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TOMMY DUNN: At this time I’d like to call the September 3rd part of our council meeting where we do resolutions to order. Like to welcome everyone here. And thank you for coming out tonight.

First order of business is Resolution R2019-035, Councilman Craig Wooten. Craig.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THIS IS A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE AND HONOR ANDERSON PREGNANCY CARE FOR ITS EXCEPTIONAL EFFORTS TO PROMOTE THE SANCTITY OF LIFE THROUGHOUT ANDERSON COUNTY BY PROVIDING YOUNG WOMEN WITH POSITIVE, LIFE-AFFIRMING ALTERNATIVES TO ABORTION.

WHEREAS, Anderson Pregnancy Care, formerly known as Anderson Crisis Pregnancy Center, is "a Christ-centered nonprofit organization committed to providing assistance to women who believe themselves to be facing an untimely pregnancy, exists to minister to women and their families with the love and compassion of Jesus Christ by providing positive life-affirming alternatives to abortion, believing that life of the pre-born is precious as is the life of the mother;" and

WHEREAS, Anderson Pregnancy Care's volunteers and staff daily provide young women with free services including, but not limited to, pregnancy tests, information about abortion alternatives, abstinence counseling, post-abortion counseling and support group for women who have had abortions, and a points program that incentivizes healthy practices and supplies clothing, diapers, formula, and furnishings for mothers and babies through the baby's first eighteen months of life; and

WHEREAS, Anderson Pregnancy Care significantly expanded its capacity to serve young women in a recent expansion that more than doubles its programming space, providing three private rooms for counselors to meet with clients, a private room equipped with an ultrasound machine, a large classroom area, and a baby and toddler playroom.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, in meeting duly assembled this 3rd day of September 2019, to take effect and be in force immediately upon enactment, that the Anderson County Council expresses its gratitude to Anderson Pregnancy Care for its life-saving work and recognizes the organization's reputation as a model in South Carolina and beyond for communities that seek, through practical assistance, to protect the sanctity of human life and provide a sanctuary for unborn children and their mothers.

I put that in the form of a motion.

TOMMY DUNN: Have a motion Mr. Wooten and
second by Ms. Wilson. Are there any discussion? I want to appreciate Mr. Wooten for doing this and for all the association does. Just some great work. And I know you have supported them and been on council. Appreciate it. If no more discussion, all in favor of the motion show of hands. All opposed like sign. Show the motion carries with Ms. Floyd being absent at this time. Mr. Wooten, do you have any?

CRAIG WOOTEN: Yes. If everybody would come forward, we’d like to all take a picture together and recognize who’s in attendance.

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION

CRAIG WOOTEN: I think from my standpoint I can’t say enough. I met with these folks years ago and it was a small meeting in a house. And they said they had this big vision and, you know, a lot of people talk about stuff like that, but they saw it all the way through. They’ve opened up a wonderful center that serves everybody in the county. It doesn’t matter who you are. And I just want to thank you for what you’ve done and your leadership and the board’s leadership. I feel very confident for years to come there’s going to be bigger and better things coming. So thank you so much.

FEMALE: Thank you for your support.

APPLAUSE

TOMMY DUNN: This is going to conclude our part of the meetings. We’ll reconvene back at 6:30 for our regular council meeting.

(SPECIAL PRESENTATION MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:07 P.M.)
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TOMMY DUNN: At this time I’d like to call the September 3rd regular council meeting to order. I’d like to welcome each and everyone here. And thank you for coming tonight. At this time I’d like for us all to rise for the invocation and pledge of allegiance, Councilman Davis, please.

JIMMY DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE BY JIMMY DAVIS

TOMMY DUNN: Moving on to item number 3, approval of the minutes of August 20th. Are there any corrections that need to be made? Ms. Wilson.

CINDY WILSON: On page 8, line 29, Linwood Trail is actually Windward Trail. And that was the only thing I noted. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Anyone else? Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Wilson, do you want to make the motion to accept the minutes with that change?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Second.

TOMMY DUNN: Second by Mr. Wooten. All in favor of the motion show of hands. All opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Moving on now to citizens comments. When Mr. Harmon calls your name, please address the chair. You have three minutes. Items on the agenda only at this time. Please address the chair. Mr. Harmon?

LEON HARMON: Mr. Chairman, first speaker is Rick Freemantle.

THE COURT: Please state your name and district for the record, please.

RICK FREEMANTLE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. My name is Rick Freemantle. I’m from District 7. I’m here to speak tonight about this proposed fee on our vehicles. I understand also that this thing is still a work in progress, so I just want to kick around some things that bother me about it. I understand that this comes about because there’s a shortfall due to the lower tax rate on our vehicles dropping. I believe it was from ten percent down to six percent, which means you guys get less money. I would have thought y’all would have been happy about that, that your constituents finally get a break. Apparently not.

I also understand that you have no consistency in the paving budget so this is another reason for this, so that you can have monies you can count on every year and set your paving accordingly. As I understand it, my years of watching county council, you guys make the budget, you set the priorities, so why hasn’t this been a priority over the last twenty something years in this
My biggest bone of contention with this is for eleven years this county, every other county in this state, has allowed the theft of money owed to this county by the state budget violating their own state laws. In this county alone that represent over twenty-five million dollars since 2008, and yet nobody, either on this council or previous councils, with the exception of Francis Crowder, ever raised a finger or an eyebrow with any attempt whatsoever to fight this illegal theft of money due to our county. I find that very shameful, disgraceful and appalling that you would want twenty-five dollars per vehicle out of my pocket when twenty-five million dollars isn’t enough to motivate you all to stand up in unison with the rest of the counties in this state and fight to get the money that’s due to us. We wouldn’t be in this situation.

Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Next.
LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Ruby Gerisch.

RUBY GERISCH: Ruby Gerisch, District 7.
First of all, I would like to thank the council for the wonderful event we had out at the Civic Center. It was wonderful.

I am a Tea Party republican. Now, as to the auto fee, I would respectfully ask that the council take one more time to look further to see if needed funds could be found that are already in the budget in other areas. With the economy improving by leaps and bounds, we are seeing the growth of the county in a residential business and industry like we’ve never seen. This is certain to grow our tax base. Please do not rush through this.

Although it may be true, it will give the general public the impression that there is a negative reason that this is being done quickly. If you determine there is no other avenue than to implement the road fee, I ask that you consider a twelve to fifteen dollar fee with absolutely no exemptions. Set up a web page exclusively for the fee. I ask that the funds from the fee be kept in a lockbox exclusively for the road repair. No bike trails, no green pond, no private subdivisions that now belong to a developer. No new subdivision roads.

I ask that all districts receive work in their areas. If there is a need for a fee, I ask that everybody benefit from it across the whole county.

Thank you.

LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Guy
Thurman.

GUY THURMAN: District 6, Guy Thurman. Forest Glen Drive. I probably speak for ten to twenty thousand people in this county to silence this issue. The reason I’m here, any time somebody talks about raising what we have to pay to live here, when we see in some cases absolutely no services, some roads that we live on. Forest Glen Drive, you might want to check that. When is the last time you did anything on it? I can’t remember anything, zip, in the last thirty years. But yet you won’t do something, pave something somewhere else, clean out the ditches, ditch maintenance of county roads. It’s pathetic. I’d like to see how in the world you can save money? I want to hear discussion. How can you save money? If you’re interested in it, you could ask me the question. I’m surprised that we don’t have that privilege of answering a question that you would ask.

I think that one thing that you need to do is have some kind of form so that the citizens in this county can do something to help you find ways to save money; not find ways to spend more money. If you save money you might be able to handle some of these situations, like potholes or keeping grass out of the roads or cleaning out ditches. Whatever you’re going to do on maintenance.

I don’t hear anything from you about saving money. Another thing, I don’t even know whether this is proper or not, but years ago this council authorized an eighty thousand dollar budget for a stupid balloon in this county. I don’t even know where it is. Do you know where it is? That’s a question I’d like to know. If somebody wants to tell me, I’d appreciate it. What’s happened to it? Do we have a team that floats that thing? I think it’s pretty good, but I think that you need to be accountable about things like that. I can’t imagine even authorizing that kind of money when you’ve got private industry everywhere doing that kind of stuff, want to float their beer balloon or whatever, RE/MAX balloon. You don’t need something for the county like that. We don’t want that. Thank you very much.

LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Youko Simmons.

YOUKO SIMMONS: Hi, Youko Simmons, District 5. I’m here to discuss about 8(b), about the twenty-five dollar fee. I have some questions and concerns around that. And the reason why I do is because we pay vehicle property tax; right? And if we drive our vehicles on the road, it would make sense that we pay
taxes because we utilize our vehicle on the road. But the thing that I see the most that’s on my vehicle tax is school. And that’s the largest amount of tax that I’m paying as far as on my vehicle, which is a vehicle tax, not a school tax. So I feel that we need to allocate that money, as far as school tax, somewhere else where it properly needs to go. It doesn’t need to go on vehicle taxes, because we don’t use school for our vehicle. We use it for the road. So I come to you asking just to look at that and examine that because I feel like it needs to be -- it’s in the wrong allocated vehicle tax.

And secondly, I see a lot of mopeds that are on the road. They operate like a vehicle, as well. I see many of them will bypass a stop sign. If I’m a vehicle and that moped -- I’m stopped and that moped is running through the stop sign, I’m liable to hit him or her who’s riding that moped. So I feel that as we are -- we have people who drive mopeds on the road need to pay taxes, as well. They need to pay insurance, as well, even if they have a permit. Because I have noticed that some feel that even if they’re highly intoxicated it’s okay to drive a moped. And it really is not okay to drive a moped while you’re under the influence. So I think as far as there’s an area for opportunity with our mopeds to say, hey, look, first you need to be permitted; secondly you need to be insured. Because if I -- God forbid if I hit a person on a moped, I don’t want just my insurance to be hit, but his or her insurance need to be hit, as well. So that’s an area that I feel needs to be looked into.

And that’s all I have for today. So thank you.

LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Dan Harvell.

DAN HARVELL: Hello, everyone. Thank you for your service. We appreciate you giving of your time to do this. I know you don’t get paid quite enough for all the hassle you go through to be up there. But you do ask -- you do kind of ask for it when you ask for the voters’ approval to put you in office.

I’m concerned -- oh, Dan Harvell, District 3. I’m concerned about another tax increase. I know you wish to couch this as a fee, but we know there’s really no difference in fees and taxes. If it’s coming out of the citizens’ pockets, it’s basically a tax. I’m really concerned about another increase on the citizens of our county. We’ve just had a new one by Duke Power. We’ve had numerous increases in the municipalities and outside there for the water and the sewer rates. It
costs so much now to have a house and a water bill at
the same time. I’m just amazed at how those rates have
gone up. I know about the mandates that come down that
you say are our government say caused that. But
nonetheless, it’s beginning to squeeze our citizens to
the point to where I think many of them can’t take
anymore.

Now, citizens want to see sufficiency in
government, especially when it comes to road funding
and what it costs to maintain our roads and bridges.
What citizens want to see is we want to know that we’re
getting the most for our money from the people that
work for us. This is not only county, but of course,
state and federal, too. When we go by a work site and
we see five people hanging on a shovel and one person
doing the work, we think about efficiency and that
makes us think twice about increases and fees and taxes
for roads.

Another thing, it seems like the county’s budgets
have increased quite a bit over the years. You know,
I’ve been here for many years and I know where we
started about in 1987 and I know where we are now. Are
we getting any more services for those fees now than we
were then? It’s something to think about. The new
growth and all the development that’s happened brings
in new taxes. So you have more money. So, you know,
from the taxpayers’ standpoint we just want true
accountability. We want to know that we’re getting the
most bang for our buck. We want to know that the money
is being spent in the most efficient manner it can be.
And right now, as a citizen, I can’t be assured of
that. So, please, let’s don’t do this. Let’s tighten
our belts more and look for other ways to serve our
citizens. Thank you very much.

LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Mark
Powell.

TOMMY DUNN: I don’t believe Mr. Powell
is here. Somebody must have signed his name up. Or I
can’t see him. So move on.

LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Elizabeth
Fant.

ELIZABETH FANT: Elizabeth Fant, District 3.
I was digging in some of my papers and I happened to
come across the summary of budget reviews all funds for
2017 to ‘18 and then 2018 to ‘19. I just want to read
you the bottom line on both of those. 2017-18 budget
was a hundred and eighty million dollars total
revenues. Budget for 2018 to 2019 was a hundred and
ninety-four. That’s fourteen million dollars more
revenue in one year. I did not bring the one for the
last year. But fourteen million dollars more revenue in one year. Now, where is that money going?

I’m going to talk this morning not just so much on the road fee, but from an emotional standpoint about roads’ condition. The roads, we know, need fixing. They’re in horrible shape. Those of you that know me know that I had a major car accident, which is the reason I’m in the condition that I’m in. I had an aunt that died from no guardrail where a rain swollen creek took her life. Today I visited somebody who’s in the hospital who had a stroke while she was driving. Thankfully she got somewhere and somebody behind her got her stopped before she ran into something. I used to have to travel a lot at night. One time I came on I-85 when they were doing a lot of construction, two o’clock in the morning, a car where they had done construction, didn’t have the change labeled correctly and I came up on a vehicle that had hydroplaned and was set up in the middle of the air. And I know those people both who were in there got broken necks. It happened right before I got there. Another night as I was traveling in the middle of the road on I-85 I come over a hill and there’s a vehicle right in front of me with all four doors open.

And that’s not a road issue itself, but what I’m trying to say is there are road issues everywhere. We don’t do due diligence in the roads that we make. It is not enough to slap some asphalt and say we have fixed the roads. South Carolina is as stingy as they can be with asphalt. On intersections we don’t do our pipes long enough so we can do road -- where we can put enough road there where somebody doesn’t have to go off into the ditch in order to make a curve. It’s our road construction and it’s our road composition. Evidently the materials that we’re using are worthless. If you have to go behind every three to five years to fix a road, you’re not doing due diligence. So it’s not enough to raise this money. I’m going to talk more on that on the end. It’s the quality of what we do.

LEON HARMON: Time, Mr. Chairman.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Harmon.

Next.

LEON HARMON: No one else is signed up.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Harmon.

Moving on to item number 5, discussion on Project MCPEND, Ms. Floyd. Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: Thank you. I would like to talk to you tonight about something that’s close and near and dear to my heart. I guess it can go along with the car taxes. But I have been worried about this
thing. It’s just -- you need to know about it so you
can make your own decision about it, as I have made
mine.
Let me read to you what it is first. It’s an
ordinance authorizing pursuant to the titles and the
codes and all the little numbers thereof in Article 7,
Section 13 of the South Carolina Constitution, the
execution and delivery of an infrastructure credit
agreement by and between Anderson County, South
Carolina and Falls at Meehan Apartments, LLC, including
certain related or affiliated entities, formerly
identified by the county as Project MCPEND, to provide
for certain special source revenues or infrastructure.
It comes up for public service tonight.
Now, I know you’re wondering what this is. All
right. It’s an apartment complex to be built in
Pendleton. And it’s to be built, I was told, for the
Arthrex. We have a company in Pendleton that’s coming
or is there or what. But it’s called Arthrex. And
what it is, Arthrex -- they’re looking for places to
have people to come and live there.
Now, in last week’s minutes we talked about this
and there were certain questions that were asked and I
want to tell you about it -- these questions. One
question was will the schools get some funds out of
this? All right. Please know that schools always get
funds. They get most of the fund out of anything
coming to Anderson that’s an industry or a building or
anything. So the schools will get the bulk of the
money out of this thing. Another question was someone
says this apartment complex helps to deal with the
issue of affordable housing. That’s not the truth.
This is not an affordable housing complex. It’s a
high-end ritzy complex that they’re hoping that the
people who get the jobs over at Arthrex will then move
right in the town of Pendleton, that they’ll have some
place to spend all the money that they’re going to get.
So it’s a high apartment complex. We had two people
that believed that it was affordable housing. You can
check last week’s minutes. And it’s not. We were told
that it’s apartments that will certainly be above
standard. They’re not student housing and will be for
folks to have good -- and it will be for folks who have
good quality jobs such as those that will be created at
Arthrex.
Now, it sounds really good. But the thing about it
is, the people who are going to build these apartments
has been given fifty percent off property taxes. Fifty
percent they have been excused. They won’t have to pay
the whole hundred percent for property taxes like most
of us have to do. They have been excused fifty percent
off their property taxes. And it seems that a better
deal could have been made, it seems like a better deal
could have been made so it would not impact us. Maybe
my questions are not the right questions. I’ve had two
or three meetings about this and I’m still
understanding it the same way.

