C Ag + Art Tour - \$2,900; 701 Center for Contemporary Art - \$5,000)
- b. FY23 – District 6 Hospitality Tax Allocations: (The Therapy Place - \$10,000)

Mr. Pugh moved to approve Items 21(a) and (b), seconded by Ms. Terracio.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton moved to reconsider Items 21(a) and (b), seconded by Ms. Barron.

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Weaver, Barron, Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

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

24. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. I move the County Council authorize the County Administrator to enter into negotiations with Divine Auro Development, LLC or its Assignee regarding the potential sale of the property located at 1430 Colonial Life Blvd., also known as, the old Haverty's property. [TERRACIO] – Ms. Terracio moved to act on the motion at this meeting, seconded by Mr. Pugh.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the motion requires unanimous consent to be taken up at this meeting.

Mr. Wright responded in the affirmative.

In Favor: Terracio, Weaver, and Mackey

Opposed: Branham, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Barron, Walker, English, and Newton

The motion failed.

Mr. Walker forwarded Ms. Terracio's motion to the A&F Committee.

25. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. English moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Newton

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:33 PM.