



Richland County Council

MINUTES

Special Called Meeting
2nd Reading – FY23 Budget
May 26, 2022 – 6:00 PM
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Lori Thomas, Tamar Black, Angela Weathersby, Ashiya Myers, Stacey Hamm, Steven Gaither, Denise Teasdell, Michael Maloney, Dale Welch, Sandra Haynes, Michael Byrd, Kyle Holsclaw, Leonardo Brown, Allen Brown, Anette Kirylo, Aric Jensen, Randy Pruitt, Jennifer Wladischkin, Dwight Hanna and Abhijit Deshpande

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman O. Walker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to adopt the agenda as published.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **SECOND READING**

a. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt an Annual Budget (FY2023) for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2022 and ending June 30, 2023. So as to raise revenue, make appropriations and Amend the General Fund, Millage Agencies, Special Revenue Funds, Enterprise Funds, and Debt Service Funds Budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2022 and ending June 30, 2023** – Ms. English moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve this item.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. **An Ordinance authorizing the levying of Ad Valorem property taxes which together with the prior year's carryover and other State Levies and any additional amount**

appropriated by the Richland County Council prior to July 1, 2022 will provide sufficient revenues for the operations of Richland County Government during the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023 – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. English, to approve this item.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4.

Millage Agencies

1. ***Richland County Recreation Commission (Recommended: \$16,063,900)***
2. ***Columbia Area Mental Health (Recommended: \$2,584,000)***
3. ***Public Library (Recommended: \$30,868,000)***
4. ***Riverbanks Zoo and Gardens (Recommended: \$2,574,000)***
5. ***Midlands Technical College – Operating (Recommended: \$7,250,700)***
6. ***Midlands Technical College – Capital (Recommended: \$3,861,000)***
7. ***School District One (Recommended: \$239,797,217)*** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve Items 1-7 at the no mill increase amount.

Mr. Livingston stated, for the record, he will be voting against these items on Second Reading because several of these agencies would be funded at a lower amount than the previous year. Therefore, he wants an opportunity to determine the impact it would have on the agencies before Third Reading.

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

Opposed: Livingston

Not Present: Pugh

The vote was in favor.

8. ***School District Two (Recommended: \$169,467,321)*** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to defer this item.

Mr. Livingston inquired how the motion for deferral will affect moving forward.

Mr. Leonardo Brown, County Administrator, responded Council has time to make a decision, but the item would be out of sequence with the rest of the budget.

Mr. Malinowski withdrew his motion.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. J. Walker, to approve this item at the no mill increase amount.

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

Opposed: Livingston

Not Present: Pugh

The vote was in favor.

GRANTS

9. ***Accommodations Tax (Approval of A-Tax Committee recommendation; \$400,000)*** – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. English, to approve this item.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of Reserve for Future Years/Contingency funding level: \$150,000)*** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve this item.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

11. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of Transfers Out funding level: \$4,487,750)***

12. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for Columbia Museum of Art for FY23: \$791,705)***

14. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for EdVenture for FY23: \$423,333)***

15. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for Township Auditorium for FY23: \$385,000)***

16. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center and Visitor's Bureau at FY 22 level: \$201,091)***

17. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for Columbia International Festival at FY22 level: \$166,344)***

18. ***Hospitality Tax (Approval of SERCO funding at FY22 level: \$67,895)***

19. Hospitality Tax (Approval to carry over any unexpended funds from the Gateway Pocket Park/Blight Removal Project to FY23 budget: \$250,000)

20. Hospitality Tax (Approval to carry over any unexpended funds from the Historical Corridor to FY23 budget: \$372.715) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. English to approve Items 11-20.

Ms. Barron requested to remove Item 13.

Mr. Malinowski requested to remove Items 12 and 14.

Mr. O. Walker stated, for clarification, the motion now is for Items 11 and 15-20.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the projected Hospitality Tax revenue is more or less than last year.

Mr. Abhijit Deshpande, Budget and Grants Management Director, responded the projected revenue is greater than last year.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the agencies are receiving the same amount as last year.