But here we are, we’re talking about charging
everybody twenty-five dollars on a car so we can have
road money. But what about the fifty percent tax
deduction. Anderson County has never subsidized any
county houses before. Why are we subsidizing this one?
Anderson County have never even built a home for low
income people. Why are we building homes for high
income people? I don’t get it. I don’t understand it.
I think that we should be concerned about it. And I
think that we ought to be asking why.

Now, I was told that, well, we did the same thing
for Anderson when Anderson wants to bring this motel
here in town, this new motel, you’ve heard about it,
that we did the same thing, we’ve done the same thing
and now here we are -- we have one small town that owes
us eight hundred thousand dollars. They owe us eight
hundred thousand dollars. That’s gone. We probably
will never see that. And now here we are, we’re going
to give these people, the builders -- I don’t know who
the builders are, but whomever they are, if they don’t
have the money to pay their property taxes, all of
their property taxes, somebody else will. It doesn’t
mean that we have to do this or these poor people won’t
have any place to live if they come to Arthrex. Look
around you now. We have First Quality down there.
They didn’t build any apartments for them. They didn’t
build an apartment for Milligan or Michelin. These
people live all around us, some of them in Greenville,
some of them in Florida -- I mean Georgia, some of them
down below Laurens. But yet they’re doing all right.
But no, for Arthrex in Pendleton, we are going to give
the builders of the high-end, high class apartments a
fifty, fifty percent property tax reduction.

And now we’re going to ask you to come up with some
money for the roads fee. Most of everything we get in
this county, we go to the schools first. It goes to
the schools first. Maybe we need to go back and re-
evaluate the money that is spent in the school area
because we can. We tried it once before. We can.

But folks, my only concern is this. I pay taxes,
too. I pay taxes, too. And is it right -- do you
think it’s right that we give these people fifty
percent off of their -- what is it? -- property taxes
so they can build a high-end apartment so that Arthrex
will pay these people big money so they can live in a
really, really, really nice apartment? That’s all I
have.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Ms. Floyd.

Moving on to item number 6(a), ordinance third
reading, be 2019-036, it’s an ordinance authorizing
pursuant to Title 4 of the Code of Laws of South
Carolina 1976, as amended, including sections 4-1-170,
4-1-175 and 4-29-68 thereof, and Article VIII, Section
13 of the South Carolina Constitution the execution and
delivery of an infrastructure credit agreement, by and
between Anderson County, South Carolina and Falls At
Meehan Apartments, LLC, including certain related or
affiliated entities, formerly identified by the county
as Project MCPEND, to provide for certain special
source revenue or infrastructure credits.

This will be a public hearing. Anyone wishing to
speak to this matter, please step forward and state
your name, district, address the chair. Anyone at all?

RICK FREEMANTLE: Good evening, Mr. Chair,
Rick Freemantle, District 7. First, I would like to
commend the council lady from District 2. Spoken like
a true conservative. I have a question. I’ve been in
this county over twenty-five years. Where’s my fifty
percent discount? This is just appalling. I come here
to talk about the twenty-five dollar per vehicle fee
and I find out that you guys are giving people cut-rate
taxes if they’ll build houses. Seems to be a lot of
squirrely stuff going on over there in Pendleton. I’ve
heard wind of about a half a million dollar little fund
coming from the state that wasn’t done legally to go to
the fire department. Maybe this is the reason, so
they’ll have more fire department for these apartments
or whatever they’re going to be. But fifty percent tax
reduction on people who are just building homes here in
this county when we have a shortage of available
housing all over this country. There was no reason to
give this discount whatsoever. You could get full tax
value on these properties, no problem at all,
especially if these are going to be high-end jobs.
These people can afford to pay their taxes. What is up
with you folks? Apparently I shouldn’t have taken such
a long hiatus from coming to these meetings. This is
ridiculous. Thank you, District women 2.

STAN WELCH: Stan Welch, District 7 or
maybe 6. I can’t tell exactly. Is it 7? Are you
disowning me? Okay, I was just asking. If I recall
from the original presentation on this project, the
seven acres of land involved currently pays about
twelve thousand dollars in property taxes. Once this development is finished, I believe that amount will increase to over a half million. If you don’t see the value in that, I don’t think anybody can explain it to you. It’s seven acres of scrub land basically. It’s not being used for anything.

Also, the other issue is, if you create eight thousand jobs in ten years like this county has done, you’ve got to give them somewhere to live. They can’t all live in Elberton and drive over here. Thank you very much. And I hope you vote for this.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? Anyone at all?

DAN HARVELL: Dan Harvell, District 3.

There’s hardly anyone in here that has a longer history of fighting property taxes and the unfairness that they bring than me. It goes to back to three years as a citizen lobbyist at the state house because of the punitive, punishing situation that we have ...

TOMMY DUNN: Wait a minute, Mr. Harvell.

We’ve got to get this squared away.

DAN HARVELL: All right.

TOMMY DUNN: I don’t think it was you.

I think it was something in the equipment; I don’t know. Just give it a whirl and we’ll try it again.

DAN HARVELL: Okay. But anyway, many of you know my history on this. And if you give this -- any time you give a fee in lieu of for one thing, somebody else is going to have to make up the difference. I applaud Ms. Floyd for her comments tonight. I appreciate those very much. You’re dead-on. You’re totally right. You know, you have to wonder -- yes, it’s a coup for this company to be coming here. But if they’re coming here, they’re already committed. If they’re already committed, they’re already going to have the employees. They’re already going to have the people here. And the free market will work itself out.

You know, we as conservatives say that we believe in the free market, but sometimes we just kind of get in the way of that. And in doing so, we’re actually costing our own citizens more money than they should be paying. So I would agree with Ms. Floyd and not go for this. Thank you very much.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? Anyone at all?

RUBY GERISCH: I agree that we shouldn’t be giving those kind of tax breaks. People when ---

TOMMY DUNN: I’m sorry. Would you state your name again for the record and your district?
RUBY GERISCH: Ruby Gerisch, District 7.
TOMMY DUNN: Yes, ma’am. Go ahead.
RUBY GERISCH: I agree that we shouldn’t be giving those kind of tax breaks when obviously we don’t even have the money to keep our roads up. I’ve been to the point in my younger days when I -- at one point I had eight dollars to my name and nobody gave me a tax break. I still had to pay my taxes. And maybe we could give a small incentive to business and industry, but fifty percent is way too much. And really, in my opinion, it makes no difference if those breaks are being given on housing for the rich or housing for the poor; it’s still not right.
TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? Anyone at all? Public hearing will be closed. Somebody want to make a motion to put this on the floor for discussion?
CRAIG WOOTEN: So moved.
TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Wooten. Have a second? Second Mr. Sanders. We’ll start off getting some another. I don’t want to start no argument. The thing about it, sometimes we get things and not know our facts. There’s been a bad misunderstanding. I know you understand about the tax breaks, fee in lieu, like that. But this apartment complex ain’t got one iota to do with Arthrex; not nothing. Now somebody might happen to work there and rent this, but this ain’t -- I want that straight for the record and all news media. This has got not one thing to do with Arthrex. Nothing. This was a request by the town of Pendleton, is what started this, about this coming in. Now, we can debate that or not, but it’s like Mr. Welch said, it is revenue more on tax that we wouldn’t have got. But where this come from is the town of Pendleton wanting this revenue. But I’ve said my piece and I’m going to yield the floor.
BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Chairman?
TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Sanders.
BRETT SANDERS: Yes, sir. I understand where a lot of this is coming from, Ms. Floyd’s ideas, other people’s ideas. I reached out to the town of Pendleton and also what hasn’t been brought to the forefront is this development was actually banned, pretty much. This company came in and spent millions and millions of dollars. They have revamped. I rode through there today. I went and looked at the property. There’s a lot going on there. The town of Pendleton, again, has requested this from council. I met with them. They feel this is the right thing to do in order to help the town of Pendleton, help them decrease their millage rate and trying to get their
millage and tax rates down in Pendleton.

