



Richland County Council
Regular Session
May 15, 2018 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Jamelle Ellis Beverly Harris, James Hayes, Kim Williams-Roberts, Cathy Rawls, Tim Nielsen, Trenia Bowers, Michael Niermeier, Nathaniel Miller, Quinton Epps, Kecia Lara, John Thompson, Brandon Madden, Jennifer Wladischkin, Tracy Hegler, Sandra Yudice, Sandra Haynes, Stacey Hamm, Chris Eversmann, Ismail Ozbek, Geo Price, Laura Renwick, and Brad Farrar

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The invocation was led by the Honorable Gwen Kennedy.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Gwen Kennedy.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. **Special Called: April 9, 2018** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as submitted.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Myers and C. Jackson

The vote in favor was unanimous

- b. **Regular Session: May 1, 2018** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as submitted.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to reconsider Item 14(b) “An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Animals and Fowl; Section 5-4, Community Cat Diversion Program; so as to amend the language therein”.

Ms. McBride stated we have spent a great deal of time on this particular cat diversion ordinance. She thinks it is irresponsible for us to spend any additional time on it. When we have kids out there that are hungry and need medical attention. This has been vetted beyond vetted. Furthermore, she thinks it is a

Regular Session
May 15, 2018

disservice to our staff, and particularly our Director of Animal Services, to question her ability and her integrity, in terms of the reason that we are asking for a reconsideration. She thinks this reconsideration is discriminatory. She would ask that her Councilmembers support her in not reconsidering this. She has used the same language that the City of Columbia used for their cat diversion program. Their cat diversion program was given as a model program. Richland County is using that same program, but yet you question the integrity of Richland County Council person. You question the integrity of our Director of Animal Services that we cannot make a discretionary decision. The voters voted on us to make good choices and for us to go over this again and again when we have come to a good compromise. Nobody wants to seek cats killed. She supports the neuter-trap-return program. She also support the rights of citizens to protect their property. But in compromising, she gave into that. The only thing that we requested is that we follow the City of Columbia's cat diversion program. So, she cannot see the need for reconfirming this. She just asks her colleagues to support her and our Director of Animal Services.

Mr. Pearce stated his motion was to reconsider this item. The item is not up for debate until it is reconsidered. Therefore, he does not feel it would be appropriate for him to go into a debate unless the item is reconsidered. If the item should be reconsidered then he will be prepared to enter into a conversation regarding his reasons for wanting to reconsider this. He thinks they are some valid reasons. He does not think it is consistent to compare the City of Columbia with Richland County; therefore, he is prepared to discuss that, if the item can come back before us.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Livingston, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

Opposed: McBride, Dickerson and Kennedy

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Pearce recommended that it be placed under Third Reading items for consideration, at the appropriate point in the agenda.

Mr. Farrar stated it would be appropriate to place it under Third Reading items.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the minutes as amended.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Kennedy, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- a. Special Called: May 7, 2018 – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as submitted.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Myers and C. Jackson

Abstain: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous with Mr. Manning abstaining.

5. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. C. Jackson apologized to his colleagues for the late request for an addition. He moved to amend the agenda to add the following item entitled “An Ordinance to levy and impose ad valorem property taxes for Richland County School Districts One and Two; to improve, simplify and make more efficient the systems and procedures among Richland County School Districts One and Two and Richland County Government to fulfill responsibilities under Act 280 of 1979; and to repeal Ordinance Sec. 2-537(2) and amend Ordinance Sec. 2-525(H) {By Title Only}. Mr. Pearce seconded the motion.

Ms. Dickerson requested that Mr. C. Jackson restate the motion.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it is coming from a request from Richland I and Richland II School Districts to request Council to look at and consider the way in which the County funds their budgets and consider an alternative way of funding.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why it does take the normal process and get placed on as a motion, sent to a committee, in this case the Budget Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. C. Jackson stated because we will be having the First Reading on the budget, which did not include this. With this having 3 readings, it would fall behind our Third Reading on approving the budgets for the school districts. That is why we wanted to add it for Title Only tonight.

Mr. Malinowski stated they have known for a year...

Mr. C. Jackson stated it is his fault. He did not get it in in time. It is not Richland I or Richland II’s error.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Dickerson, Livingston, Myers, and C. Jackson

The vote in favor was unanimous.

A discussion took place regarding where to place the item on the agenda since there was not a section titled “First Reading Item”. It was decided to added it as the last item under the “Approval of Consent Items”

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the minutes from the May 14, 2018 Special Called Meeting.

Ms. Onley stated the minutes have not been prepared yet.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, what was discussed at the meeting is not final until after the minutes are read, correct? He stated the vote was not clinched; therefore, nothing is final until after the minutes have been approved.

Ms. Dickerson stated this item was not before Council.

Ms. Myers stated we authorized a contract to be executed.

Mr. Farrar stated the key is that this is not before Council.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Dickerson, Livingston, Kennedy, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor of adopting the agenda as amended.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Dickerson recognized the Clerk of Court, Jeannette McBride, was in the audience. She introduced the new COMET Executive Director, John Andoh. She also recognized Roger Leaks, a COMET Board Member, was in the audience.

PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATION

6.

- a. A Proclamation Honoring “National Public Works Week”, May 20-26, 2018 – Mr. Malinowski presented a proclamation to Mr. Ozbek in honor of National Public Works Week.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Dickerson recognized that former Lt. Gov. Bob Peeler was in the audience.

7.

