



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING
BUDGET – 2ND READING
(ALL NON-GRANT ITEMS)
May 30, 2017 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Sandra Yudice, Michelle Onley, Gerald Seals, Ismail Ozbek, Tracy Hegler, Natashia Dozier, Quinton Epps, Brad Farrar, Jamelle Ellis, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, James Hayes, and Kevin Bronson

CALL TO ORDER – Ms. Dickerson called the meeting to order at approximately 6:01 PM.

AMENDED ORDINANCES FOR SECOND READING

- a. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2018**
- b. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2018 and ending June 30, 2019**

Mr. Seals stated before Council this evening the amended ordinance for 2nd Reading. It covers both years of the Biennium. Thus far Council has dealt with the millage agencies, etc. Tonight’s session deals with the General Fund and all remaining areas of the budget.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to add in FY18 and FY19, on p. 31 of the Budget Book, Key # 11001812000 – CASA – Object # 511100 – Salaries and Wages the amount of \$41,500 and all necessary associated funding (i.e. FICA – Employer’s Share, SC Regular Retirement, Health, Dental, Membership and Dues, etc.) to hire 1 FTE to serve as the Richland County Anti-Human Trafficking Coordinator in place of the 0.5 PT position that has been funded and in place since FY15-16.

Mr. Pearce inquired since the budget is balanced against the revenue is there a recommended funding plan.

Mr. Manning stated the funding for this would come from the Council growing the General Fund balance in Biennium Budget I – FY18 up to 23% as opposed to 24% and FY19 up to 25% as opposed to 26%. As a result of doing that it would provide Council with \$1.6 million to fund other things that may be important to the citizens of the County.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the \$41,500 is the total amount.

Mr. Manning stated that is the total for the Salaries and Wages line item. The motion also was for all the associated funding (FICA, Retirement, Health, Dental, Membership Dues), which is usually 33 – 35%.

Mr. Malinowski stated he had sent in some questions regarding this position and inquired if he would be receiving a response prior to 3rd Reading.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Dickerson stated according to the matrix provided by Administration, CASA would be under the purview of the County Administrator.

Mr. Seals stated Council made the decision to place CASA under the purview of the County Administrator, but indicated at some time in the future there may be a change in the reporting structure.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the CASA Director requested an additional position (i.e. Human Trafficking) and if the County Administrator approved the position.

Mr. Seals stated the request was not made to him.

Ms. Myers inquired if the position had been discussed with CASA.

Mr. Seals responded that this had not been discussed with CASA.

Mr. Pearce inquired if this position was already in the budget as a part-time position.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative. Staff recommended what has been the historical level of the position.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this is a Council member motion. It does not necessarily have to come from CASA or the Administration.

Mr. Manning stated if you recall when the public hearing was held there was 3 people who came and informed Council they were aware of the ½ position and gave a rationale for it going full time.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Malinowski
Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Manning stated the funding for this would come from the Council growing the General Fund balance in Biennium Budget I – FY18 up to 23% as opposed to 24% and FY19 up to 25% as opposed to 26%. As a result of doing that it would provide Council with \$1.6 million to fund other things that may be important to the citizens of the County.

Ms. Myers stated since it has been identified that if Mr. Manning's is accepted the reserve will be reduced from 24% to 23% in the first year and then from 26% to 25% in the second year. There may be other motions

put forward and it may make sense to hear those motions before voting on Mr. Manning's motion instead of voting on a reduction every time.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to vote on the reduction in fund balance as an individual category after hearing all of the suggestions to reduce the fund balance.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the dollar amount of Mr. Manning's motion.

Ms. Dickerson stated it was \$1.6 million.

Mr. N. Jackson stated if we know we have \$1.6 million we can keep track of how much we spend.

Mr. Manning stated for clarification it is \$1,639,931.

Mr. Pearce inquired how much was spent with the motion for the CASA position.

Mr. Manning stated \$41,500, plus all the associated costs, which is approximately 35%.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the CASA position would be working with the State's Victim Assistance program.

Mr. Seals stated the position will form a very strong network and the proper way to do this would be to work with all of the entities that exist.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
C. Jackson	Pearce
N. Jackson	Rose
Malinowski	Livingston
Dickerson	Manning
Myers	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of Ms. Myers' motion.