Again, developers came in. They have spent millions without any breaks. Again, this is not for Arthrex. This is apartments. And it is requested from the town of Pendleton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. And also I’d like to add, Pendleton can get their tax revenue -- or their revenue up maybe they can get their police force full time and us not having to subsidize it. That’ll be a good point, too.

Mr. Davis.

JIMMY DAVIS: Mr. Nelson? Mr. Nelson, can you remind me and the rest of council what the current tax revenue is on this property?

BURRISS NELSON: It’s -- currently it’s twelve thousand five hundred and twenty-three dollars on a seven acre tract of land.

JIMMY DAVIS: And Mr. Nelson, if we vote to approve this on third reading for the fee in lieu of agreement, what will be the tax revenue on that property then for the county?

BURRISS NELSON: The projected tax rate in 2021, after it’s completed and all the buildings are up, is eight hundred and twenty thousand three hundred and forty-four dollars.

JIMMY DAVIS: So we gain roughly eight hundred thousand dollars with this agreement?

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, sir.

JIMMY DAVIS: Mr. Nelson, does this property we’re talking about have any affiliation at all with Arthrex?

BURRISS NELSON: Absolutely none.

GRACIE FLOYD: Uh-uh (negative).

JIMMY DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Nelson.

BURRISS NELSON: Thank you.

CINDY WILSON: Mr. Chairman, may I?

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Wilson.

CINDY WILSON: I normally have never voted for these type configurations in the past, but when the town of Pendleton requested that we support them in this measure, I gave my vote. And seventy-five percent of the fee in lieu of taxes goes to the schools. The rest of it goes between the town and the county. We don’t get that much, but it was significant for the town of Pendleton. So I will vote for this based on that. If it were out in the county, I probably would not have voted for it without some really good reason. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: I don’t think we would be having this discussion if it was out in the county,
neither.

RAY GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: Ms. Wilson, I’m with you.

I think what our citizens are failing to recognize, you
know, as far as our municipalities, and I actually have
several in my district, you know, we as a county, we’re
here as a resource to our municipalities. When they
come wanting, you know, to promote growth or whatever
they come across the board with, we truly have to take
into consideration what are their needs; are their
needs being met; what are they benefitting from each
individual project. And I mean, looking at those items
and looking at -- I wish, honestly, Pendleton would
have had some representation here tonight as far as
from their council. But I mean when they come to the
county asking us to support this, you can’t help but
think, you know, they’ve done their homework, they
realize that it’s going to cost us $x amount of dollars
to provide protection, whether it’s law enforcement
fire service or whatever, to this new apartment
complex, but yet this is what we’re going to get in
return on the tax revenue. This is what we’re going to
get in return on the tax revenue. This is what our
local businesses are going to get in return from them
-- local people shopping at the local restaurants, to
convenience stores, to just the mom and pop stores.
You know, Pendleton is a small hometown. I’m
comfortable in saying that they’re doing what’s best
for their community. They’ve got to answer to their
community. They came to us wanting us to support that.
And with that being said, I would probably be very
reluctant, which even like Mr. Chairman says, you know,
I don’t even know if we would be having this
conversation if this was county property. But it’s
not. It’s actually something in the town of Pendleton.
It’s something that they’ve requested that we support.
And with that being said, I can’t help but feel led
that we need to support it.

Our council member, one of our fellow co-workers,
has done their homework to ensure it’s best for their
district, ensure that’s what that community wants up
there, and we rely on their recommendation. And with
that being said, I mean to me it’s kind of a -- it’s
really not nothing in question. At the end of the day,
as it was pointed out, we will benefit from it because
that revenue that was twelve thousand dollars is now
going to be eight hundred and something thousand
dollars. Is it going to cost the county more funding
to ensure that they’ve got what they need and their
needs are met? Absolutely. But it’s continuing letting Anderson County grow. Is employees of Arthrex going to be living there? Probably, hopefully. It’s right up the street from them. As far as what type of housing it is, that does not even matter in this conversation. A community has asked us to support them and I feel like we should. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you.
GRACIE FLOYD: Mr. Chair?
TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.
GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. Right before the meeting we received up here newspaper clipping from -- it was about Arthrex in Naples, Florida. In this article it was talking about how Arthrex was going to pull out -- will probably be pulling out of Naples, Florida because people have nowhere to live down there. They don’t have any housing complex down there. So, you know, why were we given this information right before this other thing came. And I want to read something to you.

Mr. Chairman, my apology, one other thing about the affordable housing -- now remember it’s not affordable housing -- I’m sure everybody on council and plus the community has probably seen Arthrex. Part of the reason they’re not developing as much in Naples, I believe it is due to affordable houses for their employees. This here is right near Arthrex and will be a very easy drive for their employees. So I’m sure they’re going to be grateful for this investment, as well. Nobody said that we’re doing this for Arthrex. What you were told was that these high-end dollar homes were being built near Arthrex so the people could live there in Pendleton because Arthrex is going to be there.

Folks, twenty-five percent reduction, thirty percent reduction would have done it. But I still say, I still say, you’re giving fifty percent of the property taxes that we would have gotten away. I still say that. I still say that the eight hundred thousand dollars that Anderson County will not be getting. We will not be getting eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. Burriss, on a monthly basis, except for the first year, the first year Anderson County will get, is it seventy-five thousand?

BURRESS NELSON: Well, the property tax this year is twelve thousand and some change. The development will start, probably get twelve thousand and change next year. The ---

GRACIE FLOYD: And how much will Anderson County get a year?
BURRELL: Out of that?
GRACIE: Uh-huh (affirmative). Each year for property tax we’ll be getting how much?
BURRELL: About, well, let’s see, about three thousand maybe, twenty-five hundred.
GRACIE: Okay. All right. Who will get the bulk of the money from the property taxes that we are going to get?
BURRELL: The town will probably get another fifteen hundred and the schools and fire districts, but the schools will get the majority.
GRACIE: Okay. Let’s start it from the top. Schools will get the top part?
BURRELL: Yes, ma’am.
GRACIE: After that who is it?
BURRELL: Anderson County.
GRACIE: Uh-uh (negative). We were at the bottom, remember?
BURRELL: Well, no, we’ve got three hundred mils at that location, three hundred and twenty-five mils. So total -- we’re at about eighty-five mils.
GRACIE: No, no, no, no, no. Mr. Nelson, you’re going into an area right now that gets all mixed up when you’re talking about it. You’re getting -- if you would just answer the -- on the sheet that you showed me, on the sheet that you showed me ---
BURRELL: Yes, ma’am.
GRACIE: --- who was getting the most money from it?
BURRELL: The school district.
GRACIE: And the next person was?
BURRELL: Town of Pendleton.
GRACIE: Okay. Where was Anderson County on this map?
BURRELL: We would have been last.
GRACIE: Would have been last; okay. Folks, you can do what you want to. You can vote any way you want to. I don’t, I don’t hold it against anybody if you vote your heart. I don’t hold it against against you; okay? If you think we’re getting a whole lot of money out of this, fine. If you think that fifty percent tax dollars is enough for us to get, you vote that way. That’s all I’m saying. But you have a right to know. You have the right to know what’s going on. And that’s all I’m doing. Whether you like what I said or not. I care because I pay taxes, too. Okay? But if you don’t like it, I’m too old to care. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Chairman?
TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: I think when we’re looking at affordable housing, we’ve got to put it in context. Port Royal Naples, Florida, the median home value seven million eight hundred and fifteen thousand three hundred. I’m sure Arthrex needs some affordable housing. And that’s why they’re here in South Carolina and I’m glad they’re in district ---

GRACIE FLOYD: These are not affordable houses. They said -- he said himself these are not --

TOMMY DUNN: I believe Mr. Wooten has asked for the floor. Mr. Wooten.

CRAIG WOOTEN: I just want to ask a couple of questions of Mr. Nelson. I mean to the best of your knowledge and I won’t hold you to anything specific, but does Pickens, Greenville, Abbeville, Oconee, do they do any type of fee in lieu of or incentive packages for people who invest?

BURRISS NELSON: All of them will if they have the opportunity, certainly.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Same thing with -- would you say that’s pretty reasonable to say with Georgia, North Carolina and Tennessee?

