



Richland County Council
REGULAR SESSION
MINUTES

December 6, 2022 – 6:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Chair; Jessica Mackey, Vice-Chair; Bill Malinowski, Derrek Pugh, Paul Livingston, Allison Terracio, Joe Walker (via Zoom), Gretchen Barron, Overture Walker, Cheryl English, and Chakisse Newton.

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Jennifer Wladischkin, Kyle Holsclaw, Judy Carter, Michael Byrd, Angela Weathersby, Justin Landy, Dale Welch, Michael Maloney, Aric Jensen, Patrick Wright, Leonardo Brown, Anette Kirylo, Sandra Haynes, Tamar Black, Susan O’Cain, Jeff Ruble, Ashiya Myers, Abhijit Deshpande, Crayman Harvey, Stacey Hamm, Sarah Harris, Brittney Terry-Hoyle, Chelsea Bennett, Bill Davis, Hans Pauling, Geo Price, Zachary Cavanaugh, Dante Roberts, Paul Brawley, and Lori Thomas.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Overture Walker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
Chairman O. Walker noted, for the record, Ms. McBride is ill and unable to attend tonight’s meeting.
2. **INVOCATION** – The Invocation was led by the Honorable Derrek Pugh.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Derrek Pugh.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. Regular Session: November 15, 2022 – Ms. Terracio moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Barron.
In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
Not Present: McBride.
The vote in favor was unanimous.
 - b. Zoning Public Hearing: November 17, 2022 – Mr. Pugh moved to approve the minutes as distributed, seconded by Ms. Barron.
In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton
Not Present: McBride
The vote in favor was unanimous.
5. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Pugh moved to adopt the agenda as published, seconded by Ms. Barron.
In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.
Not Present: McBride.
The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Regular Session
December 6, 2022**

6. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS** – Mr. Patrick Wright, County Attorney, stated the following item was eligible to receive legal advice and be discussed in Executive Session.

a. Comprehensive Council Rules

7. **CITIZENS' INPUT**

a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing – No one signed up to speak.

CITIZENS' INPUT

8. a. Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda (Items for which a public hearing is required or a public hearing has been scheduled cannot be addressed at this time)

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the development at 1113 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC.

1. Ms. Becky Gross, 1463 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
2. Dr. Jeremy Dertien, 357 Cross Creek Road, Central, SC 29630
3. Mr. John Logue, 108 San Carlos Court, Hopkins, SC 29630
4. Ms. Majken Blackwell, 4600 Old Leesburg Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
5. Mr. Norman Gross, 1463 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
6. Ms. Cindy Harrelson, 1317 Lower Richland Boulevard, Hopkins, SC 29061
7. Ms. Jennifer Mancke, 320 Clearview Drive, Hopkins, SC 29061
8. Mr. Robert Reese, 204 Sonoma Drive, Hopkins, SC 29061
9. Ms. Linda Johnson, 654 Harmon Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
10. Mr. Billy Sanders, 1133 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
11. Ms. Pam Rose, 1328 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC 29061
12. Mr. Clay Chappelle, 1416 Ridge Road, Hopkins, SC 29061

Mr. Wright stated County Council does not have the authority to not allow a permit. If there are any environmental or biological issues, the information should be presented to the Permitting Department. He noted Council makes the law, but they do not determine who receives permits.

Ms. Newton stated she made a promise to the community that she would never increase the density, and she has kept that promise. Within the bounds of the law, she will continue to work with the community to ensure anything developed there is respectful of the community.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the County Attorney can provide the community with information on where they can take their concerns. He also inquired, if Council has the authority to approve or disapprove zoning and other environmental matters, why is this matter not in the purview of the Council?

Mr. Wright responded County Council is a legislative or law-making body. Council makes zoning laws but does not determine who abides by the laws. For example, if something is zoned a certain way, and they have the authority to appeal, you can change the zoning. If they are within the law, there is nothing you can do. He noted he is not the appropriate person to provide information on where to voice their concerns.

Ms. Newton stated she has the information and can provide it to the community members.