Mr. Pearce stated it is of great concern to him there are 95 seniors in the County that do not get a decent meal every day. The cost to provide these seniors with a meal will be \$182,400. The County has not given Senior Resources additional funding in a long time.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to provide Senior Resources an additional \$182,400 to assist with feeding the seniors in the County.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if Senior Resources had partnered with Central Midlands to receive additional funding.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION – Mr. Manning inquired if another organization was able to assist with funding for Senior Resources would Mr. Pearce be okay with them accepting the funding and having the remainder of the County's portion on June 30th roll over and grow the fund balance.

Mr. Pearce stated he would accept that as an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Pearce clarified there likely are more than 95 seniors in the County that are in need, but there are 95 seniors on Senior Resources waiting list (40 in the unincorporated area; 55 in the City).

Mr. Malinowski stated every year we get to this point where if it was our own personal resources we would have to live within our means. However, because we have other people putting in to comprise an overall huge dollar amount we have no problem dipping into the additional funds and trying to satisfy as many as we can. The Administrator provided us with a no tax increase budget and that was based on the fact that the estimated revenues would be 3.7%.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion to approve the agencies before Council tonight at the amount they requested and give an additional 3.7%, if needed.

Mr. Pearce asked for clarification on what group of people Mr. Malinowski is referring.

Mr. Malinowski is referring to the school districts, elected officials, etc.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if Mr. Malinowski's and Mr. Pearce's motions are related.

Mr. Seals stated the discussion is about the General Fund.

Mr. Malinowski's motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Dickerson stated she has to agree with Mr. Malinowski because what she is seeing is a duplication and an overlap of many of these organizations. The COG has just done an aggressive work to make sure they fund all of Richland County to ensure that the seniors are reached, which will include Senior Resources.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion is if Senior Resources does not need the funding it will come back to County.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor was unanimous to provide an additional \$182,400 to Senior Resources.

Mr. Pearce stated the County has funded Transitions consistently at \$100,000. At one time, we did have the benefit of some of CDBG money to assist with construction of the facility. They have demonstrated themselves to be an efficient organization that has placed a large number of people back into the community and independent living situations.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve an additional \$100,000 for Transitions.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the recommendation for Transitions.

Mr. Pearce stated the recommendation was for \$100,000.

Mr. C. Jackson stated after the lengthy discussion last week about the responsibility for Pinewood Park and who would be to responsible for managing, maintaining and operating it, he moved to provide \$143,988...

Ms. Dickerson stated that they were still on Mr. Pearce's motion.

Mr. C. Jackson requested that she not acknowledge him again until they were ready to take up his motion.

FOR
Pearce
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Rose
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of providing an additional \$100,000 to Transitions.

Mr. Livingston stated EngenuitySC was funded out of the Economic Development last year at \$75,000. This year the Economic Development Office decided to fund the agency at \$25,000.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to provide the additional \$45,000 in funding for EngenuitySC out of the General Fund.

Mr. Malinowski stated he does not feel the Economic Development Department should be picking and choosing how much to give and requesting Council to figure out where the remainder of the funding comes from. The Economic Development Department is getting an increase and are funding every year at 0.5 mill.

Mr. Livingston stated he believes Economic Development does some other things for the community as well.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of providing EngenuitySC an additional \$45,000 from the General Fund.

Mr. Livingston stated the Library is interested in opening a new branch in the Edgewood Community and provide funding for planning for a branch in the Lower Richland area. The Library has put together a comprehensive \$8 million funding plan. There is a \$650,000 shortfall. They have spoken with the City of Columbia and the City has agreed to provide half of the funding to cover the shortfall. He further stated the

referendum that passed was not to build new branches unless they were replacing a branch; therefore, these branches were not a part of the referendum.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to match the City of Columbia's contribution of \$325,000 for the Edgewood Library and planning for the Lower Richland Library branch.

Mr. Pearce stated he was not opposed to providing the funding, but he requested an example of when Council funded a millage agency through the General Fund.

Mr. Seals stated he was not aware of a case, but he is not prepared to say definitively that is the case.