BURRISS NELSON: Certainly.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Here’s where I reconcile. I’m with Mr. Harvell on the free market stance and I have a fundamental problem with fee in lieu of taxes because it doesn’t operate the way we want it to. It’s something that we inherited from a long time ago. I think anybody on this council, if we could do it in a different way, we would. The problem with it, and this is where I have to reconcile is, if I don’t make a deal and I say a deal that’s in benefit for the taxpayers of Anderson County, I feel relatively certain one of our neighboring counties or one of our neighboring states will make the deal. And they’ll take people there.

We’re elected to represent Anderson. We’re elected to represent the people.

Now, if the question of whether the tax deduction or increase is worth it or not, that’s something that we have to work with for county economic development. We hire professional economic developers to negotiate on our behalf because we’re part-time council members. That doesn’t mean that we don’t give them scrutiny and that we don’t ever look at what they do and that we don’t hold them accountable. So I look at it in the same way our President is looking at other countries. Is tariffs and subsidies free market? No. Laissez
faire economics. Let’s just let it roll and it’ll work
itself out. But our President said, no, we need to do
some tariffs and subsidies because these other people
aren’t playing fair. Now whether or not you think
Georgia and North Carolina are playing fair or not,
they have something that they will use to our
disadvantage. I can’t go back and look at people and
say, I didn’t get you an industry here. I didn’t get
you affordable housing here regardless of the
definition of affordable housing, because I had to
stick so hard to a principal that I let your neighbor
benefit.

Now, that doesn’t give me the leeway to just carte
blanche do whatever I want to, but I have to look at
how it benefits the people here that we’re elected to
represent. I’m not trying to oversimplify it, but
twelve thousand is what we get now. If we make this
deal, we get eight hundred thousand. I would like to
get 1.6 million. And if Mr. Nelson says we can go get
1.6 million, let’s go do it. But if he’s saying this
is the best I think we can get, I don’t want to lose
that eight hundred thousand to Pickens because I bet
Clemson City Council or Pickens City County, I know
some of those guys, will make the deal. So that’s how
I reconcile. What I don’t like is a system that
hopefully one day is out of our hands and be changed so
we can make conservative judgment calls on it. But
until then we have to weigh the costs and weigh the
benefit and make a decision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.


CINDY WILSON: By my calculations the
school district will get over six hundred thousand once
this facility is in operation. This -- well, previous
council sent two separate resolutions to our general
assembly requesting, respectfully, that we change our
industrial tax ratios; ten and a half percent, the
highest in the United States. Across the river in
Georgia, they can make zero taxes, which even our fee
in lieu of taxes, which is reduced. And all that does
go back to when Michelin first was established here in
the county. Our General Assembly has failed to address
our 1895 Constitution where it’s ten and a half percent
industrial, six percent commercial for rental or
commercial, four percent homes. We do have homestead
exemptions which do help those of us who are over
sixty-five.

Again, the town requested our support for this, so
I will vote for it this time. But perhaps it’s time to
send that resolution back to the General Assembly and
respectfully request that we have a different tool set
in the bag because, I agree, this is so convoluted and it does seem to be unfair a lot of the time. And frankly, and you can ask our Mr. Maybank, he says if we do that it’ll put the lawyers out of work. Mr. Nelson was in that meeting when we had that discussion. But anyway, there are a lot of complications in these agreements. And I try to read through each of them. And Mr. Nelson knows, he gets phone calls from me because a lot of the lawyers change the wording and you have to read through several times to understand exactly what’s going on. And that is ridiculous. They get paid by the hour and we only get paid by the year. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. If no one else, call for the vote. All in favor of the motion show of hands. All opposed. Show the motion carries, Mr. Davis, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Wooten, Ms. Wilson in favor. Ms. Floyd opposes.

TOMMY DUNN: Moving on to item number 6(b), 2019-037, an ordinance to amend an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial business park, 2010 park, of Anderson and Greenville Counties so as to enlarge the park to include Project MCPEND.

This will be a public hearing. Anyone wishing to speak to this step forward, state your name and district for the record and address the chair, please. Public hearing. Anyone at all? Seeing and hearing none, public hearing will be closed. Do we have a motion to put this on the floor?

JIMMY DAVIS: So moved.

TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Davis; second Mr. Graham. Any discussion?

GRACIE FLOYD: Yes.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: All right. This one got me, too. I asked -- this is an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial and business park of Anderson and Greenville Counties so as to enlarge the park. And it has Project MCPEND. So I asked a question, is this apartment complex going into the department of joint county industrial park for Greenville and Anderson? And I asked that question of Mr. Burriss. Mr. Burriss, would you please explain to them what your answer was to me?

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, ma’am. It would ---

GRACIE FLOYD: I didn’t understand this part of it.

BURRISS NELSON: It would go into the multi-county park agreement. That’s the platform or method of fee in lieu of taxes that allows commercial
properties to receive a property tax discount.

GRACIE FLOYD: In other words, the
apartment complex won’t be going into the industrial
dark? That’s not the apartment complex. That’s just
where we’re getting the credit from?

BURRISS NELSON: Well, the actual complete
title of the legislation is multi-county park -- let’s
see -- multi-county industrial and business park. And
it includes -- when you say business, that includes
commercial entities. A rent by the year, by the month
or whatever, apartment complex certainly falls under
the commercial definition and is allowed under state
law.

We have protocols in the county that we developed
fifteen, sixteen, seventeen years ago when we had a
huge commercial project that looked -- in a part of the
county. And we set some limits of minimum capital
investment. Council probably doesn’t even know that we
operate in our office on these protocols. But it’s got
to be somewhere twenty million or greater on a
commercial project, whereas an industrial project
qualifies it to a half million. And so council has
repeatedly said that residential property in the
county, whether it was rental property or residential
housing at four percent or commercial property, that
that was not a subject or an opportunity for fee and
for discounted property tax. And we followed that
protocol for, I don’t know, Mr. Burns, for thirty years
that I’ve been in this business. And of course, Mr.
Burns hired me thirty years ago and he was in it before
that. So we haven’t changed how we approach economic
development as far as residential property unless we
are requested by a city or political subdivision that
obviously needs a taxed income and that revenue to
assist them. It is a -- it just is what it is on that
part. They need the help. Otherwise, we wouldn’t be
involved in this at all.

GRACIE FLOYD: Thank you.

BURRISS NELSON: Thank you.

GRACIE FLOYD: Mr. Burris, I just thought
they needed to understand it and needed to know. Thank
you so much.

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, ma’am.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? All in favor
of the motion show of hands. All opposed like sign.
Show the motion carries with Mr. Davis, Mr. Sanders,
Mr. Dunn, Mr. Graham, Mr. Wooten and Ms. Wilson in
favor. Ms. Floyd opposes.

Moving on to item number 7, second readings. There
are none.
Going on to 8(a), 2019-042, an ordinance to amend an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial and business park, 2010 park, of Anderson County and Greenville County so as to enlarge the park to include certain property of Project Alloy.

Mr. Nelson, do you want to have a little say before we put this on the floor?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Wilson makes a motion to put it on the floor. Have a second? Second Mr. Sanders. Now, Mr. Nelson.

CINDY WILSON: May I very quickly?

TOMMY DUNN: Yes, ma’am.

CINDY WILSON: Conversely, this is a project in Greenville County. Greenville takes ninety-nine percent of the fee in lieu of tax funding. Anderson County gets one percent. The previous one involving the apartment complex in Pendleton, Anderson County, which predominantly the school districts, took ninety-nine percent and Greenville received one percent.

BURRISS NELSON: That’s correct.

CINDY WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: We got anymore discussion?

All in favor of the motion show of hands. All opposed. You opposed Ms. Floyd?

GRACIE FLOYD: Well, no, I’ll vote for it. I was told that it was -- this was a thing for Greenville; not so much for Anderson.

TOMMY DUNN: That’s right, a company in Greenville. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Moving on to item number 8(b), 2019-043, an ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances, Anderson County, South Carolina, Chapter 38, so as to add to Article VI a new division title Road Maintenance Fee. It’s title only. Put this in the form of a motion to put on the floor for discussion. Second?