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

- a. Personnel Matter
- b. Employee Grievance
- c. Contractual Matter: Land Purchase
- d. Potential Property Purchase: Township Auditorium

8.

CITIZENS’ INPUT: For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing:

Ms. Robin Driggers spoke regarding Mr. Seals Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Barbara Roach, Ms. Queen Bonaparte, Mr. Howard Johnson, Mr. Franklin DuBose, Mr. Roger Leaks, Mr. Robert O’Brien, Mr. Richard Brown, and Ms. Elaine DuBose spoke about Code Enforcement concerns.

Mr. Allan Brown spoke regarding the Renaissance Plan and Transportation Penny Program.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Kennedy thanked her residents for coming out and talking about the issues occurring in the district.

9.

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

- a. “Richland Renaissance” SCAC Article – Dr. Yudice stated staff is seeking Council’s direction on whether or not to proceed with submitting an article on Richland Renaissance to the SCAC for the July FOCUS Magazine. The Association wants to feature the project as a cover story. The deadline to submit the article is June 1st.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to respectively request deferment or postponement to a later issue. We had a couple items that were going to be on the agenda tonight that have been removed. There is a motion, at the end of the agenda, about referring some of these pieces for further consideration. We have had someone come up and speak this evening. We have heard from the Richland County Bar Association about additional public input.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Livingston and Manning

Opposed: Dickerson, McBride, Kennedy, Myers and C. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

- b. Donation of Property – Dr. Yudice stated the County received an offer from Mr. Harold Williams to donate 5.23 acres of land to the County. The parcel is located in Council District 7 and abuts the Killian Commons Parkway. Staff’s review of the site indicated there is a detention pond located on the side. County records indicated the property was last sold on March 2018 for \$20,000. This is being presented to Council for direction on whether or not to accept the property. If approved, staff would conduct its due diligence prior to accepting the property. She stated she talked to Mr. Williams and inquired what the reason for donating. He stated he just wanted to donate the property to the County. She also inquired if he was aware of any issues on the property. He responded he does not know of any issues on the property.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to send to the D&S Committee for vetting, prior to accepting the property.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Kennedy, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Potential Property Purchase: Township Auditorium – This item was taken up in Executive Session.

10. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL**

- a. County Administrator Public Hearing, May 16, 3:00 PM, Council Chambers – Ms. Roberts stated the public hearing has been cancelled.
- b. Wheatley Library Re-Opening Ceremony, May 16, 10:00 AM, 931 Woodrow Street – Ms. Roberts stated the Wheatley Library Re-Opening ceremony is scheduled for Wednesday, May 16th at 10:00 AM.
- c. Shop Road Widening Public Meeting, May 17, 5:00 – 7:00 PM, Olympia Learning Center, 621 Bluff Road – Ms. Roberts stated the Shop Road Widening Public meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 17th from 5:00 – 7:00 PM at the Olympia Learning Center.
- d. Budget Work Sessions, May 17 – Grants; May 24 – Millage Agencies/General Fund, 3:00 – 5:00 PM, Council Chambers – Ms. Roberts stated the budget work sessions are scheduled for May 17th and May 24th from 3:00 – 5:00 PM. The May 17th work session will cover Grants and the May 24th work session will cover the millage agencies and the General Fund.

Regular Session
May 15, 2018

- e. Broad River Road Gateway Signage Dedication, May 21, 11:30 AM – Ms. Roberts stated the Broad River Road Gateway Signage Dedicated is scheduled for May 21st at 11:30 AM. The location is to be determined.
- f. National Public Works Week BBQ, May 23, 11:30 AM, Public Works Complex, 400 Powell Road – Ms. Roberts stated the Public Works Week BBQ is scheduled for May 23rd at 11:30 AM at the Public Works Complex on Powell Road.
- g. 2020 Census Update – Ms. Roberts stated this item was deferred to the June 19th for additional information.

11. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

- a. Personnel Matters – Ms. Dickerson stated the first personnel matter relates to the Clerk of Council’s contract. The attorney has not completed the review of the contract. She is in hopes this item will be ready to move forward at the June 5th Council meeting.

The Richland County Administrator formally resigned yesterday, May 14th. She believes it is imperative the Count begins the search process, as quickly as possible.

Mr. Rose moved to direct the Personnel Director to begin a National search for the next County Administrator.

Ms. Myers made a friendly amend to have the HR Director bring back suggested firms to Council who would hand the search before directing him to move forward with a National search.

Mr. Rose accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. C. Jackson seconded Mr. Rose’s motion.

Mr. Manning stated Council had already begun that process. The process was interrupted.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to continue with the process that Council had already been in about a 1 ½ years ago.

Ms. Myers stated, at the point where we made the change, there was concern about the firm that was handling the search and whether they had a broad enough scope. She would be more comfortable with going back and starting from the beginning and getting a firm that we all agree on.

Ms. Dickerson stated she could not support Mr. Manning’s substitute motion because there are 4 new Council members that were not a part of the process. She would agree to start the process all over.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is now hearing that the firm was properly qualified or there was a problem with the firm. If we already started with a firm and they have all the information we needed. He does not think the criteria has changed. Why would we try to find another firm, if we already have a firm we have paid and involved in knowing the criteria we wanted. He thinks this will expedite the firm.

Mr. Pearce stated, historically, in looking for Administrators, we have begun the process by developing a job description for the Administrator of what we are looking for. He inquired if Mr. Manning's intent is to use the original document or is the intent to use the document and the firm.