Mr. Deshpande responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated he does not understand why it indicates “use of the fund balance will be affected” if we are taking in more revenue and we are funding the agencies at the same amount.

Mr. Deshpande responded Administration does not have a recommendation, but the base use of fund balance will be affected. The projected use is \$1.186M.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the amount of the current fund balance.

Mr. Deshpande responded the current fund balance is not listed, but he can provide that amount to Council.

Mr. Malinowski withdrew his request to remove Items 12 and 14.

Mr. O. Walker stated, for clarification, the motion is for Items 11-12 and 14-20.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

13. Hospitality Tax (Approval of the funding level for Historic Columbia Foundation for FY23: \$406,810) – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to fund Historic Columbia Foundation at \$506,810, which is an increase of \$100,000 from their previous years. She noted this organization manages our buildings.

Mr. Malinowski noted the County funds these organizations, but there is not a budget report provided back to the County on how these funds are spent.

Ms. Terracio stated she can see the downward trend of the organization's funding amount. She inquired if the maker of the motion was attempting to return their funding to a certain level.

Ms. Barron noted Historic Columbia requested a \$200,000 increase. Although, the County may not be in a position to fully fund the request she was willing to compromise and recommend a \$100,000 increase.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 21. Hospitality Tax (Approval of H-Tax Committee Recommendations: \$500,000)** – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Barron.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 22. Hospitality Tax (Approval of Councilmember H-Tax Discretionary funding level: \$906,675)**

- 23. Hospitality Tax (Approve funding of \$60,000 to the Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival for their annual festival in FY23: \$60,000)**

- 24. Hospitality Tax (Approval to carry over any unexpended funds from each Councilmember District to FY23 budget: N/A)**

- 25. Hospitality Tax (Approve Lake Murray Capital City as a Special Promotion Agency and appropriate funding: TBD)**

- 26. Neighborhood Redevelopment (Approval of Neighborhood Improvement Grant Recommendations: \$75,775)**

- 27. Conservation Commission (Approval of RC Conservation Commission Grant Recommendations: \$250,000)**

- 28. Various Grant Funded Depts. (Approval of department requests that are applying for external grants in FY23 and required matching of County funds: \$105,231,142)** – Ms. English moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve Items 22-28.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Brown noted Item 25 did not have an amount associated with it.

Ms. Newton stated, her understanding is, the primary objective was to make Lake Murray Capital City a Special Promotions agency.

Mr. Livingston confirmed Ms. Newton's statement.

Ms. McBride stated she does not feel comfortable approving the item without an amount being provided.

Mr. Livingston recommended approving \$150,000 for Lake Murray Capital City.

Mr. Malinowski indicated this agency is one of the two tourism promotion agencies approved by the State to bring tourism from Lake Murray down to the Congaree. We give a lot of money to some of these groups, some in the six figure amount, for one event. Here is a group working on behalf of the Midlands and Richland County the entire, and bringing numerous events.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve \$150,000 for Item 25 (Lake Murray Capital City).

Ms. Barron inquired if this motion is in proper order since we have already approved the item.

Mr. Patrick Wright, County Attorney, responded the previous motion approved Lake Murray Capital City being added as a Special Promotions agency and the current motion is to appropriate a funding amount.

Ms. Barron stated this agency has been funded in the past; therefore, she inquired why they were not funded in the upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Brown responded the agency was included, but this motion brought them to a different area in the budget.

Ms. Newton inquired if the agency will be receiving two allocations or was their funding moved in response to this motion.

Mr. Brown responded the agency will be eligible for one allocation under Special Promotions.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

GENERAL FUND

29. County Departments (Approve Projected General Fund Revenue as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$189,747,431)

30. County Departments (Approve total General Fund Transfers in as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$3,025,000)

- 31. County Departments (Approve Projected Use of General Fund Balance to support overall General Fund expenditure as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$3,992,503)** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommendations for Items 29-31.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 32. County Departments (Approve change in the County’s health insurance carrier from CIGNA Health Care to the SC State Health Plan (PEBA): -\$3,698,357)**

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve the Administrator’s recommendation for this item.