Ms. Myers stated she is in favor of funding the library and getting the branch up and running; however, her understanding was the Edgewood branch itself required \$650,000 to open. She does not know if the funding would sufficient to include the planning for the Lower Richland branch. As long as the \$100,000 for the Lower Richland branch is earmarked she is happy to support the motion.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the funding is for capital and/or operating.

Mr. Livingston stated the request is for capital funding.

Mr. Pearce inquired about putting the request in capital. He further stated it's setting a precedent to use General Fund dollars to fund millage agencies on capital projects and he is uncomfortable with that. He stated he would rather raise the millage than to do it this way.

Mr. Pearce made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to freeze the \$325,000 until Administration can provide a funding recommendation.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Malinowski

The vote was in favor of freezing the \$325,000 in funding to allow Administration to bring back a funding recommendation.

Mr. C. Jackson stated after listening intently to his colleague, Norman Jackson, last week. He wanted to reassure himself to do everything in Council's power to make sure Pinewood Park would be managed successfully and have the resources necessary to do the things he and others have articulated need to be done.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to allocate \$143,988 for a position and operation and maintenance of Pinewood Park.

Mr. N. Jackson stated after the discussion last week, he has been looking at other facilities that are operated by Hospitality Tax. One of his concerns is that one facility that is ½ an acre gets over \$700,000 between the

County and City for operations. Pinewood Lake Park is 44 acres with a house, a walking trail, a 20-acre lake and several other historic buildings on the property. To allocate \$143,000 for operations of a facility that large is concerning.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the funding would be coming from Hospitality Tax.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the funding would be coming from the General Fund.

Mr. Pearce inquired if this is the funding for the Conservation Commission.

Mr. C. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated for clarification the funding would cover personnel and operations. What was appropriated last week?

Mr. C. Jackson stated that funding was for promotions.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the amount for operations was provided by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. C. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the funds for operations would go to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. C. Jackson responded in the affirmative.

FOR

Pearce

Rose

C. Jackson

N. Jackson

Malinowski

Dickerson

Livingston

Kennedy

Myers

Manning

McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to allocate \$143,988 for Pinewood Lake Park.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to allocate \$110,510 for two positions in the Public Defender's Office.

Ms. McBride inquired about how many positions the Public Defender's Office requested.

Mr. Rose stated there was a request for 11 positions over a 5-year period.

Ms. McBride requested a friendly amendment to increase it to three positions.

Mr. Rose stated he did not have the dollar amount for the additional position. Therefore, there was a suggestion to take up the additional position during Third Reading.

Ms. Myers stated the additional position would be approximately \$55,255 for a total of \$165,765.

Mr. Rose accepted the friendly amendment.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of the 3 additional positions in the Public Defender's Office in the amount of \$165,765.

Mr. Seals stated the additional funding spent to present is \$1,003,653, which leaves a balance of \$636,278.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve a full time position of a Financial Crimes Prosecutor in the Solicitor's Office in the amount of \$85,176, which includes salary and benefits.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he has shared with the Solicitor's Office he will support the will of the Council as it relates to filling this grant position that is ending, which is somewhat against his nature. He hopes going forward there will be a firm policy, even if it has to be codified, that makes it clear to agencies prior to receiving and accepting grants, there will be a plan for sustainability of positions beyond the lifespan of the grant that does not include coming back to Council and increasing their budget.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of approving a Financial Crimes Prosecutor position in the Solicitor's Office in the amount of \$85,176.

Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve the Clerk of Court's budget as submitted.

Ms. McBride stated it was her understanding all of the elected official agencies were given the amount of funding they requested and the recommendation is different than the amount requested. The difference is approximately \$400,000.

Mr. Pearce stated the difference would be \$421,167. He stated for clarification it was his understanding that not every department got everything they asked for.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated the departments requested things and then the various departments sat down with staff and discussed their requests. Therefore, it is not true that everybody got everything they asked for. In sitting down with Ms. Jeannette McBride and discussing her budget was there any “wiggle room” in what she asked for and what the recommendation was.

Mr. Seals stated it was his understanding there are questions concerning a Withholding Clerk position in the amount of \$36,500.

Ms. Myers stated for clarification if the issue with the Clerk of Court’s Office is one position that amounts to approximately \$40,000, how did we get to the reduction of \$421,000?