CINDY WILSON: I’ll second it for discussion sake.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Wilson seconds it.

We’ll start off discussion with just a couple of things. We’ve still got work to do if this even passes, but we’ve got a time thing to try to get if we’re going to do something to make this worthwhile for the first of the year. It doesn’t mean we’ll vote on it next council meeting. I think there’s going to be a few more community meetings. And the council needs to meet -- have a special meeting just for this to discuss it to put the nuts and bolts in it. But I just want to get one notion thing I think was said tonight about
rushing into something. We’ve had almost ten community meetings. We’ve meeting tonight and there’s going to be some more. So there ain’t going to be no rushing into this. Everybody has got a right to come into them meetings and encourage you to come to more if you found some answers come up tonight.

There was one gentleman tied in about (change of audio) balloon was sold over eleven years ago. The majority of this council didn’t buy it. You made the statement about your road not being worked on. Well, that’s what this whole discussion is about, trying to get some funding to work on roads.

Now, we call it a fee because state law says that’s what we’ve got to call it. It’s a tax, no doubt about it. But we have to call it a fee because that’s what state law says it is. And Ms. Simmons back here mentioned a while ago about her cars and about the schools. That’s state law. They dictate what percentage of car fees goes where and all your tax goes where on that. It’s not the county that does that.

Like I said, we need to have a lot more discussion on this. One thing I think we all do agree on, our roads are in bad shape. We would also be in worse shape if we had some hard freezes this past year we haven’t had and whether or not that comes back. If you go out and ride the county and look at our roads, how they’re cracking and what not. I wish you would come to some of the meetings and I hope y’all come some more to see what it is. We’ve got to pay this thing, too.

Our biggest thing on the road fee is if we don’t come up with some kind of funding on the road, and I’m just telling you, millage ain’t it. I’ve been on council almost twelve years, cutting, scraping and trying to do this, that and the other. To make a dent in our roads, we’re behind, that’s not going to be the answer. But if we can’t come up with some kind of fee to do something with roads, we’re going to still be patching potholes. And it’s going to be discussion, things out and come back. But I’ll leave it at that right and go to Mr. Davis.

JIMMY DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to reiterate to anyone here, if you’ve not attended one of our town hall type meetings on this topic, I would urge you to -- I’ll be glad to have more in District 6, and I’m sure any council member up here would be glad to have one or more meetings to discuss this and to get the information, the facts, out there that Ms. Davis has done. You know, this past year was mine and Mr. Sanders’ first budget go-round, and I think we did a really good job as a council to pass a
budget with zero millage increase. Yeah, we have a lot
of people -- more people and industries moving in to
Anderson County, but we also have -- that means
increase in services.

Now, I don’t like paying taxes anymore than anybody
else does. But one of the biggest things that I ran
into as I strove to obtain this -- you know, to win the
election to hold this seat and to represent District 6
was roads. Roads, roads, roads; that’s all I heard
about in Piedmont and Powdersville. That’s what I came
down here to try to figure out, why and what we could
do about improving those roads.

Upon going through countless spread sheets with Ms.
Davis through the budget process, as well as looking
into this road fee, one of the things that we learned
about was when you talk about road fee, you have to
spend it on asphalt and culvert work and bridges and
pipe. It can’t even go to pay the wages of the guy
that’s driving the roller machine or the paving
machine. It has to go to road paving. It goes to
paving the road in front of your house if you live on a
county road.

I have said for quite sometime since we started
this process that I do not believe that millage is the
answer to paving roads because it gets into too big of
a pot of money. It gets into the general fund that can
be moved around to so many different places. And we
just don’t get the bang for our buck. What I like
about a road fee is it’s going to paving. And it’s
reportable and auditable. And the only way that I
would support it, and I think everybody up here in
agreement is that we do report it and we do show you
that we’re auditing, and we do show you the projects
that need to be worked on. The scientific method that
our roads and bridges department goes through I believe
is called Cartograph. And we can tell you in advance
what roads we’re going to hit next. But spending two
million dollars a year, if we’re lucky, to pave roads
in the county that has fifteen hundred and thirty-five
miles of road is absolutely a waste of time almost. At
a cost -- at a rising cost of close to two hundred
thousand dollars a mile to pave a road, that’s just
simple resurfacing.

Some of you may not know this, but I’m an employer.
And one of the biggest challenges that we face in
today’s modern age is to hire good people. Well, these
paving companies, right now there’s over four hundred
paving jobs available. Four hundred paving jobs.
These companies can’t even hire enough people to --
what are they doing? They’re picking and choosing the
jobs. The cost of paving is going up. It’s supply and demand. And so we’ve got more areas to struggle with on paving roads than just trying to figure out how much money we can get. There’s a struggle too trying to find the people to do the work. So the cost of paving is going up. Our roads are continuing to degrade. We’ve got to find a way to put money in there that it can’t be moved anywhere else. It can’t be put under the magic coconut shells and moved around. It’s got to go to paving. And this is the way that we can do it. Do any of us like paying more? No. But we’ve got to do something about our infrastructure on our roads. And I thank you, Mr. Chair.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Anyone else?

Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: I have a question of ---

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Burns? Mr. Burns.

GRACIE FLOYD: Two, three, maybe four years ago we did a special thing where we took money out of the general fund -- we took a million dollars from somewhere and was for road fees or road work. What happened to that money?

RUSTY BURNS: Ms. Floyd, I’m not sure what you’re talking about.

GRACIE FLOYD: Just think about it a little bit. I think Mr. Dunn was the one who made the motion that we take ---

CINDY WILSON: It came out of contingent or fund balance?

GRACIE FLOYD: Wait a minute. --- that we take some money out of the road fund -- I mean out of the fund balance and put it aside for the road stuff. Do you remember that?

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: You remember now?

RUSTY BURNS: I do.

GRACIE FLOYD: So what happened to that money?

RUSTY BURNS: We spent it on paving.

GRACIE FLOYD: All of it is gone?

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: All right.

RUSTY BURNS: We just recently put out a 2.2 million dollar paving contract.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. All right. I will check back. I’ll check back, Mr. Burns, because there is some misinformation out there because I was told that the money hadn’t been touched yet. So I will go back to my person and let’s see what’s going on here.

RUSTY BURNS: Okay.
GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. Good. Thank you.
TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Wilson.
CINDY WILSON: It’s my understanding that those contracts were let, what was it, last spring and now the paving is being done that involved that pot of money. There was no money in this year’s budget for district paving. A lot of my constituents were concerned because they thought the gas tax money was going to provide funding for county roads, and that’s not true. The C-fund money will increase slightly. But still the majority must be spent on state roads. So we’re still in a quandary. Having my form of PTSD from the previous regime, when I saw this in title only I came in prepared to vote against this situation tonight. But I talked with our chairman coming in. I thought we were going to get the rush job like we used to get and not have a full discussion. And from his description, we will be having continued town hall meetings.

My constituents in District 7 had requested a meeting this previous weekend and we’ll set that up soon. But there has to be a meeting with all of our council members and, of course, the public invited, too, to hash out all the pros and cons before a proposed ordinance is even put up for consideration. I still feel like there’s funds in our budget that can be re-prioritized. This year is the first budget I voted approving in I guess about ten, twelve years. GRACIE FLOYD: Twenty.
CINDY WILSON: And that was because we made a lot of adjustments. Mr. Sanders got in, a welcome addition to our council, he reviewed a lot of our permitting costs which I had not looked at since the great depression that we went through. The study came back that all the counties around us were charging a whole lot more, so we’ve increased those fees up to level of the surrounding counties.