Ms. McBride thanked staff for their work on this matter and trying to save the County money while providing self-services to the staff. She believes in the long run this will hurt staff; therefore, she cannot support this motion.

Mr. Malinowski requested staff to address Ms. McBride’s concerns.

Mr. Brown stated, when you look at the breakdown, it shows the annual savings. This year the County is projected to save \$3.6M, and the County is reinvesting \$4.2M in a cost of living adjustment for the employees.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, we are increasing the insurance costs to the employees and then turning around and giving them a raise. She noted she could see staff viewing that as we gave them a raise, and then took it back with increased insurance premiums. This is not the message she wants to send to the employees.

Mr. Brown stated no one necessarily likes this conversation. Richland County’s health plan, by analysis from agencies over the past few years, has told us we have a rich health plan. Part of the reason we struggle with the healthcare costs is because we have a high risk health pool, the claims themselves, and the richness of the plan drives up the costs. This restricts the ability to affect other compensation. He noted staff was told if we kept the health plan the same this year, they could expect premiums to go up because the healthcare carrier has indicated they have lost over \$9M. In this instance, employees will not pay higher rates. The County will be covering the deductibles for the employees and dependents. There may be a few individuals, because of their health plan choices, that may have some additional costs. If we do not make a change, we will all be paying increased costs because the County will not be able to absorb the costs.

Ms. Barron inquired about the percentage of staff that responded to the County’s survey regarding health insurance.

Mr. Brown responded he does not have the specific percentage. He noted there were several meetings with current employees and retirees. Due to it being a group health plan, there are going to be some individuals that are supportive and others that are not.

Ms. Terracio inquired about the average impact on out-of-pocket costs.

Mr. Brown responded they have provided information to the employees regarding the plan's costs and the difference between the current plan and the proposed plan.

Ms. Newton stated, her understanding is, when the proposal was presented to Council, one of the things you did was solicit addition insurance quotes from other providers. Based upon the research, the PEBA Plan was the best.

Mr. Brown responded the PEBA Plan offered individual cost savings to the employee and the County. The other plans did not. At worst there would be an increase, and at best there would be no cost increase, which we do not expect. He indicated the current provider wanted the County to go from an 80/20 Plan to a 70/30 Plan. The premium costs would be the same, but the co-insurance amount would change. Something was going to have to change because the funding structure does not support our utilization as an agency.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, as a part of the transition, the County will be picking up deductibles so employees will not have extra out-of-pocket costs.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

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

Opposed: McBride

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

33. County Departments (Approve increasing the minimum entry-level annual wage to \$32,210 [\$16.52 per hour] for full-time and part-time positions to be implemented by August 5, 2022: \$712,197)

34. County Departments (Approve 4% pay raise for Richland County's full-time and part-time employees excluding certified detention officers to be implemented by September 2, 2022: \$4,281,128)

35. County Departments (Approve on average 7.24% pay raise for Richland County's certified detention officers to be implemented by September 2, 2022: \$943,119)

36. County Departments (Approve independent Procurement Department: N/A)

37. County Departments (Approve independent Grant Department: N/A) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Administrator's recommendations for Items 33-37.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

38. Transfer Out (Approve General Fund Operating Transfers Out as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$10,395,758) – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the Administrator’s recommendations for Items 38-39.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

39. County Departments (Approve General Fund New Positions and Reclassifications requests by Departments as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$872,126)

40. County Departments (Approve Other Fund New Positions requests by Departments as presented in the FY23 Recommended Budget Book: \$735,719)

41. Discretionary Grant (Approve total of \$200,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations: \$200,000) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve the Administrator’s recommendations for Items 40-42.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

42. Discretionary Grant (Approve additional \$300,000 in discretionary grant committee recommendations: \$300,000) – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

Ms. Mackey indicated this is an effort to streamline the process of giving to non-profits and allowing additional funds to be used through discretionary grants to applicants who complete the application process.

Mr. Malinowski inquired how we are going to determine who receives the funds.

Ms. Mackey responded this is an additional amount given to the committee. The committee will reconvene and decide how the funding will be awarded.