Mr. Manning stated his understanding was that had already done, in working with the firm. Council met with the firm twice and the process was interrupted. His motion is to continue in what we were doing, at time, when we had started the whole process.

Ms. Kennedy stated, since she was not here, she would like to know who the firm was that Council had chosen before.

Ms. Dickerson stated she did not recall. She stated even though we started that process, and it was interrupted because we hired a person, which ended that process, so, in her opinion, the process was ended when we hired the previous Administrator.

Mr. Livingston called for the question.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Livingston, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

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

In Favor: N. Jackson

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Rose, Pearce, Manning, C. Jackson and Myers

The substitute motion failed.

Ms. Dickerson requested Mr. Rose restate his motion.

Mr. Rose stated the motion was to direct staff to bring back a list of firms to begin a National search.

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Kennedy, Myers and C. Jackson

Abstain: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous with Mr. Manning abstaining.

- b. NOBCO Briefing – Ms. Roberts presented a PowerPoint regarding the recent NOBCO Annual Economic Conference she and Ms. Dickerson attended in Prince George's County, Maryland.

12. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 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 an Infrastructure Credit Agreement to provide for infrastructure credits to Project Reign;

and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 18-004MA, Olman Lobo, GC to LI (1.93 Acres), 10535 Farrow Road, TMS # R17500-02-02 [THIRD READING]
- b. 18-005MA, Salman Muhammad, HI to LI (3 Acres), 10500 Farrow Road, TMS # R17500-03-02 [THIRD READING]

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

In Favor: Pearce, Rose, McBride, N. Jackson, Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Kennedy, Myers, C. Jackson and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. An Ordinance to levy and impose ad valorem property taxes for Richland County School Districts One and Two; to improve, simplify and make more efficient the systems and procedures among Richland County School Districts One and Two and Richland County Government to fulfill responsibilities under Act 280 of 1979; and to repeal Ordinance Sec. 2-537(2) and amend Ordinance Sec. 2-525(H) [FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY] – Mr. C. Jackson stated this clearly was an attempt by Richland School Districts I and II to make sure, in going forward, they present a budget that speaks to the needs of their distinctive school districts, while at the same time, recognizing the appropriate funding source and mechanism to get those funds. Council has in the past, prior to his arrival, has set a millage for the school districts. Other times we have asked them for a dollar amount. Sometimes we have asked them for a combination of both. Richland I and II came and spoke, and several of you, and asked if they could propose a way to receive funding that would be more consistent, and would put the onus on them to be responsible for the revenues they ended up with. Mr. C. Jackson requested permission to allow Dr. Harry Miley and Mr. Ed Carlon to speak briefly to share with Council what they are going to recommend.

Dr. Miley stated what this ordinance amendment would do is to get the process with Richland County approving our millage rate more in line with the State law. It also would provide more direction to us. It does not change your approval. You would still approve our millage rate, as the State law recommends. The school district would come to Council with a proposed budget. They would go through their own budget process, at their respective boards. What they would be asking Council to vote on, as authorized by law, is a millage rate. And, with that millage rate, they would be responsible for appropriating the funds. One of the things that is unique with their entities, they are all lumped together as millage agencies. The millage rate that Council approves factors into about 35% of their total budget. Whereas, a lot of the other millage agencies, Council's direction and decisions are basically their entire budget. The districts get 60% of their funds from the State. One of the items that is included in the budget that Council has approved in the past, is actually a State allocation. They are asking to focus on what is generated by County millage. Council will approve or disapprove the requested millage rate.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item for First Reading by Title Only.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like some additional information and provided to us. It sounds like we will be changing an entire budget process for one group. What happens when the next group comes in

and claims we are not doing something they do not like? He would like some input from the Auditor.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

14. **SECOND READING ITEMS**

- a. 18-008MA, Tony Cates, RU to GC (17.3 Acres), 1045 Marina Road, TMS # R02414-01-04 – Mr. Malinowski stated he requested this item be deferred to this date, so the group would have time to get the covenants signed and in place. He was told the covenants have been signed, but he has not seen them yet. He would like to see them prior to 3rd Reading.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. An Ordinance Authorizing the issuance and sale of not exceeding \$20,000,000 General Obligation Bond Anticipation Notes (Richland Renaissance Project), Series 2018B, or such other appropriate series designation, of Richland County, South Carolina; fixing the form and details of the notes; authorizing the County Administrator to determine certain matters relating to the notes; providing for the payment of the notes and the disposition of the proceeds thereof; and other matters relating thereto –

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Pearce, Manning, N. Jackson and Rose

The vote was in favor.

- c. An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 5, Animals and Fowl; Section 5-4, Community Cat Diversion Program; so as to amend the language therein – Mr. Pearce apologized to Ms. McBride. He stated the reason this was carried over was because he was negligent in his preparation on the last reading. He takes full responsibility for being the one to, unfortunately, have his colleagues to consider this again.