13. Cynthia Spencer, 1813 Pennfield Drive, Columbia, SC 29223 shared her concerns about being harassed

9. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

a. Updates:

1. Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center Updates – Mr. Leonardo Brown, County Administrator, shared a PowerPoint presentation of the current state of the Detention Center which was shared at the 11.17.22 Detention Center Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Since March 2022 the Detention Center has hired over 50 detention center officers. Mr. Brown introduced Mr. Crayman Harvey, Interim Detention Center Director, and acknowledge all the good work and efforts Mr. Harvey has been doing since he took over the leadership role at the facility including but not limited to addressing some of the mental challenge issues.

Mr. Harvey stated they are trying to change the philosophy of what correction looks like while also dealing with the mentally ill. They have been aggressively trying to determine how to keep these individuals safe, as well as provide them services while in the Detention Center. A mental health unit opened up. The Special Housing Unit where the mentally ill were previously housed has been demolished and taken offline. He noted they are going back to the basics of taking care of people, no matter if they are a criminal or a staff member.

Ms. English thanked the staff for their hard work on this matter.

Ms. Newton asked what measurements the County will take to continue to show improvements.

Mr. Brown replied one of the Assistant County Administrators has been working daily hand-in-hand with the facility to demonstrate Administration's commitment to the improvements. In addition, he is planning to hire a Compliance Officer for Quality Control. This person would have the ability to work as an Assistant Director, but will report directly to the County Administrator, which will allow this person to independently advise the Administration of issues.

Mr. Wright noted Chief Justice Toal has spoken highly of Richland County Council and the County Administrator for their response to address the issues at the Detention Center.

2. *Public Safety Salary Assessment* – Mr. Brown stated there was a review of salary associated with the public safety sector. As a part of this process, he spoke with the department heads or elected officials so they could share information regarding this review. In assessing the initial requests, we can address the salary concerns within the departments' budgets, based on their vacancy rates and COLA funds. Part of this will be addressed in FY22, but as we address this in the future, other considerations will have to take place. In reviewing the requests, an appraisal of other similarly-sized counties was conducted.

The recommended salary increases are as follows:

- Sheriff- Sworn Non-Exempt Only Earning less than \$55,000
 - Of 409 positions 357 would receive increases between \$9 and \$4,999; averaging \$2,215
 - Deputy I starting salary (certified) would increase to \$45,000
 - Deputy II starting salary would increase to \$36,508
- Solicitor – Attorneys Only
 - Entry Attorney salary would increase to \$62,000 from \$52,483
 - Staggered increases by position and years of service
- Public Defender – Attorneys Only
 - Entry Attorney salary would increase to \$62,000 from \$52,483
 - Staggered increases by position and years of service
- CASA – Attorneys Only
 - Entry Attorney salary would increase to \$62,000 from \$52,483
- EMS – Paramedics Only
 - Salary increases averaging 4.75% would be implemented

The total impact in FY24 would be \$2,457,600. The following are options to fund the increases:

- Option A: 5% reduction of operating expenditures Countywide
- Option B: Allocate \$2,457,800 from ARPA Public Safety funds
- Option C: Increase tax collection by 1.5 mills

Ms. Terracio inquired when we are looking at the future impact, does that include filling vacancies.

Mr. Brown replied the ultimate goal is to fill those vacancies as soon as they find qualifying applicants.

Ms. Terracio inquired, for clarification, the numbers before us, are maintaining the same number of people on the current payroll.

Ms. English inquired, in regards to the 74 positions, do we have to maintain the funding for salaries, or do we have the ability to fluctuate those funds.

Mr. Brown responded the positions have to be funded so the dollars can be counted.

Mr. Livingston inquired if all the vacancies are public safety positions.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we support Option B, does that mean we will be all right for the remainder of this year and next?

Mr. Brown responded we will be all right for the remainder of this fiscal year and next.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, through the end of this fiscal year, which ends June 30, 2023, and the entirety of FY24, which runs July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024, we will be all right.

Mr. Brown responded in FY24 you would apply the ARPA funds to cover the costs of the salary increases.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the funding from the current vacancies will be enough to fulfill the full request.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. It would be his recommendation to authorize the utilization of the ARPA funds to ensure there are enough funds to cover any miscalculations.

Ms. Mackey stated, it is her understanding, as it relates to the Sheriff's Department, once we allocate funding we cannot reduce their budget. Therefore, if we allocate ARPA funding to the Sheriff's Department, and the dollars run out, we will have to ensure we have funding in our budget to cover that amount.