Mr. Seals stated at this point he does not know, but he will follow up and find out.

Ms. Myers offered a friendly amendment to fund the Clerk of Court’s Office as requested, minus the \$36,500 in question by staff, which equates to \$384,667.

Mr. Seals stated he is not familiar with \$421,000 number. The number that he understood had arisen was the \$36,500.

Mr. Livingston stated he received an email that mentioned 3 positions at \$400,000.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the \$400,000 was for the 3 positions or just \$400,000 short.

Several Council members responded it was \$400,000 short.

Mr. Pearce made a substitute motion to defer the Clerk of Court’s portion of the budget to 3rd Reading to allow staff an opportunity to sit down with the Clerk and work out where the discrepancies are, how much is needed, and what the funding is needed for.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. McBride stated as Council looked over the elected officials’ budget, it was distinctly stated we tried to work with them. We never questioned any of the issues because it was said we were trying to work with the elected officials. Now I get a recommendation to do a detailed analysis of their budget, which has not been done with any of the other agencies.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he wanted to clarify the \$400,000 was for not salaries, but the amount cut from the overall budget.

FOR
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Pearce
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of approving the Clerk of Court's budget as submitted, which equates to an additional \$384,667.

Mr. Seals stated the remaining balance is \$226,113.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to provide an additional \$11,254 for FY18 and FY19 to Sexual Trauma Services of the Midlands.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the requested amount for Sexual Trauma Services is on p. 136a of the budget book.

Mr. Manning stated it was his understanding their request was for \$60,000.

FOR
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Malinowski

The vote was in favor of providing an additional \$11,254 for FY18 and FY19 to Sexual Trauma Services of the Midlands.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to fund Victim's Assistance at the FY17 level.

Mr. Livingston inquired about how that differs from the Administrator's recommendation.

Mr. Pearce stated the Administrator's recommendation was to provide a portion of General Fund to fund an additional position. It's not a lot of money, it is the principle of the thing. Council took a stand; therefore, whether it is \$5,000 or \$500,000 to me it means no more money. There are several different agencies that utilize the money. Let them work out the funding.

Ms. Myers requested for the benefit of the new Council members the history of this matter. She believed when it was discussed in the work session, that Council had taken action wherein there was an agreement not to increase funding.

Mr. Pearce stated the program is supposed to be funded with State fines and forfeitures. It is a State funded program. After two or three years the program started growing. There are several different agencies (i.e. Sheriff's Department, Solicitor's Office, etc.) Council started pitching in General Fund money and the program continued to grow. For the last several years, Council has tried to hold the line and say no more General Fund funding. Now it has popped back up again. As a matter of principle he cannot support the additional funding.

Ms. Myers stated at some point Council has to draw lines in the sand. She further stated she supports full funding for Sexual Trauma Services, the Solicitor's Office, etc. This matter was to have been funded from a different funding source than the County. Her concern is that at some point Council has to be responsive to taxpayers and draw the line. And when the line is drawn, Council has to adhere to it or we will have to continue to raise millage.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the agencies that are requesting amounts for victim's assistance are included in Mr. Pearce's motion.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion is to provide the same amount of funding as last fiscal year.

Mr. Seals stated the history he has may help to clarify because it supports Mr. Pearce's statement. At the June 9, 2016 budget meeting, 3rd Reading, Council decided to cap the General Fund contribution to the Victim Assistance budget at the FY17 level of \$686,021. Apparently it was treated as a budget in and of itself in an effort for Council to address all areas of the budget. It was Items #16 and #17 during those discussions.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

C. Jackson

The vote was in favor of funding Victim's Assistance at the FY17 level.

Mr. Rose requested Mr. Seals to elaborate on the request versus what was allocated for the Detention Center. He stated he believes the Detention Center has some serious needs and was interested in the Interim Director's request.

Mr. Seals stated the request was for \$24.6 million and the recommendation is for roughly \$22 million. Most of the requests were dealing with salary adjustments because salaries, as you know, in our Detention Center are below market levels. The rationale was that the County would get the compensation issues addressed. There is a class and comp study underway. The number is FY19 rebounds and goes up to approximately \$25 million. Some simple sample surveys have been conducted and we know there are agencies within the Midland area that are paying more than Richland County.