Mr. Pearce stated every ordinance Council passes is important to him, and when we are looking at an ordinance that affects the life of animals, he cannot help but be moved by the fact that we would want to get an ordinance that the policy adopted would be the best possible policy we can pass. A lot has been said about the City of Columbia and the wording of their policy, but we are not the City of

Columbia. We do not own the animal shelter. We do not provide the medical care for the cats. What we do is follow a procedure. The procedure is: They pick up the animals and take them to the animal center, where a medical assessment is provided. They make a determination if the cat is healthy. If the cat is healthy, under the policy, they are going to perform surgery, neuter and vaccinate the cat, and clip its ear to identify it as a neutered cat. If the cat is severely injured or extremely sick then the cat is going to be euthanized, but they make the determination on that at the shelter. If the cat is healthy then we pick up the cat and return it to the community. So, the ordinance we passed says treatment and return of any cat in the program, shall be subject to the discretion of the Richland County Director of Animal Care. We are not in a position to make a determination about that. Our ordinance states we should pick up the cat and transport it. The City of Columbia has gone on record, and the Mayor has even put it in his State of the City Address, they will be a no-kill facility by the end of 2018. They are not going to euthanize any healthy, adoptable, treatable animal. So, that shelter, that we do not own, is not going to euthanize a healthy, treatable animal. For us to include in our ordinance, and what he is asking for, is strike the phrase, "treatment and return of any cat in the program, shall be subject to the discretion of the Richland County Director of Animal Care." Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Ms. McBride stated she agreed with everything that Mr. Pearce has said. All of this in the ordinance that we passed at the last meeting. Nothing has changed. Additionally, the ordinance we have is the same one that the City of Atlanta has. The only thing that it says is the treatment and return of any cat in the program, shall be subject, it did not say it had to be, but it should be subject, if necessary. We have a very qualified Director of Animal Services, who has done an excellent job, loves cats and loves all animals. She would do nothing to hurt an animal. What Mr. Pearce has is nice, procedurally, but this is what this does. Ms. Haynes would know about these policies because she handles all of this for Richland County, and works directly with Columbia. She can tell you this is not different from what they have.

Ms. Haynes stated the sole discretion is not about putting any animal to sleep. The sole discretion is for special circumstances, where a healthy cat cannot be placed back where we picked up from. For example, a situation they are presently dealing with at a daycare. They are having problems with the cat feces in the yard. What we need to do is to be able to move them to another feeder location where these people are willing to introduce these cats into their colony. The sole discretion is for public health and safety. It is not about the medical treatment or if a cat is injured. That is left up to the City. When it is a healthy animal and the City will not put it to sleep, but we need to do something with it then she does need some discretion because it cannot go back to that community.

Ms. Kennedy stated she agrees totally with Ms. McBride and Ms. Haynes.

Mr. Pearce stated if a cat is taken to the shelter and deemed healthy, but you cannot place that cat back into the community, then the cat dies. Is that correct?

Ms. Haynes stated they will find a place for it. It will not die.

Mr. Pearce stated, respectfully, that is not included or addressed in the ordinance that would, in fact, would take place. And, if a healthy cat could not be placed that cat would be euthanized in the shelter. If we do not take it back, its healthy and its left in the shelter, they will put it to sleep, right?

Ms. Haynes stated with the discretion to move it somewhere else, if it is healthy it will not be left at the shelter to be euthanized.

Ms. Myers stated currently the way it works with our ordinance is Ms. Haynes uses her discretion to take the cats to a colony where there is a known feeder and other TNR cats in that area.

Ms. Haynes stated that is correct, with the permission of the colony owners.

Ms. Myers stated she supports taking care of the cats, dogs, and animals in our community, but she also respects Ms. McBride's right to disagree with me. She would like for those that do disagree with her be a little more respectful of her right to disagree. She stated she is going to vote for the cats to be saved, but she would not like to see Ms. McBride vilified if she disagrees.

Ms. Kennedy stated she is not for killing any animals. She inquired, for clarification, if these animals are being taken back and put in people's yards that do not want them.

Ms. Haynes stated the cats will be returned to the community.

Mr. Pearce stated the phrase that was added, "Treatment and return of any cat program shall be subject to the discretion of Richland County Director of Animal Care" is not a discretion. The way it works is they transport the animal there. The treatment decision is made at the City shelter. If the cat is deemed severely ill, injured, etc., they will euthanize the cat. If the cat is healthy, they are going to neuter it, vaccinate it and clip its ear, so they know it is a TNR cat, and wait for the County to come pick it up to take it back to its community.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Ms. Haynes has the discretion on whether the animal is treated.

Ms. Haynes stated the treatment Ms. McBride was referring to in her amendment at the last meeting was not medical treatment.

Mr. Pearce stated he is referring to medical treatment and that is what is implied in the ordinance.

Mr. Livingston stated if we clarify whether it is medical treatment or other treatment then we will not have a problem. He inquired about what kind of treatment Ms. McBride was referring to.

Ms. McBride stated there is medical treatment and the treatment of taking it somewhere else. Maybe a better treatment would be "care."

Ms. Kennedy stated she is still not happy about the cats being returned to the community after they are neutered.

Ms. Haynes stated the cats will be returned to the community, not necessarily the address it was picked up from.

Ms. McBride stated, the ordinance Mr. Pearce has presented us with, is the one that requires the cats to be returned to the community. Ms. Haynes' is trying to help in case there is a rare incident, like the childcare facility she mentioned, so that someone would have some discretionary power. It does not do anything but make the program better. Many citizens do not agree. They believe their property rights are being violated. We have worked together to come to a compromise, so that we can pass the Trap-Neuter-and Return. We have worked hard to get this far. And now to mirror Columbia's Cat Diversion Program that what Richland County needs. We respect the City of Columbia Animal Care Director, let's

respect our Director. Let's give her the same rights the City has given their Director.