Mr. Brown replied we cannot reduce positions, but he does not know if that equates to funding.

Mr. Wright responded you cannot reduce the positions and budget enough funds to keep the positions open.

Ms. Mackey inquired which departments Option A would apply to and which line items would be impacted.

Mr. Brown responded Option A would affect departments countywide and it would apply to their overall budget.

Ms. Mackey stated Option C proposes a tax increase. For clarification, this option would only be implemented if we do not go with the other two options.

Mr. Brown stated, generally speaking, a taxing entity does not have any other way to generate revenue other than fines, fees, and taxes. The way you address increased needs is to reduce expenditures or increase revenue.

Ms. Barron noted her concern is allowing these increases and not taking into account the vacancies these departments need to fill to achieve the level of excellence we would like to see. In her mind, it is like a hiring freeze for some of these departments because we are usurping the funds to meet the current needs/requests. She noted, from personal experience, law enforcement did not respond because her call was not a priority. She cannot imagine that continuing to happen. Are we going to be putting ourselves at an advantage by giving salary increases, when there are still hundreds of positions that need to be filled?

Mr. Brown replied it is a two-prong approach. In looking at this as an option to move forward, the Sheriff's Department is aware and has signed off on it. He believes they feel as though the need will be met to a certain degree. If you recall, the steps we took with the Detention Center, as it relates to personnel, are the same thing we are talking about here. Eventually, we hope we will get to a point where more salary dollars are the issue, but we did not want to wait on the hopeful personnel issue to materialize. As you look at the County's desire to invest in various segments of its core functions, we are going to have to look at the way we prioritize expenditures and the millage we receive.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, the \$2.4M in ARPA funds are the funds that have not been allotted across the board.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. The funds were set aside to potentially address public safety-related concerns. He noted he believes we set aside approximately \$3M.

Ms. Barron noted there are additional funds that have not been allotted.

Mr. Brown replied he would have to go back to ensure that is correct.

Mr. Pugh inquired about how current the vacancy numbers are.

Mr. Brown responded they are relatively current, as they just met with the department heads in the last few weeks.

Mr. Pugh inquired if Option B will eventually take us to Option C.

Mr. Brown replied, with the current trend, we would have to substantially reduce expenditures or increase revenue.

Ms. Newton inquired regarding unfilled vacancies, are those unused salary dollars refunded to the County?

Mr. Brown noted the funds remain within the department's personnel line item, but, in general, the funding is in the General Fund. At the end of the fiscal year, the funding returns to the General Fund.

Ms. Newton inquired if the presumption is the ARPA funding will carry us through FY24 or if there will be additional salary increase requests.

Mr. Brown responded he cannot say this will be an end-all, be-all. He noted in his three years with the County they have received salary requests and they have not fully funded those requests. Currently, the County is conducting a compensation study, specifically for pay, to determine how we look in the governmental market and the private sector. In addition, establish a pay plan that you can budget for.

Ms. Newton inquired who the County's millage agencies are and are we required to give millage to those agencies, and, if yes, what percentage are we paying and what percentage are we required to provide.

Mr. Paul Brawley, County Auditor, responded the only millage agencies the County has to fund are the school districts and the Recreation Commission. The Recreation Commission must be funded at a minimum of 5 mills and there is a formula for the school districts that must be adhered to. All of the other millage agencies are at the pleasure of the Council.

Ms. Mackey inquired if a projection has been done for the next three years that shows the true impact of these salary increases. If not, she would like to see that done. She inquired if we have worked with the departments to develop other ways to look at benefits we could offer, outside of salary, to recruit individuals.

Mr. Brown responded staff did not do a 3-5 year projection because we are awaiting the results of the current compensation study. The compensation study is to produce a plan similar to the "GS Schedule". He noted the HR trends have been changing, and we are now in the timeframe where people want to know what they can do with what they are earning, and not what the future looks like.

Ms. Newton inquired if Council has to take action tonight.

Mr. Brown replied action can take place at the December 13th Special Called meeting, which would allow the increases to take effect in January 2023.