Ms. McBride stated the previous Detention Center Director requested additional staff for the psychologists or counselors because there are a number of psychological problems that many of the detainees have. Was that addressed in the budget?

Mr. Seals stated that was not completely addressed; however, that is a directive from Administration that we will move forward in that area. Council has also weighed in on the issue and have directed Administration to work with the Sheriff. For example, medical transport involving those with mental issues. He further stated the County is approximately 1 ½ away from final recommendations.

Ms. Kennedy stated, for clarification, that Mr. Seals is only referring to the Detention Center.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative and stated he is being purposefully careful in his wording because there are a number of categories of mental issues, as well as getting the appropriate medical and professional recommendations.

Ms. Kennedy stated she does not believe these individuals need to be transported by deputies that are untrained.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the money was still in the bank that was appropriated for construction at the Detention Center.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated the County has been working for several years and have a very good system of codifying the mental health clients that come in. We have worked diligently to add additional psychiatric care. The problem is the inability to segregate the patients, which would be addressed with the proposed construction at the Detention Center. At one time 30% of the population qualified as mental health clients.

Mr. Manning stated this is his 9th budget. Most of the time, we have gone into the General Fund balance to balance the budget. Most of the time, we have gone into the allowable cap to do the budget. This is his first year that we have not done one or two of those. So far everything he has heard in a motion and voted on are very important to the citizens it impacts in our county.

Mr. Manning further stated Council was invited to St. Lawrence Place to read to the children. They are now under the umbrella of Homeless No More. What they do there, unlike Transitions, is they serve families and the County does not fund any family homeless services in Richland County. They did not make a request because it was well into the budget cycle, but when he was there reading to the children, he asked how much money do you get from the County. That is when he learned they did not get any funding.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to provide \$50,000 in FY18 and FY19 to support the programs at St. Lawrence Place/Homeless No More.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Dickerson

The vote was in favor of providing \$50,000 in FY18 and FY19 to support the programs at St. Lawrence Place/Homeless No More.

Mr. N. Jackson stated for years the Urban League has provided programs for the youth, especially during the holidays.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to provide an additional \$50,000 to the Urban League.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Malinowski

The vote was in favor of providing an additional \$50,000 to the Urban League.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to adopt the General Fund budget as amended.

Ms. Myers inquired if there were any changes that need to be made as it relates to Emergency Services budget prior to Mr. Livingston's motion being taken up.

Mr. Seals stated Administration is aggressively working to address the deficiencies in Emergency Services and will likely go further in the 2nd year of the biennium budget. There are a variety of things Administration is doing, including addressing personnel by targeting the Southeast Richland area. They are also exploring the possibility of locating a station in that area.

Mr. Manning stated the 2-year budget was new to Council and he was careful on his motions to ensure the funding was for both years. Some of the Council members simply made motions, assuming the funding was for both years; therefore, does Council need to make a motion to make sure that is clear or is it understood that all the motions made were for both years.

Mr. Seals stated because it is Biennium Budget I, Administration has made the assumption and understanding that it applies to both years. He further stated he is tracking those motions that differ in the second year.

Ms. McBride thanked Administration for conducting a very good work session. This is a new process and it has definitely been different. She requested in the future, in order to be fair, that each Council member only make one motion at a time to allow other Council member an opportunity to make their motions.

Mr. Livingston suggested going back to the way it was done in the past and submit motions in writing. There was a list of motions provided to everyone ahead of time; therefore, Council members had an opportunity to decide what they wanted to support.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if Mr. Livingston's motion dealt with the millage agencies.

Ms. Dickerson responded that it did not.

Mr. Malinowski inquired of Administration will provide specifics on the equipment requested by the various departments prior to Third Reading.

Mr. Seals stated he did not have a problem providing that information to Council.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if any details would be provided for the larger dollar figure requests from the elected officials.

Mr. Seals stated the elected officials have been very cooperative and most have provided the detail. If there is something specific that has not been provided, he does not feel the elected officials will have a problem providing that information.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many airplanes and helicopters the Sheriff's Department has presently.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated presently they have 2 helicopters and 2 airplanes.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the purpose of purchasing a third airplane for over \$600,000.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated that was approved by Council a year and half ago. The \$600,000 is one of six payments on the airplane.