Mr. Deshpande stated \$2.8M was requested. The fund balance is currently \$3.9M and the \$300,000 will come out of fund balance.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, if this motion is approved, where it will leave the fund balance.

Mr. Deshpande responded the fund balance will still be in the acceptable range.

Mr. Malinowski stated there are several upcoming motions that will affect the fund balance.

Mr. Deshpande stated all of the motions will decrease the fund balance by approximately \$665,000, which is still within the acceptable range of 20%-35%. He noted we are on the tail end of the range.

Ms. Mackey stated motions further down on the motions list address everything listed on pp. 28-30 in the budget book, and having those agencies apply via ARPA funds.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Ms. Mackey's motions result in a net neutral affect.

Ms. Mackey responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, it would actually be a net savings, and not net neutral.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the intent is for the same committee to meet or will be given a chance to look at the committee and potentially reform.

Ms. Mackey responded, her intent is, to submit a motion, which will be taken up at an upcoming Council meeting, to address redefining the committee.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to what happens in the future when there are no more ARPA funds.

Ms. Mackey responded we, as a body, have to strategically decide what we want to focus on.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

43. Contractual & Statutory Grant (Approve funding the Central Midlands COG for FY23: \$200,826)

44. Contractual & Statutory Grant (Approve funding the City Center Partnership for FY23: \$47,500)

45. Contractual & Statutory Grant (Approve funding LRADAC for FY3: \$600,000) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve Items 44-46.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

56. Lump Sum Agencies (Move to fund the following organizations [listed in Lump Sum Appropriations] via ARPA funds up to \$1,150,000 – (a) Capital Senior Center [\$180,000]; (b) Columbia Urban League [\$100,000]; (c) Senior Resources [\$548,046]; (d) Transitions Homeless Center [\$100,000]; (e) Greater Columbia Community Relations [\$95,250]; and (f) Palmetto AIDS Life Support [\$90,000]: \$1,113,296) – Ms. Mackey stated Item 47 is slightly out of order. If Item 56 was addressed prior to taking up Item 47, it would cover the agencies listed on pp. 28-30 in the budget book. She noted she did not list all of them, but it is all of the agencies that requested funding.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve Items 47 and 56.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Item 47 would be for the agencies that have requested funding, but some of the agencies in Item 56 have not requested funding.

Ms. Mackey responded she believes all of the agencies have requested funding.

Mr. Malinowski noted there is not a requested amount listed for the Columbia Urban League.

Mr. Deshpande responded the Columbia Urban League requested funding during the Budget Public Hearing, but not in writing.

Mr. Malinowski stated many of the agencies requested funding at the public hearing, but did not indicate a funding amount. He inquired how we determine the amount of funding to provide.

Mr. Livingston responded the funding will be based on the amount they received in the last 10 years.

Mr. Malinowski noted there is not a funding amount listed for Palmetto AIDS Life Support.

Mr. Deshpande responded he believes Palmetto AIDS Life Support applied for ARPA funds. After consulting with budget staff, it was determined they did not submit an application.

Ms. Mackey stated the motion is to allow the agencies to get funding from ARPA, instead of the General Fund.

Ms. Barron stated the Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee has worked hard, and diligently, for months to prioritize funding and look at specialized categories. It is somewhat hard to swallow this process, as the requests have come through the committee and now they are coming before Council as a budget line item. She supports the lump sum items being funding, but she thinks we need to stay true to our process.

Ms. Newton inquired if Item 56 is only covering the agencies listed or is the idea that all the agencies on the budget motion list for lump sum would come before the committee for ARPA fund priority determination.

Ms. Mackey responded organizations that requested funds would have priority consideration for ARPA funds. As Ms. Barron stated the Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee met and there is a section where there \$16M set aside for community, which is broken down into different areas. When the recommendation from the Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee comes before Council, and we approve it, there is a process where funds are open to everyone. The organizations that have already requested funding will get priority consideration.

Ms. Newton stated, for example, if we look at Item 48, which is a lump sum appropriation for the Therapy Place, they would qualify for funding through ARPA. Therefore, her question is the intent of the motion that all of the agencies, whether the agency requested the funds, or a Council member is requesting the funds, would receive priority consideration or only the agencies listed in Item 56.