Mr. Rose stated he respects Ms. McBride's opinion. He stated this is a trap and release program that was designed to alleviate the issue, if we simply allow it to work. In previous debates, we talked about contacting the property owner to ask if the cat could be returned. If the answer was no, it was his understanding the cats were left at the City of Columbia Animal Shelter. Then if they were not adopted out, they were euthanized. What he struggles with, now, is to hear there are feeders or colonies that we can take cats to when it has been on the record that we have simply left them at the shelter and not taken them to a feeder colony. He thinks we should simply allow the program, that there is much research on, to work, which will alleviate the issue. For the reasons he cited, he thinks the discretion should be removed. We are simply in the transportation business. This is our program. We should transport them to the City. The Mayor has stated they will be a no-kill shelter by the end of the year.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the treatment Ms. Haynes is referring to what is done with the animal once it leaves the shelter.

Ms. Haynes responded in the affirmative. The cat is not going to stay at the shelter to be euthanized.

Mr. Livingston inquired if changing the word "treatment" to "the return of the cats" will fix the ordinance.

Ms. Haynes stated if treatment is confusing, then it will.

Mr. Pearce stated the City of Columbia Director of Animal Services has been directed by the City Council to not kill. The City's Director is not operating under the same rule as the County because we have not directed our Animal Services no-kill. He inquired about how many cats that were taken to the shelter were euthanized.

Ms. Haynes stated she does not know because Pawmetto Lifeline and the City of Columbia has been returning the cats to the community.

Mr. Pearce stated, his point is, whether it is 1 or 400, cats are still being euthanized at the City shelter because they are not being returned.

Ms. Haynes stated that is not true. They are taking all the cats back out.

Mr. Pearce stated, if everything is working great, you do not need the added phrase.

Ms. Haynes stated it is working great, but it is not working great for the circumstances she is talking about. They cannot just put them back at a daycare center.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to remove the line, "Treatment and return of any cat program shall be subject to the discretion of Richland County Director of Animal Care."

Mr. C. Jackson stated someone who has evidence of abuse or euthanization, it appears to be someone other than our Director. If she is not getting accurate information from the City. That disturbs him. If you are going to make a sound decision, you need all of the information to make the best decision. The second point, is that, if in fact, we are listening to a scenario where a healthy cat would not be allowed

back, for example, at a daycare. In those isolated situations, he did not hear a solution coming from the group, if we took the discretion from the Director, of what to do with the healthy cat. He stated he guess we close our eyes and not think about that. He would think a process like this, though he would agree with Mr. Rose, to some extent, should be given an opportunity to operate, then give it an opportunity to opportunity as it exist now and allow it to be revisited. Just as Mr. Pearce asked the question about how many cats have been euthanized, we can also ask the question in 3 months, how many cats have been relocated or done something differently than the ordinance says.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the objective is no-kill. He is trying to determine which version would allow the euthanization of the cats.

Ms. Haynes stated neither one of them will cause the cat to be euthanized.

Mr. Livingston requested Mr. Pearce to restate the motion.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion is to simply strike the following language: "Treatment and return of any cat program shall be subject to the discretion of Richland County Director of Animal Care."

Ms. Myers inquired if we take her discretionary are we going to end up killing cats.

Ms. Haynes stated the cats will not be killed. She will find them another place for them.

Ms. Myers stated whether we give Ms. Haynes the discretion or not she still has to return the cat to the community and/or feeder colony.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson and Rose

Opposed: Kennedy, Livingston and McBride

The vote was in favor.

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

Ms. Myers moved to defer reconsideration for 3 months to allow Ms. McBride an opportunity to gather the information.

Ms. McBride stated she does not need it.

Ms. Myers withdrew her motion.

In Favor: C. Jackson

Opposed: Malinowski, Myers, Pearce, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and Rose

The motion for reconsideration failed.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Dickerson thanked Judge Edmond for making it possible for us to honor Ms. Hattie Sims.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Manning recognized former Representative Frank McBride was in the audience.

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

16. **NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS**

- a. Transportation Penny Advisory Committee (TPAC) – 2 – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee recommended appointing Mr. Cyril B. Busbee, Jr. and Mr. John P. Epting.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

17. **REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE** – Mr. C. Jackson thanked the committee, as well as, some Councilmembers that are not a part of the committee that attended to help us ensure we handled the business of transportation in a manner that is consistent with the referendum, as well as, the reality and practicality of funding projects and moving it along.

- a. Greenway Projects – Mr. C. Jackson stated Mr. Pearce is very familiar with part of this item. As you recall, the heroic job he did, in terms of dealing with that issue earlier. This is the 2nd part of that, Greenway B. We found out there are members of the community who are opting not to have that portion funded. The question became, what do we do with the funds that were initially allocated? We are going to make a motion to defer that. The reason we are going to defer that is because we were informed at the committee meeting there are several other community meetings that need to be held with regard to greenway projects and other project discussions. As a result of that, there may be some other areas of non-interest by community folk. Therefore, additional funds may become available. We would like to go ahead and complete all of those community meetings and find out whether or not there are any additional funding. Lump them all together and then make a decision with regards to that.