Mr. Malinowski inquired what the general avionics list are for.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated general avionics are major repairs that need to be done to the aircraft to keep them operational.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many deputies the Sheriff's Department has presently.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated there are approximately 654 deputies.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about how many of the deputies have to qualify.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated all of the deputies have to qualify twice a year.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if they are given the ammo listed in the budget.

Deputy Chief Cowan stated the ammo listed in the budget is the ammunition required to be used for training.

Mr. Malinowski requested a breakdown of the ammunition needs for the Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Pearce stated Mr. Malinowski never specified which equipment details he was requesting.

Mr. Seals stated when you speak about rolling stock he automatically goes to items over \$100,000.

Mr. Seals stated he will have something definitive by Third Reading regarding the Library funding.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Manning assured his constituents he will do everything he can to make sure the police have bullets.

Mr. Pearce inquired if a grant has ended, how does the grant get picked up?

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is his understanding at the time the grant ends you will decide if you want to extend it or not.

Mr. Livingston stated there is a statement in the documents that clearly addresses this matter, but he cannot find the document at this time.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	Malinowski
Rose	Manning
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of approving the General Fund budget as amended.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the Debt Service.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor of approving Debt Service was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve the Enterprise Funds.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor of approving the Enterprise Funds was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the Richland County Recreation Commission to the allowable cap.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the Recreation Commission sent a budget and at the time it was not blessed by the Commission itself because there was not a board seated at the time. He would like the Board to have an opportunity to comment on the budget.

Ms. Myers stated based on the sheet they requested a \$1 million less than the cap.

Mr. Seals stated they actually requested a little more than the cap.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
C. Jackson	Pearce
N. Jackson	Rose
Livingston	Malinowski
Kennedy	Dickerson
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote was in favor of approving the Richland County Recreation Commission to the cap.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve Columbia Area Mental Health to the cap.

<u>FOR</u>	<u>AGAINST</u>
Pearce	
Rose	
C. Jackson	
N. Jackson	
Malinowski	
Dickerson	
Livingston	
Kennedy	
Myers	
Manning	
McBride	

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve Columbia Area Mental Health to the cap.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the Richland Library to the cap.

Ms. Myers inquired if the \$600,000 appropriated earlier makes up the difference from what was requested and the amount recommended.

Mr. Livingston stated that is not a part of the request.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the Richland Library to the cap.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve the Riverbanks Zoo at the requested amount.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the Riverbanks Zoo at the requested amount.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve Midlands Technical College to the cap.

Mr. Pearce stated usually when Midlands Tech is voted on there are two separate items.

Mr. Seals stated the debt service is separate.

Mr. Livingston stated the only thing not listed is the addition for the new building and 0.5 mill.

Mr. Malinowski stated the request from Midlands Tech is \$80,000 less than the cap.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Rose, to fund Midlands Technical College at the requested amount.

Mr. Manning stated when Council was provided the information, it was his understanding they were requesting an amount or the cap, whichever was higher.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Kennedy
Myers

AGAINST

N. Jackson
Manning

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion to fund Midlands Technical College at the requested amount. Mr. Livingston abstained from voting on this item.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to when Midlands Technical College Debt Service would be taken up.

Mr. Livingston stated Debt Service was voted on at one time.

Mr. Malinowski stated Midlands Technical College Debt Service was not listed under Debt Service.

Mr. Seals stated Midlands Technical College Debt Service was not included and needed to be taken up at this time. The debt service for Midlands Technical College will be 2 mills, which equates to \$752,500.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to approve Midlands Technical College Debt Service at 2 mills.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve Midlands Technical College Debt Service at 2 mills. Mr. Livingston abstained from voting.

Mr. Manning inquired for clarification if Midlands Technical College will be locked in at the same dollar amount for the next 2 years.

Mr. Pearce stated he did not think millage agencies were doing 2 year budgets.

Mr. Seals stated that is correct. There was an error made by a member of staff and there was inconsistent reporting done to the millage agencies.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, based on Mr. Seals' clarification regarding the millage agencies that the millage agencies be funded only in FY18.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to what the understanding was of the vote just taken.