Also, the driveway apron budget which is in the roads and bridges budget is about three hundred and seventy-five thousand, I believe, and that funding is now in a situation where developers have to pay for their own aprons instead of the county taxpayers. But if you citizens have a driveway apron that needs to be repaired or one put in for you, that’s still covered. So that allowed the county budget not to increase our levy this year. And that was very, very heartening to know that. There’s still more that needs to be done, but still in all no paving to speak of has been done except in this year’s budget between C-fund money and the money that we put forward in last year’s budget.
that’s now being paved. From 2003 until most of this
council was seated in 2009, there had been no paving in
Anderson County. Our funds were being used for, shall
I say, wine, women and song, by the previous
administrator. The funding -- this county got fleeced
out of about a quarter of a billion dollars from deals
that were done. And you can do the math in your own
mind and know where this came from. Our landfill was
given away for two million dollars; no public
competitive bidding. Mr. Daniel, who did the forensic
audit on what could be found of the contract -- we
still don’t have a completed, executed contract -- it
was kicking off, according to public documentation ten
to thirteen million a year for the group that bought
it. The Civic Center property was given away, same
thing, no public competitive bidding, and sold for like
three hundred and sixty-five thousand. It was worth
about four million. Those people flipped it three
months later for three and a half million.
Y’all it’s hard to overcome that kind of tyranny
that we have had to work through. But the good thing
is, our county, in spite of that baggage and the
recession, we came out, according to the Wall Street
Journal, one of the top ten counties in the nation for
economic development. That can only be attributed to
the good citizens of this county and the county staff
and the county council working so hard together with
industries and learning institutions to turn this ship
around.
So, no, we’re not perfect yet, but we’ve surely
come a long ways and we still have a ways to go. But I
will never vote for anything that I don’t feel like we
have our county citizens and all of us pulling together
and in agreement on. I will vote for this in title
only tonight, but there will be lots more coming. And
we do desperately want your input and your
participation with us. Thank you.
TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Ms. Wilson.
Anyone else? Mr. Graham and then go to you, Ms. Floyd.
Mr. Graham.
RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Just a couple of things. I definitely want to commend
each council member for all the district meetings that
we’ve had concerning this. Since I’ve been on council,
this has probably been one of the most widely spoken-
about topics that we’ve had. And in doing so, it’s
also been the most engaging as far as with our
citizens. I’ll be honest with you. I still have
questions. People in my district still has multiple
questions concerning this. One thing that I have
learned through this process is I think every one that
I’ve spoken with agrees; we have issues with our roads.
The question is how do we fix them? How do we cover
that cost?
   So, you know, with that being said, we definitely
have a lot of ways to go on this. I am willing to
support this tonight. My only thing -- request to my
fellow council members would be in between readings of
two and three, the second and third readings is that we
have enough time to get back out in our district.
During these meetings that we’ve had, we have shared so
much information. We have gotten so much information.
We have got so much -- many comments from citizens,
anywhere from just your average Joe, your local farmer,
to you know, people that’s been in business their
entire lives, local businesses, corporate businesses.
I mean we have talked to all levels of education.
Everybody has some input. A lot of great ideas have
been shared.
   Doing this as title only, this is nothing more than
a process for us to get it started. I don’t think no
council member up here is willing to pass this as far
as the final reading in title only. We can’t do that.
So there’s a lot of information that we’ve got to
still, just among ourselves, talk it out. I look
forward to meeting on that second reading and
determine, you know, what is the final suggestion as
far as to moving forward with. What are we going to do
as far as allowing some breaks on some individuals,
some we’re not. What is the answer there? There’s a
lot of questions unanswered for us to move forward and
say, well, this is the third reading, guys, let’s vote
on it. I think we’re a ways from that. But I think
we’re strongly working hard on getting toward that
point. At that point, I mean I hope each and every one
is going to vote at the end of the day what’s best for
our district. We all realize we’ve got issues with our
roads. We’ve go to make a stand and determine what’s
our best option for Anderson County. Not for myself,
not for individuals that’s in my district, but the
entire Anderson County, our entire districts.
   We’ve got a lot of information that we’ve still got
to gather. I’m definitely planning on still having
meetings in District 3 as we kind of, I guess, solidify
some of these questions that’s really unanswered right
now. You know, what are some of the things that we’re
going to do? What’s going to be included on this? And
in doing so, I want to go back and share it with my
citizens. That’s what they’ve all asked for; you know,
what are we going to support, what are we moving
forward with?

Again, everybody realizes we’ve got issues with our roads. Everybody realizes we’ve got to take a stand and do something about it. But we have not nailed that final thing as far as this is the correct-all, this is what we need to lean toward, this is what we need to move forward with. We’ve still working at it. Again, I mean I commend our council members. Each and every one of us, I guarantee you, when it comes to this road topic there’s things that every one of us agrees on and there’s things that there’s probably only one or two that agrees on. But we’re going to have to somehow come together and determine what’s best for Anderson County and what do we need to move forward on? Do we need to scrap this and go to something else? I don’t know. If we do scrap it and go to something else, we’d better be willing to pick something else up. Because we can’t just keep punching this ball down the road and hoping the state is going to come in and fix our roads or Joe Blow down the street is going to come in and give us a lot of money to fix our roads. That’s not going to happen. We’re not going to save this kind of money in a budget. We’re not going to raise this type of millage in a budget. So again, we’ve got to somehow figure out what is the answer, how do we move forward and make the best decision? I’m looking forward to that. I mean it’s probably one of the toughest decisions that we’ve came up with as far as since I’ve been on council. But we’ve got to make that decision.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I just hope that between the second and third reading that we will allow ourselves time to get back in our community. But again, I appreciate what everybody has done on this. I know it’s been a lot of late nights at community meetings. Look forward to hopefully coming up with a decision on what’s best.

TOMMY DUNN: Along those lines, not only before second reading we’re going to have -- council is going to have workshop, not to vote on nothing, but to put the nuts and bolts together on something.

Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. Thank you. The only thing I wanted to say was that District 2 have not had a community -- full community meeting. We have had community meetings of spot in the district and we have had community meetings with all the leaders. So please look out for District 2's community meeting.

Now, I understand that some of the community meetings were well attended. Some of them were not.
So I don’t know how well we’re getting the news out, but I didn’t -- I was hoping that they would wait until we had all of the meetings done before they brought it -- because it’s not ready to be voted for yet. Okay. And I think our biggest -- the biggest thing we’ve done this year is stuff that was -- really people were talking about was the budget this year. Uh-huh (affirmative). We’ve still proud of what happened to the budget, and they were talking about it. And I thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Ms. Floyd.

Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that -- and commend all the council members, the community meetings we had. Not only have I attended the ones in my district. I’ve went to everyone’s meetings. I think I missed one. I was out of town. I understand some of the comments looking in the budget. I think that needs to continue. But also I would love to see, and it has been discussed but nothing’s in concrete, a four-year sunset clause. And if people look at it from an investment point of view, say you have four cars, you’re talking twenty-seven cents a day to get sixteen million dollars worth of paving over four years. And we’re talking paving outside your window, as Councilman Davis said. I think I heard someone mention about the state. I’ve reached out to not only my state representative but state representatives in every district and asked for help. It’s a problem that’s going to have to be addressed. It is a problem that everything else is status quo.

We’re working, we’re looking, we’re trying. I think our budget this past year is a fine example of thinking outside the box, looking for new alternatives, looking for new ways. But we’ve got to do something. These roads, they’re rated, and we can keep -- this four million dollars per year will allow us to keep some of these roads that’s in the hundred thousand dollar, a hundred fifty, two hundred thousand mile maintenance versus five hundred thousand. And I would love to see a four-year sunset clause to where we can actually look, come back to the people and say, hey, this is working, this is not working, this needs to be adjusted. But as of right now I’m not ready to vote on a road fee, but I support title only and I look forward to working with council members. I heard a lot of people complain. I think I’ve seen two people that were actually attending the meetings. Check out the county website, attend the meetings. I think the majority of meetings I’ve been to, everyone comes in,
just like I would have, oh, I’m against this tax. And
as things get explained and clarified and a better
understanding of what’s going on at our state levels,
people -- I don’t want to say -- they understand that
there is an issue and we have a serious issue that’s
growing exponentially and it’s going to have to be
addressed. I hope we can all get together and work
something out to help the citizens of Anderson. Thank
you, sir.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Anyone else?

CRAIG WOOTEN: I think from my standpoint,
you know, just bringing commentary on this, I think so
much of life as I get older is timing. I joke
sometimes if I had proposed to my wife a month earlier
or a month later she would probably say no. But I
captured her at the right time. That’s what gives me
reservations about this is because I represent a lot of
the city and, you know, within this time frame we have
been hit with an increased Duke Energy; we have been
hit with increased sewer rates, increased water rates,
increased sales tax. And so in saying that, it’s not
lost on me that there’s a cumulative effect no matter
what government entity it comes from. And that should
definitely be recognized in a citizen, but using the
same determination of timing, with every passing second
or minute, day, year, our roads get worse. And we will
have to engage on them at some point. And at every
juncture that you engage that’s not today then the cost
rises exponentially and you’re playing a game of sort
of cake walk or hot potato.