Chairman Walker stated, for clarification, the request is for Council to approve the ARPA funds to cover any gaps in FY23 and meet the salary increase request for FY24. To pay for these increases in FY25 and FY26, Council would have to decide on either a 5% Countywide budget cut or raise taxes with a 1.5 mill increase.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Lori Thomas, Assistant County Administrator, stated, in speaking with the departments, they could continue to hire new hires at the new rates. Based on the timing it takes to hire people in our market, they would be able to make significant impacts on their vacancy rates.

Ms. English requested what the millage increase would equate to in tax dollars.

Mr. Livingston inquired if any of the options will require three readings and a public hearing.

Mr. Wright responded Options A and C would require three readings and a public hearing. Option B, which is the ARPA funds, those funds have already been dedicated to public safety.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if the use of ARPA funds would require additional action by Council since those funds were approved during the budget process.

Mr. Wright replied the County Administrator has the authority to allocate the ARPA funds.

Mr. O. Walker urged Councilmembers that have further questions to address those with either Mr. Brown or Ms. Thomas.

10. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – No report was given.

11. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – No report was given.

12. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina, the Ritedose Corporation and TRC Propco, Inc. to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.
- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County South Carolina and Epoch Properties, LLC a company formerly known to the County as Project Coyote, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 22-022MA, Jenny Reyes, RU to NC (8.63 Acres), 9200 Wilson Blvd., TMS # R14600-03-41 [SECOND READING]
- b. An Ordinance amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; by the addition of Article VII, Residential Rental Property Resignation and Regulations [FIRST READING] – Ms. Terracio removed this item from the Consent Agenda.

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

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, the ordinance includes nuisance offenses (i.e. noise and/or code enforcement infractions).

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker

**Regular Session
December 6, 2022**

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Information Technology – Cybersecurity Modernization
- d. Utilities Department – Shady Grove Pump Station Project Bid Award
- e. Finance Department – Travel Policy Updates
- f. Richland County Sheriff's Department – Accreditation Manager
- g. County Partnership with Gateway to the Army Association Centennial Park Project

Mr. Malinowski moved to approve the Consent Items (a) and (c-g), seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Malinowski moved to reconsider Items 13(c-g), seconded by Mr. Pugh.

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

Not Present: McBride.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

14. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina, the Ritedose Corporation and TRC Propco, Inc. to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Mr. Pugh.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker. (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County and Epoch Properties, LLC, a company formerly known to the County as Project Coyote, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Terracio.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there were any significant changes to the updated agenda documentation from what was presented to Council a year and a half ago.

Mr. Jeff Ruble, Economic Development Director, indicated there were no significant changes.

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

Not Present; McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **SECOND READING ITEMS**

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

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; authorizing the execution and delivery of an infrastructure credit agreement by and among Richland County, South Carolina and Project Cheers to provide for certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Pugh moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a public infrastructure credit agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to a company identified for the time being as Project Green Arrow; and other related matters – Mr. Pugh moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. English.

Mr. Malinowski requested the land description by Third Reading. He inquired as to who will be providing sewer for the project.

Mr. Ruble responded it will be the City of Columbia.

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

Opposed: Newton.

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote was in favor.

- d. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement y and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Golden Eagle to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston moved to approve this item, seconded by Ms. Mackey.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

- a. An Ordinance authorizing the option and acquisition of certain property located in Richland County; and other matters related thereto [FIRST READING] – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to when the effective and option dates will be defined.

Mr. Ruble replied they will be provided once the ordinance has been approved.

Mr. Malinowski requested a map of the property and, as it relates to Item 4 – “Option Term/Closing”, to have the type of mail defined. In addition, he requested an explanation of the following language: “Optionee hereby agrees to reimburse Optionor for all claims, demands, actions, losses, costs, damages, liabilities and expenses (including, without limitation, reasonable attorneys’ fees, costs of litigation and the cost and expense of removing or bonding over any liens affecting the Property)”.

Mr. Ruble replied he did not fully understand the language. He will have the real estate attorney provide an explanation.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what the intended use will be in the future.

Mr. Ruble replied they have discussed it being zoned EMP (Employment District) in the future. Some of the property will best be utilized as industrial.

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

Opposed: Terracio.

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote was in favor.