Mr. Livingston stated that is what is being clarified.

Mr. N. Jackson stated if we want to change that then we will have to go back and amend the vote.

Mr. Seals stated he believes Mr. Manning's concern is with the operating budget and not with the debt service.

Mr. Manning responded affirmatively. The motion is for all the millage agencies operating budgets.

FOR

AGAINST

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the millage agencies operating budgets for only FY18.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund School District One at the requested amount.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to fund School District One to the cap.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the difference between the cap and the requested amount.

Mr. Seals stated School District One has requested the cap, plus the look back mills of 7.8.

Mr. Manning withdrew his second on the substitute motion; therefore, the substitute motion dies for lack of a second.

Mr. Pearce stated he does not understand the amounts on the sheet. Does the millage cap amount include the look back millage?

Mr. Seals stated it does not include the look back. The cap is \$208,235,256.

Mr. Pearce stated the Auditor gave them 2 numbers. The millage cap would raise taxes \$21.40/per \$100,000 home and with the look back millage added it would raise taxes \$67.89/per \$100,000 home.

Mr. Pearce made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund School District One in the amount of \$208,235,255.

FOR
Pearce
C. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson

AGAINST
Rose
N. Jackson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

The substitute motion failed.

Mr. Pearce stated for clarification that this motion will raise taxes \$67.40/per \$100,000 home.

Mr. Seals stated that amount is for commercial property. It is not applicable on residential property.

Ms. Myers stated as a point of clarification, she supports robust funding for School District One, but the tax increase does apply to some homes. If it is a second home it does apply and that is not a commercial business, it is a home.

FOR
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST
Pearce
Malinowski
Dickerson

The vote was in favor of funding School District One at the requested amount.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to fund School District Two at the requested amount.

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to fund School District Two to the allowable cap.

FOR
N. Jackson
Manning

AGAINST
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers

The substitute motion failed.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to fund School District Two at the requested amount.

Mr. Livingston requested School District One and Two to provide a list of unfunded mandates from the State prior to Third Reading.

Mr. Seals stated the Special Revenue has changed due to Council action. The packet provided to Council identifies the bottom line result of those changes.

Mr. Seals stated the following items have not been taken up: Victim's Rights, Tourism Development, Temporary Alcohol Permits, Emergency Telephone System, Stormwater Management and Fire Service.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve Victim's Rights funding as recommended.

It was determined the Victim's Rights item was taken up earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Dickerson inquired as to what Tourism Development is.

Mr. Seals is the fund set up to account for the 3% Tourism Development fees.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the funding for Tourism Development.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification on the amount.

Mr. Seals stated the amount would be the cap. The changes will be captured at Third Reading.

Ms. Myers requested an explanation regarding the Tourism Development fees. (i.e. debt on Convention Center, portion of the contribution, etc.)

Mr. Seals stated it is his understanding it is all of the above.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the funding for Tourism Development.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Temporary Alcohol Permits funding.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the Temporary Alcohol Permit funding.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Emergency Telephone System funding.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the Emergency Telephone System funding.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the Fire Service funding for discussion.

Mr. Pearce stated for clarification that the County still does not have a contract.

Mr. Seals responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated this will appropriate the funds available.

Mr. Seals stated the position of Council is clear and has been relayed.

Ms. Myers stated for clarification that the number is contingent upon the contract; therefore, it may be woefully inadequate or more be too much.

Mr. Seals stated staff believes it is adequate, but obviously things could change. During negotiations it has been said that the budget discussions of Council is not an indication of Council changing its position and the direction given to staff.

Mr. N. Jackson made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the funding for the Fire Service in the amount of \$26,282,310.

FOR

Pearce

Rose

C. Jackson

N. Jackson

Malinowski

Dickerson

Livingston

Kennedy

Myers

Manning

McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the funding for the Fire Service in the amount of \$26,282,310.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the funding for Stormwater Management.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification on why this budget is being increased in excess of \$829,000.

Mr. Seals stated you will recall in the budget message it was noted there were a variety of Stormwater improvements that are anticipated.