Ms. Mackey responded any agency that requested funding.

Ms. McBride stated, once we decide whether we are going to approve funding requests through motions, then we would determine if they are eligible to be funded with ARPA funds instead of through lump sum appropriations.

Mr. Deshpande responded it will depend on when we received the organizations application.

Ms. McBride stated, if the agencies are not eligible for ARPA funds, then we would use lump sum appropriations.

Mr. Brown stated, for clarification, Item 56 states, *“Move to fund the following organizations via ARPA funds”* and Item 47 states, *“Provide priority consideration for remaining Lump Sum Appropriations agencies”*. Ms. McBride’s motions are all lump sum agencies that she is requesting to be funded. Ms. Mackey’s motion ((Item 47) would impact those by saying they would not receive General Fund dollars. They would receive priority consideration for ARPA or Discretionary Grant fund dollars.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve Item 56 and leave it up to the Administrator to determine which funding source to utilize.

Ms. McBride moved to amend the substitute motion to include Items 48-49 and 51-53.

Ms. Mackey requested the funding total before we move forward.

Mr. Deshpande responded it is an additional \$236,000.

Mr. Malinowski stated the total requested funds in Item 56 is \$1,113,296, which leaves only leave \$36,704 for anyone else. If Council needs to follow the process, the agencies need to submit a written request, not a verbal request during the public hearing.

Mr. Brown noted the process we are talking about is the motions process, which Council has utilized in the past.

Ms. English stated the agencies her motions were based on were under the impression their requests would automatically rollover, and they did not.

Mr. Brown responded, each year, agencies are notified they have to request funding.

Ms. English stated she was informed they were not notified.

Mr. Brown stated, for clarification, we want the funds to come from ARPA dollars. If they do not come from ARPA dollars, they would need to come from another funding source, so you would have to clarify if you mean General Fund dollars.

Ms. Barron noted the motion to amend the substitute motion did not receive a second.

Mr. O. Walker stated, for clarification, Mr. Livingston agreed to accept the friendly amendment without the increase of \$15,000 for Item 54. Ms. McBride removed Item 54 from the friendly amendment.

Ms. McBride responded this would not affect the lump sum funds because it would be coming from ARPA funds.

Mr. Livingston stated his motion is to handle the ARPA or lump sum allocations the same way we did last time.

Mr. Brown stated if the intent is for the agencies to have an option that will create issues because we have agencies that qualify for ARPA funds, but do not want to receive ARPA funds.

Mr. Livingston responded we would not give the agencies an option on which funds they receive.

Ms. Barron stated we are only speaking about organizations funded. New organizations are not being considered to be funded, so what are we suggesting to those organizations.

Ms. Mackey responded there is another motion that addresses those organizations. The intent of her motions for Items 47 and 56 is to create accountability and transparency for all of us. We have some organizations which take the time to follow the rules and deadlines and apply through the application process. Then we have other organizations that go to councilmembers to make their request through lump sum appropriations. She is attempting to create a process that is clear for everyone. If a Councilmember submit a lump sum allocation, it is not staff's responsibility to notify the agency, but if there is a unified process then everyone will have the same opportunity and be on the same page.

Ms. McBride's motion to amend the substitute motion died for lack of a second.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor of Item 56.

47. Lump Sum Agencies (Provide priority consideration for remaining Lump Sum Appropriations agencies [that have requested funds] via ARPA funds [Community Grant and Public Private Partnership] and/or additional Discretionary Grant funds: N/A) – Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. English, to approve this item.

Ms. Barron stated, for clarification, this motion only applies to agencies that applied/requested funding last year. She inquired as to what we are saying to the organizations that made requests in this fiscal year.

Ms. Mackey responded the agencies that applied or requested funding will get priority consideration, but there is still funding in ARPA available for other agencies.

Ms. Barron inquired if an organization requested funding out of the FY23 budget they will be given priority consideration.

Ms. Mackey responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the organizations listed on pp. 28-30 are the sum total of organizations that have made a FY23 request.

Mr. Deshpande responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio noted she has an organization that is not listed.