- b. A Resolution approving and consenting to the sale of property by Unum Group, Unum Life Insurance Company of America, and Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Company (collectively, "Assignors") to TSO 1200 Colonial Life Blvd Retail, LP and TSO 1200 Colonial Life Blvd, LP; the partial assignment by Assignors to TSO 1200 Colonial Life Blvd Retail, LP and TSO 1200 Colonial Life Blvd, LP of two fee agreements by and between Assignors and Richland County, South Carolina; and other related matters – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Authorizing the first amendment of that certain fee agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina, and Eastover Solar, LLC, relating to, without limitation, the further investment of the project, the increase of the phase termination date, and an update to the fee payment schedule and amount and other related matters [FIRST READING] –

Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. REPORT OF RULES AND APPOINTMENT COMMITTEE

a. NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS

1. Community Relations Council – One (1) Vacancy – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended appointing Ms. Sharrell Simmons.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

2. Music Festival Commission – One (1) Vacancy – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended appointing Mr. Stephen Rebl.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. Richland Library Board – Six (6) Vacancies – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended re-appointing Ms. Erin Johnson and Ms. Lee Rambo and appointing Ms. Chelsea Richard, Mr. Jonathan Robertson, Ms. Cynthia Cox, and Ms. Burlean Moses.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. Township Auditorium Board – Two (2) Vacancies – Ms. Barron stated the committee recommended appointing Mr. Frank Robinson and Dr. Travien L. Capers.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

18. **REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Resurfacing Package T – Ms. Mackey stated the committee recommended awarding the construction contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Palmetto Corp of Conway.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Lake Tide Summit Credit Sales – Ms. Mackey stated the committee recommended approval of Lake Tide Summit Development's purchase of 3.132 wetland credits at a rate of \$20,000 per credit.

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

Opposed: Newton.

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Barron moved to reconsider Items 18(a – b) and 19(a-c), seconded by Ms. Newton.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The motion for reconsideration failed.

19. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. FY23 – District 2 Hospitality Tax Allocations: (Big Red Barn Retreat - \$5,000 and Benedict College - \$10,000)

- b. FY23 – District 7 Hospitality Tax Allocation: (Westwood High School - \$3,000)

- c. FY23 – District 9 Hospitality Tax Allocation: (Divine Nine Foundation - \$10,000)

Ms. Barron moved to approve Items 19(a), (b), and (c), seconded by Mr. Pugh.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

20. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- a. Comprehensive Council Rules

Ms. Mackey moved to go into Executive Session, seconded by Ms. Newton.

Mr. Malinowski stated Council Rules are always made public. He inquired if there is anything sensitive that should not have been made public.

Mr. Wright responded he does not give legal advice in public, which is the purpose of the Executive Session.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Terracio.

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker.

The vote was in favor.

***Council went into Executive Session at approximately 8:09 PM
and came out at approximately 8:34 PM***

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

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

**Regular Session
December 6, 2022**

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker. (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Chairman Walker stated no actions were taken during the executive session.

- a. Comprehensive Council Rules – No action was taken.

21. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. Motion to amend Council Rules – Rule 4.1 – Ad Hoc Committees

The title should be changed to read Standing and Ad Hoc Committees for the heading.

Below the heading should be the wording “Standing and Ad Hoc Committees will be appointed by the Chair on an as-needed basis and shall follow the same rules and procedures as Council.” [MALINOWSKI] – Mr. Malinowski stated this motion can be included in the recommended changes to the Comprehensive Council Rules.

- b. Direct the Administrator to create regulations for the operation of Short-Term Rentals (STRs) in unincorporated Richland County. Those regulations would be listed as an amendment to the current ordinance relating to residential rental property regulations similar to the Absentee Landlord Ordinance that is currently being considered. Consideration should be given to licensing, safety measures, number of occupants allowed, effects on infrastructure such as sewer and water, EMS and Law Enforcement potential response and not having them create a nuisance in the neighborhood [MALINOWSKI] – Mr. O. Walker proposed this item be referred to the Development & Services Committee.

Mr. Wright stated the only possible concern is the motion is dealing with a land use regulation, which may be under Chapter 26 and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Malinowski responded he was attempting to tailor the motion after the absentee landlord motion. If Mr. Wright believes this needs to go to the Planning Commission, he will stay with the motion he made at the last Council meeting.

Chairman O. Walker referred the motion to the Planning Commission.

22. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Newton moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

Not Present: McBride and J. Walker (technical difficulties with zoom)

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:38 PM.