FOR

Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the funding for Stormwater Management.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Mr. Seals noted there were over 1,400 budget transfers in the last fiscal year and was concerned about that. There was a policy or practice being put in place that would either reduce that drastically or not allow any. He requested Mr. Seals explain the recommendation as it relates to budget transfers in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Seals stated generally speaking the budget transfers will be for specific unexpected items that have come up or were not planned for. Secondly, for an item that may have been planned for, but the costs parameters have changed.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there was a request that comes from the Conservation Commission that deals with anticipated or agreed upon acquisition, would that fall under one of those categories and be honored?

Mr. Seals stated it would and the key word is already agreed upon.

Mr. Livingston inquired if the gateway pocket park and the Civil Rights Museum were voted on.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to appropriate the funding for the gateway pocket park and the Civil Rights Museum, but to not specify where anything will be located.

Mr. Manning stated the information Mr. Livingston referenced says to explore for \$2 million. In the past, feasibility studies were done for 6 H-Tax projects that ranged from \$60,000 to \$85,000 to explore those projects. As far as setting this funding aside, the funding is sitting in fund balance for H-Tax, so it's still going to be sitting there. Why wouldn't we just make a motion to do feasibility studies to explore and come back to Council with a funding recommendation?

Mr. Manning made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to allocate up to \$80,000 to do a feasibility studies on both of those.

Mr. Livingston stated the gateway pocket park talks about exploring, but the other item refers to developing something. It would be his suggestion that they be taken up separately.

Ms. Kennedy withdrew her second on the substitute motion; therefore, the substitute motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Pearce stated the money is in the bank. If Council wants to do these projects the committee can make a recommendation to Council. He stated he does not know anything about these projects.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to defer this until Third Reading.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous for deferral.

Mr. Malinowski stated in the General Fund Department detail on p. 10 of the budget book there are details regarding Delegation funding in the amount of \$269,000. He inquired as to who utilizes the \$269,000 in funding?

Mr. Seals stated there is staff that serves the Richland County Delegation.

Mr. Malinowski moved to deny the request and take it from the Local Government Funding.

Mr. Pearce stated this motion was out of order since the budget has already been approved.

Mr. Seals stated Council needs to take up the remaining items under Special Revenue.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the funding for Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund, Drug Court Program, Road Maintenance Fee, Public Defender, Transportation Tax, and School Resource Officers.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Malinowski
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

The vote in favor was unanimous to approve the funding for Title IVD – Sheriff’s Fund, Drug Court Program, Road Maintenance Fee, Public Defender, Transportation Tax, and School Resource Officers.

Mr. Malinowski stated we voted on and passed Mr. Livingston’s motion on EngenuitySC in the amount of \$45,000. He indicated then he felt that is truly an Economic Development matter and if Council believes that it

is and we are willing to fund it there. Economic Development does not want to take it. He does not know what precedent we are setting for every time somebody that gets a mill decide they do not want it.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to fund Economic Development at the amount recommended, less \$45,000.

Ms. Myers requested an explanation.

Mr. Livingston stated the matter was discussed in the Economic Development Committee. They felt like they wanted to make certain changes in the department and had limited funds; therefore, one of the options was to partially fund EngenuitySC.

Ms. Myers inquired if that means EngenuitySC will now be funded out of the General Fund.

Mr. Livingston stated it depends on what Council decides and how much is in the Economic Development fund.

Ms. Myers stated it struck her as odd that Economic Development has their own fund and decide to throw EngenuitySC out and it is truly Economic Development.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if it was the committee's decision.

Mr. Livingston stated it was the Economic Development Director's recommendation and the committee supported his recommendation to fund EngenuitySC at a different level.

FOR
Malinowski

AGAINST
Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

The motion to fund Economic Development at the amount recommended, less \$45,000 failed.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the Economic Development funding.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Malinowski

The vote was in favor of approving the Economic Development funding.

Mr. Manning inquired if a motion had been made to approve 2nd Reading of the budget.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the 2nd Reading ordinances for FY18 and FY19 as amended.

FOR

Pearce
Rose
C. Jackson
N. Jackson
Dickerson
Livingston
Kennedy
Myers
Manning
McBride

AGAINST

Malinowski

The vote was in favor of approving the 2nd Reading ordinances for FY18 and FY 19 as amended.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:24 PM.

The Minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley, Deputy Clerk of Council