Mr. Brown responded the organizations listed on pp. 28-30 submitted applications prior to the budget book being printed. There are other organizations that made requests, and will be given priority consideration, which are not listed in the budget book.

Ms. Newton inquired about how much ARPA funding will remain after all of the priority appropriations have been allocated.

Ms. Barron responded the Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee dedicated \$16M to the community, with specific needs outlined (i.e. community safety, senior needs, etc.) We will have to determine what “pot” to take the allocations from.

Ms. Newton inquired if the only guidance we are going to give, as part of this motion, priority consideration or are we going to further specify what it means.

Ms. Mackey responded the intent of her motion is for the agencies to have priority consideration.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was a deadline for lump sum appropriation requests to be submitted to the County.

Mr. Deshpande responded there was a deadline.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we are using the official County deadline verbiage.

Ms. Mackey noted there was a deadline for discretionary funds, but she was not aware of a deadline for lump sum appropriations. There has never been a deadline advertised because of the manner in which lump sum appropriations are made. She noted we need to start moving in the direction of providing a deadline.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 48. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve funding of \$20,000 to the Therapy Place towards its operating expenditure in FY23: \$20,000)**
- 49. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve funding of \$81,000 to the Communities in Schools towards their program expenditure in FY23: \$81,000)**
- 51. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve funding the Antioch Senior Center for FY23: \$40,000)**
- 52. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve funding for the Greenview Swim Team for FY23: \$20,000)**
- 53. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve funding the St. John CDC for FY23: \$75,000)**
- 54. Lump Sum Agencies (Approve to increase the Wiley Kennedy Foundation to \$75,000 in FY23 [increase of \$15k]: \$75,000) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. English, to approve Items 48-49, 51-55 and utilize ARPA funds in place of General Fund Lump Sum funds where appropriate.**

Ms. Terracio stated, for clarification, if the appropriations qualify for ARPA funds they will fall into the buckets they belong in.

Ms. Barron responded in the affirmative.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Mackey

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 50. Council Services (Approve increasing the amount of each Councilmember District's discretionary operating expenditure from \$10,000 to its previous amount of \$15,000: \$55,000) – Ms. English moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve this item.**

In Favor: McBride, O. Walker and English

Opposed: Malinowski, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, Mackey and Newton

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The motion failed.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve Council Services at last year's funding amount.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the Councilmembers are depleting their district discretionary accounts at the current funding level.

Ms. Kirylo responded Councilmember are still within their discretionary funding limits for FY22.

In Favor: Malinowski, Livingston, Terracio, Barron and Mackey

Opposed: McBride, O. Walker, English and Newton

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

- 55. County Departments [Public Safety] (Appropriate a contingency of up to \$3,000,000 of American Rescue Plan Funds for potential Public Safety initiatives. These funds would be a transfer to the General Fund on a reimbursement basis.) – Ms. English moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve this item.**

Mr. Livingston inquired if the requests will come back to Council for approval.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired, if we approve the ARPA contingency funds, what will be the reserve fund balance.

Mr. Brown responded no more than \$5M.

Ms. Barron stated, at the conclusion of the last Coronavirus Ad Hoc Committee meeting, there was an estimated reserve amount of \$6.8M. She noted, her understanding is, the contingency funding will not come out of the reserve fund, but each categories proposed funding.

Mr. Brown responded the budget motions that utilize ARPA dollars will come out of the ARPA reserve funding.

Ms. Barron respectively disagreed because these are non-profit organizations that would qualify in the various proposed categories of ARPA funding.