Mr. Pearce stated, as you know, he has been eaten alive over this greenway. He spent 2 years of his life on it trying to get both sides together. It is his understanding that Section B will probably never get built. Section A, which is in his Council district, and runs parallel with Mr. Rose, the terminus of that, based on the funds available, is in an absolutely horrific location. It ends on Michael Lane. Within a reasonable short distance of there, is a large tract of land that is going to become County-owned property because of the flood purchases, which would be the more optimal terminus of a greenway. It will basically be green space for perpetuity. The problem was there was not enough money to reach that other terminus. The proponents of the greenway, and the neighbors that live on that side, were hopeful that since “B” was not going to be built that money then could extend “A” to the better terminus point. He inquired if that was not debated.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it was debated. And, as a matter of fact, this would not negate that. This is simply saying defer the allocation of those funds until all of the community meetings have been held because there may be other areas of the greenways where they may have the same concern that the people in

Greenway “B” had and they also do not want theirs, as well. So, before we made the decision on pieces of the money, we wanted to find out how much money was available and make one decision on all of the money. What Mr. Pearce is asking, may still happen. We are simply asking to defer it until the community hearings have been held.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there was also a discussion about the costs. From his understanding, when it was approved initially it was an 8” path. The City changed to 14” because of maintenance and that drove the costs up. If it was agreed on initially for an 8” path and the money was assigned for 8”, he finds it hard to take money from somewhere else to accommodate the City’s decision to change it from 8” to 14”. If it remains at 8”, we will not have this problem. We should not change everything and start taking from other areas. Most of it is in the City. What about the unincorporated areas that need walking trails? He heard that some parts of Lower Richland community is asking to develop a tourist corridor, with walking trails, but there is no money assigned to it. Here we have the City having all these things. Some neighbors do not want it because they are concerned about crime. Now it has to be lighted and secured. That was not in the initial project when it was developed. His main concern is that the cost was agreed upon based on 8”, and the City agreed. Then later the City changed it to 14” and we have to find money to accommodate 14”. If the City wants the change, they should come up with the difference in funding. He also requested that all Councilmembers be informed when the community meetings are held.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Atlas Road Widening – AT & T Utility Design Authorization – Mr. C. Jackson stated during the Atlas Road Widening process that AT&T will need to relocate some of their services and equipment. They are requesting that we simply provide them a written commitment that we are going to pay our bill when they do the relocation. The agreement has been sent to Legal for review. The committee is requesting approval to move forward with the utility design process.

Mr. Malinowski stated he is agreement with this. At the committee meeting, we did not have the language and we were told we would have it in time for the Council meeting. It is his recollection, they were told the amount would not exceed \$125,000 and on p. 126 of the agenda it has an estimated amount of \$125,000, but on p. 127 – 6(a) states, “actual and related direct costs are going to be paid”, which could exceed the \$125,000. He wants to ensure that it does not exceed \$125,000.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Mr. Malinowski was correct and that is a part of the committee’s recommendation.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Additional Design Authorization – Mr. C. Jackson stated this is a huge milestone for moving forward with a lot of the work that is being done with the Penny. The committee was informed the PDT will be responsible for the Shop Road Extension, Phase 2. The remaining projects will be subbed out to On-Call

Engineering firms. This is to do 30% design work, which will allow for something that more visible for the public input, as we move forward with these projects. It will also give us a clearer idea of the costs of these projects. The recommendation is to allow the PDT Team to initiate 30% design on these projects listed in the agenda packet.

1. Shop Road Extension Phase 2
2. Spears Creek Church Road
3. Lower Richland Widening
4. Polo Road Widening
5. Blythewood Widening Phase (associated projects)
6. Trenholm Acres/Newcastle NIP
7. Broad River Corridor NIP
8. Gills Creek Greenway Section C
9. Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A, B and C
10. Crane Creek Sections Greenway A, B and C
11. Columbia Mall Greenway
12. Polo/Windsor Lake Connector, Woodberry/Old Leesburg Connector, and Dutchman Blvd. Connector Greenways

Mr. Malinowski stated he wanted to ensure the minutes reflect these are for 30% design on these projects.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Proposed Road Diet Projects – Mr. C. Jackson stated this item deals with the possibility of a “road diet” where they redesign a street to include bike paths. The only request is too simply to allow the team to engage in conversations with the City regarding how this is going to look and develop. It will be brought back to Council for approval. The City has taken the lead on this and is doing the lion share of it. However, they want to meet with our team to talk about exactly how it would look as it is developed on Hampton and Calhoun Streets.

1. Hampton Street
2. Calhoun Street

- e. Widening Memorandum – Mr. C. Jackson stated the committee recommended deferring this item until the June 5th Council meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. Release the \$250 Million Bond Proceeds from Escrow – Mr. C. Jackson stated this item is to release the \$250 Million bond proceeds from escrow. There is a resolution included in the agenda packet that gives Council approval to release the funds, not to be spent, but to be moved from the escrow account. However, before any of those dollars can be spent, as we heard in our workshop earlier, they have to be approved by Council. He stated he asked Mr. Hayes, to be clear, at the meeting earlier today, with regards to the \$61 million projected revenue, as well as, whatever dollar amount that will come from these dollars would be included in the FY19 budget. This request is simply to make those dollars available. Once they have been requested to be accessed, that approval will have to come back to Council.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are referring to the BAN.

Mr. C. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a reason for needing to release it now, if we are not using it now. Is there some timing issues that we need to understand that is going to cause the project problems?

Dr. Yudice stated the timeframe to spend the BAN funds is 5 years. She believes 35% needs to be spent within the next 5 years. As we stated in the transportation workshop this afternoon, the current budget that we will be presenting to Council next week is a pay as you go, based on the current revenues. Since we did not know when this BAN money was going to be available, but the budget can be modified to include additional projects using the BAN funds.

Ms. Myers inquired if we will slow something down by not releasing the \$250 million BAN to be included, as a budget. Is there a need to do it right now, today?

Dr. Yudice stated not today. It is not imperative to do it today, but at some point Council needs to make that decision to release the funds.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that it is helpful in moving things along.

Dr. Yudice responded in the affirmative. She stated there would be arbitrage money we would have to pay if we earned interest on this BAN.

Ms. Myers stated, so moving it now, prevents us from running up against a deadline that might mean we have earned money on the BAN. Therefore, instead of using the BAN and incurring very little debt, we may be adding to the debt by earning money and having pay penalties.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, today we had a transportation workshop, and we talked about developing an annual budget for the Penny Program. We take in approximately \$61 million a year. After taking out the COMET's portion, approximately \$45 million remains. If we are going to develop an annual budget for the program, then why would we need to use the BAN? Every year would have a budget. It is limited to that money per year. If it is not necessary to use it, why would we need to use it?

Dr. Thompson stated to put it in perspective. When we looked at what the PDT submitted to the County in January, in terms of their projected projects for FY19, they submitted over \$100 million of projects. As you heard from the Budget Director earlier today, we only have about \$65.1 million. If we have more money, it is an opportunity to go ahead and pursue more projects, especially with the design. Then

move into construction versus waiting, as we see costs continue to escalate every year we delay these projects.

Mr. N. Jackson stated we already have \$65 million. Plus we get \$45 million a year and we do not spend all of the money at one time. It is not a situation where we have to have the \$100 million immediately to start the program. As we have \$65 million in reserve, we are moving forward. The argument is that we have \$65 million and the PDT submitted a budget of \$100 million. Plus, we are not sure if we will approve \$100 million. From this workshop, he is not sure what Council will do. Therefore, he would like to see what will be recommended, and if we are going to make these changes before we decide that we need a bond release and we do not need it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated we are not spending the money. We are making the money available. We do not spend it until we come and get Council's approval. The money is there, but we are not allocating any money to be spent. We are simply authorizing us to be able to access the funds, if, and when, we need those dollars. One of the debates we had was whether or not we would try to build as we received funds. For those that understand BANs and bonds, you understand this is a loan. You use the funds that you raised through the Penny revenue to pay it back. This is not money where there is not a repayment plan in place. In order to access projects, and to begin more projects, it is a request to have access and availability to those funds, if, and when, they are needed.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we get these funds, even though we are not using them, what is the interest rate we are going to pay annually.

Ms. Hamm stated we have already borrowed the money, so we are already paying the interest. We will have borrow in February 2019 to pay back the BAN. The money from the Penny will pay back the bonds. We are trying to get the money ahead of time to work on the projects. The money is escrowed because we were waiting on the Supreme Court resolution. Since that has been decided, and the guidelines are done, we wanted to remove the escrow. The funding will still be held to the side until Council approves moving it to a budget item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the approximate annual interest.

Ms. Hamm stated the interest is approximately \$7 million. We already have \$3.5 million, so we need another \$3.5 million to make the bond payment.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there is any additional, once that is paid back. He inquired how this works.

Ms. Hamm stated when you borrow the \$250 million, then you will have the bond. If you do the 5 or 7 year bond, then you will have the interest on that.

Mr. Malinowski stated we will pay \$7 million for the BAN. Should we pay that BAN back and we get an actual bond for \$250 million, we will have either a 5 or 7 year pay back with additional interest. He inquired if the interest will be about the same as the BAN.

Ms. Hamm stated it could be, or could be a little higher because rates are going up.

Ms. Myers stated since we borrowed the BAN, and it was a one-year BAN, does it not help the County in saving money to go ahead and use the BAN, at the lower rate, rather than getting Penny revenue later

to do the same projects, at a higher cost. So, effectually drawing down the BAN now and using the money is a method of cost savings for the County.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative and stated that is the logic move.

Mr. N. Jackson stated we are paying back \$7 million in interest for one year. If we get the bond, for 5 to 7 years, it will be \$35 - \$42 million in interest we will be paying.

Dr. Thompson stated that is his understanding.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is his main concern. We are paying back \$42 million when if we pay as we build, then we will not have any interest to pay. We are saving over \$42 million.

Ms. Myers stated the point the team is making, and that Dr. Thompson is making, is that if we use this money today, we get better value on the money today, than waiting 10 years and paying as we go. As things go up, we may spend more than \$35 million and get less in the later years, which was the whole reason we went out for the BANs initially. The cost savings that we realize in purchasing what we are purchasing now, rather than in the later years, more than makes up for that. She believes that is why the committee is urging us to take this action.

Mr. Malinowski stated he knows none of us have a crystal ball and we cannot look into the future, but if this \$250 million is borrowed, how long before we spend it on projects.

Dr. Yudice stated the money was already borrowed. The BAN was sold in February. The money is in escrow. The County already has the money, but it is in an escrow account that we could not access until we had the guideline from DOR and the Court Order. We just need Council's permission to access the funds and allocate it budget items/projects.

Dr. Thompson stated he believes we can expend the money in 3 – 4 years. Mr. Beaty stated he agrees with that assessment.

Mr. Malinowski stated we borrowed \$250 million for 4 years of spending, and \$60 million a year times 4 years is \$240 million, and we did not pay interest. He still does not get the advantage of it.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: Malinowski and N. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

18. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. FY18-District 1 Hospitality Tax Allocations – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Opposed: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

19. **CITIZENS' INPUT: Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda** – No one signed up to speak.

20. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

In Favor: Malinowski, Pearce, Kennedy, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

Opposed: C. Jackson and Myers

The vote was in favor of going into Executive Session.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 8:15 PM and came out at approximately 9:38 PM.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Pearce, Dickerson, Livingston and Rose

Opposed: Manning

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

- a. Employee Grievance – This item was deferred.
- b. Personnel Matter – No action was taken.
- c. Contractual Matter: Land Purchase – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to move forward with the purchase of the property.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Kennedy, C. Jackson and Myers

Opposed: Malinowski, Pearce, Rose, Manning and N. Jackson

The vote was in favor.

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

In Favor: Malinowski, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, N. Jackson, Livingston and Rose

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Dickerson and McBride

The vote was in favor of reconsideration.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion is back on the floor.

Ms. Dickerson stated we are just doing it to reconsider the original vote, right.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Farrar to provide clarification.

Mr. Farrar stated Item 7(c) was still before Council for consideration.

Ms. Dickerson stated normally when we do something and we want to seal it, do we do a reconsideration?

Mr. Farrar responded in the affirmative. He further stated it usually fails. Then it is clinched at that point.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to not move forward on closing on the property.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to request an extension from the property owner until the June 5th Council meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, N. Jackson, Livingston and Rose

Opposed: C. Jackson, Myers, Dickerson and McBride

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

- d. Potential Property Purchase: Township Auditorium – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to move forward with the appraisal of the property.

In Favor: Malinowski, C. Jackson, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

21. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. Review the section II(i)(2)(4) of County Ordinance 043-14HR, “If twenty-five (25%) percent or more of all such property owners decline said road paving, then the subject road shall not be paved”. This seems to go against the way most items are done in our country, by majority, so why shouldn’t a majority also decide if a road should be paved or not? [MALINOWSKI] – This item was referred to the D&S Committee.
- b. Employees who provide false statements or information or collude/conspire/plan to hurt any council member’s events or programs whether individually or forcibly by a superior or influenced by anyone shall be relieved of their duties. NOTE: Richland County lost several thousand dollars in a project at a bridge replacement on Garners Ferry Road. The failure of staff to meet with contractors and SCDOT to negotiate and accept a temporary bridge to complete a walking trail at Pinewood Lake Park is unacceptable. Several meetings took place to contact SCDOT and the contractor who was willing to leave the temporary bridge went undone. Engineering contractors prepared permits for Army Corps of Engineer and FEMA to allow the temporary bridge to remain. County staff refused to carry out their

duties or to contact the Council member on any updates after constant requests [N. JACKSON] – Ms. Myers inquired if this motion circumvents the chain of command. If Council has statutory employees, this would make every employee in Richland County an employee of this Council. We would have the authority to terminate them. She does not think we have the legal authority to do this. She thinks we need our legal department to give us advice on this rather than sending this to a committee and creating an ordinance that violates State law.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he made a motion. Whether it goes to Legal, it needs to be vetted somewhere. It can go to a committee and say, “well Legal advised that you cannot do (a), (b), (c).” That is fine, but that is his motion. Whether it violates State law or not, he needs Legal to tell him it violates State law or it cannot be done. It is a motion. You get recommendations from a committee.

This item was referred to the Legal Department.

- c. I move that all unspent H-Tax funding for FY17-18 be carried over and added to any additional funding for FY18-19 to Council districts. Because of the failure of the Grants Office to notify council members of problems from changes to the grants process my district, and others, did not get to have some or all of their events. I was never notified of any problems until I was contacted by some organizations that they were having problems. Now eleven months later it is too late and it is not fair. Established organizations in Columbia had theirs but as for the unincorporated areas where they are developing programs and event, there were problems. [KENNEDY and MANNING] – Mr. Malinowski stated, because of this particular request, it is for monies that are needed to be used or moved forward to the next budget year. This budget year ends June 30th. This would not get to a committee until the 3rd week of June. He believes unanimous consent would be in order for this item.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Myers, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, N. Jackson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. After complaints/concerns from the Richland County Bar association, Minority Contractors and other local groups and Citizens, that the process for the Renaissance Plan was not properly advertised or transparent. Council also was not properly informed of the process and have questions. The selection of the Engineering teams is questionable especially with a former council member on both contracts from both teams. A personal friend of the Administrator who introduced and recommended the Administrator for the job. Performing a task that can be handled through the County’s OSBO/SLBE office is questionable. The State Supreme Court recently ruled against Richland County for paying outside contractors to perform jobs that can be performed by the County. In the interest of fairness and Transparency, I move that Council reevaluate the process giving proper notice for more participation of Qualified Bidders. (We have time to do it right) [N. JACKSON] – This item was referred to the OSBO Ad Hoc Committee.
- e. Funding for Senior programs should be distributed equally and fairly. It is not right for one organization to be receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually while other areas receive none. All areas pay taxes and all seniors should get the same and equal opportunity in receiving funding. I move that

funding for seniors (Senior Activities) be distributed equally in all eleven districts. [N. JACKSON] – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.

- f. The Recreation Commission has a balance of funds remaining from the \$50 million Recreation Bond. I move that Council discuss potential shortfalls in the recreational districts and recommend how it's used. [N. JACKSON] – This item was referred to the Recreation Commission County Council liaisons for vetting.

ADJOURN – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 PM.