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

Opposed: Terracio

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

- 57. Economic Development (Appropriate funding to approve Economic Department Budget: \$3,527,095)***
- 58. Emergency Telephone System (Appropriate funding to approve Emergency Telephone System Budget: \$6,405,101)***
- 59. Fire Services (Appropriate funding to approve Fire Services Budget: \$31,067,584)***
- 60. Hospitality Tax (Appropriate funding to approve Hospitality Tax Budget: \$8,986,312)***
- 61. Accommodations Tax (Appropriate funding to approve Accommodations Tax Budget: \$425,000)***
- 62. Transportation Tax (Appropriate funding to approve Transportation Tax Budget: \$80,000,000)-***
- 63. Neighborhood Redevelopment (Appropriate funding to approve Neighborhood Redevelopment Budget: \$909,330) -***
- 64. Public Defender (Appropriate funding to approve Public Defender Budget: \$5,426,423)***
- 65. Title IVD- Sheriff's Fund (Appropriate funding to approve Title IVD-Sheriff's Fund Budget: \$55,563)***
- 66. School Resource Officers (Appropriate funding to approve School Resource Officers Budget: \$6,957,345)***
- 67. Victim's Assistance (Appropriate funding to approve Victim's Assistance Budget: \$1,276,505)***

- 68. ***Tourism Development (Appropriate funding to approve Tourism Development Budget: \$1,253,120)***
- 69. ***Temporary Alcohol Permits (Appropriate funding to approve Temporary Alcohol Budget: \$172,168)***
- 70. ***Stormwater Management (Appropriate funding to approve Stormwater Management Budget: \$3,732,147)***
- 71. ***Conservation Commission (Appropriate funding to approve Conservation Commission Budget: \$1,139,178)***
- 72. ***Road Maintenance (Appropriate funding to approve Road Maintenance Budget: \$8,139,572)***
- 73. ***Stormwater Management (Approve funding the Congaree River Keeper for FY23: \$20,000)***
- 74. ***Temporary Alcohol Permits (Approve funding the River Alliance for FY23: \$53,000)*** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve Items 57-74.

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

 Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

 The vote in favor was unanimous.

DEBT SERVICE

- 75. ***General Obligation Debt Service (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$20,208,361)***
- 76. ***Fire Bond Debt Service (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$545,000)***
- 77. ***Hospitality Refund 2013A B/S [Special Assessment] (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$1,487,750)***
- 78. ***RFC-IP Revenue Bond 2019 (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$1,604,144)***
- 79. ***School District I Debt Service (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$61,071,918)***
- 80. ***School District II Debt Service (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$64,215,424)***
- 81. ***Recreation Commission (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$3,769,189)***
- 82. ***Riverbanks Zoo & Garden (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$2,556,463)***
- 83. ***East Richland Public Service Dist. [Sewer] (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$1,438,561)***
- 84. ***Transportation Bonds (Appropriate funding to fund debt service: \$14,433,250)*** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve Items 75-84.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

87. Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Approve funding the Keep the Midlands Beautiful for FY23: \$42,900)

88. Richland County Utilities (Appropriate funding to approve Richland County Utilities Budget: \$13,820,000)

89. Hamilton-Owens Airport Operating (Appropriate funding to approve Airport Budget: \$581,724) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve Items 85-89.

Ms. Newton requested to remove Item 85.

Mr. Malinowski stated the amount before for Item 86 is \$41,542,159, but in the budget book it was \$38,529,250. He inquired about the difference in amounts.

Mr. Deshpande responded the funding amount for Item 86 is contingent upon the new rate schedule being approved in Item 85.

Mr. Malinowski noted he did not see the \$42,900 for Keep the Midlands Beautiful listed in the budget book.

Mr. Deshpande responded the expenditures are summarized, so you will not see the line item.

Mr. O. Walker offered a friendly amendment to approve Items 87-89.

Ms. McBride accepted the amendment.

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

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

85. Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Approve Proposed Increase in the FY23 Rate Schedule as presented by the Department in the Council Budget Work Session on May 5, 2022: N/A) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve this item.

Ms. Newton inquired what the new rates will be for the residents.

Mr. Deshpande responded the curbside rate will increase from \$26.98 to \$29.21, backyard customers' rates will decrease by \$0.01, and the landfill millage will increase from 3.40 mills to 3.59 mills to support County collection efforts. The approximate change will be \$0.76 annually.

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

Opposed: Malinowski and Newton

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

86. *Solid Waste Enterprise Fund (Appropriate funding to approve Solid Waste Budget: \$41,542,159)* – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve this item.

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

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Pugh and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to adjourn.

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

Not Present: Pugh

The vote in favor was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:12 PM.