And so I don’t think that we can ignore the problem
and not continue the debate on it. I would say from
the state’s perspective, I understand what some citizen
said earlier, I don’t understand all the nuances of
what’s available to us. I know we are constantly
advocating for, you know, issues here on the ground and
we’re communicating to the state. But I also realize
that the state is allocating scarce resources among
competing ends and they have things that they have to
make decisions on that are outside of our purview. So
any way that we can continue that conversation, I mean,
I think that is, bar none, something that would be good
for us. And having said that, I guess we have to
acknowledge that there is a road problem. But, you
know, in doing so we also have to acknowledge all the
other factors that are in place.

So I do commend my fellow council members. I don’t
think any issue has been talked about more or more in
depth with citizens than this issue has and the
willingness to get feedback across district lines is
what we’re elected to do, is listen to the people. So
I appreciate the time.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. All in favor of
the motion show of hands. All opposed. In favor Mr.
Davis, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Graham, Ms. Wilson.
Opposed? Did I call for opposed? You oppose? Craig,
you oppose? Show Ms. Floyd and Mr. Wooten opposed.

Moving on to item number (c), be 8(c), 2019-044, an
ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a
fee in lieu of tax and incentive agreement by and
between Anderson County, South Carolina and a company
identified for the time being as Project Augustus, with
respect to certain economic development property to be
located at one or more locations in the county, whereby
such property will be subject to certain payments in
lieu of taxes, Project Augustus.

Do we have a motion to put this on the floor?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.

TOMMY DUNN: Motion Ms. Wilson. Do we
have a second? Second Mr. Graham. Mr. Nelson, do you
want to ---

BURRISS NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
members of council, this again is much like the project
we had several months ago. A development company has
come to Anderson. They’ve bought land. They’re going
to build with their own money buildings that are for
warehouse or industrial projects, anywhere from a
hundred thousand to two hundred thousand. They’ve
simply asked us to discount the property tax for the
first couple of years to give them a chance to recoup a
little bit of their money in the investment of sewer,
water lines and in paving that they’ll have to do from
state and county roads.

This is the best of all worlds, especially when
you’re using other people’s money for the development
side. It’s a multi-county industrial -- it’s a fee in
lieu of taxes infrastructure credit and it’s eighty-
five percent SSRC for the first five years; thirty-five
percent for the years following. Taxes on the property
that they’re choosing this year is sixty dollars and
five cents. Six zero point zero five. And the 2021
projected taxes, twenty-eight thousand three hundred
and thirty-nine dollars, and that’s just for building
one. And over thirty years property tax, three million
two hundred and eleven dollars -- two hundred and
eleven thousand dollars seven hundred and twenty
dollars.

But anyhow that comes to council as a
recommendation from staff and from the Economic
Development Advisory Board.
TOMMY DUNN: Do we have anymore discussion? Ms. Wilson.

CINDY WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this first reading tonight, but Mr. Nelson is getting me more information. There were a few items that I had some questions about. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

If there’s no objection we’re going to take about a five-minute break.

BROKEN

TOMMY DUNN: ... 2019-045, an ordinance to approve a ground lease by and between Anderson County, South Carolina and Tri-County Technical College for the site at the Anderson Regional Airport for heavy equipment operator training and for a site at the TTI Pearman Dairy Road facility for a lineman training school. And I believe we’ve already had an agreement for them using the place at the airport now for some time. Mr. Burns.

RUSTY BURNS: The place at the airport for some time is an ongoing request. And then on a piece of land that we will not be using, they will conduct a lineman training school on the old TTI site on Highway 28.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: Is this where we were going to put that department?

RUSTY BURNS: This is raw land way over to the side. It does not affect anything that the county is going to do.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. Let me understand now. Let me understand. This is Tri-County Tech?

RUSTY BURNS: Tri-County Tech ---

GRACIE FLOYD: And they’re going to come to the airport first?

RUSTY BURNS: They have been at the airport for some time using land that is on the airport and they use it for heavy equipment training.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. That’s where a couple of years ago we were going to use that for the Caterpillar thing.

RUSTY BURNS: That’s what -- they’re still using it.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. But not for Caterpillar, though, because they didn’t come?

RUSTY BURNS: No, not Caterpillar, but they’re using it for that.

GRACIE FLOYD: But now Tri-County Tech
Wants to go up there where we’re going in the old Ryobi building?

RUSTY BURNS: They want to go on that property on a piece of land. Basically what they’re going to do is they’re going to put up some poles to teach people how to climb poles to be linemen.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. All right. And they could use that up at the Tri-County building -- I mean up there in Pendleton to do it?

RUSTY BURNS: No, ma’am. They requested that they use that site.

GRACIE FLOYD: Are they paying us anything for it?

RUSTY BURNS: No, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: Are we paying them anything?

RUSTY BURNS: No, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: We ought to get something out of it.

RUSTY BURNS: When that building was given to the county, one of the ideas was that we would have training for citizens in Anderson County at that facility.

GRACIE FLOYD: But Ryobi gave us the building; isn’t that correct?

RUSTY BURNS: Ryobi gave us the building. It was purchased using state funds, so it’s our building.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. I’m not -- we’ll talk.

BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Sanders, if Ms. Floyd is through?

GRACIE FLOYD: Yes, I am. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Yeah, Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Burns, we’ve actually negotiated a lease with them on using part of that and that came in under that lease that we did with them.

RUSTY BURNS: That’s originally, and there’s no cost. But as you well know, since you’re chairman of that committee, they’re looking to locate an asphalt lab out at that same facility that serves the whole state of South Carolina and also provides that training. They will be paying market rate on that facility, but that will be inside the building. But we’re talking now if you were looking at the Ryobi building straight, if you look way off to the side on land that is completely worthless, all they want to do is put up some poles to teach people how to climb poles.
BRETT SANDERS: And that was sort of a caveat to the lease that we done -- I thought we said, hey, you’re leasing this, we’ll allow you to use this useless property down here ---

RUSTY BURNS: You’re right; yes, sir.

BRETT SANDERS: --- in the blood plain to do your line training?

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, sir.

BRETT SANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

CINDY WILSON: May I, Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Yes, ma’am, Ms. Wilson.

CINDY WILSON: I would like to see this sketched off on an aerial. But it was interesting, I think earlier last week or maybe this week there was an article in the Wall Street Journal about the shortage of linemen.

RUSTY BURNS: A big shortage.

CINDY WILSON: They’re trying to recruit women now. And on the termination, let’s see, this is a ground lease that runs from 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2024, so it’s like a five-year lease. And we have termination capabilities if we have higher and better uses of those properties.

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

CINDY WILSON: Thank you.

RAY GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: This is nothing more than basically continuing moving forward with a partnership that we’ve had for years.

BRETT SANDERS: Yes, ma’am.

RAY GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: That’s it. Well, something else is we -- correct me if I’m wrong -- but we would not be fortunate enough to have the growth that we currently have with economic development which affects our local sheriff’s department, our fire department, our local communities, our tax base, everything we’re doing, we
would not have the growth with this economic
development without the partnership with Tri-County
Tech stepping up and ensuring these people has the
proper training and everything else. That is our ace
in the hole on the majority of growth that we have.

RUSTY BURNS: They go hand-in-glove with
Tri-County Tech. Ninety percent of the time after
we’ve made initial contact, the next question is, who’s
going to train our workers? Where are they going to
get these skills? Tri-County Tech will go with us to
those meetings, they will set up special training for
training those people. They just had the first class
for Arthrex up at the new training facility up in Sandy
Springs. Those people are already working in that
plant making a product, not for sale, but making the
product, learning how to do the process. So everything
we do, we usually do with Tri-County Tech.

RAY GRAHAM: I just want to commend
Councilman Sanders and the committee for not only
finding a use for land that really had no value to us,
but we are getting a true value on this. Again, we’re
growing our partnership. But definitely a great job to
the committee on what they’ve done with this and look
forward to continued opportunities with Tri-County.

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, sir.

TOMMY DUNN: All in favor of the motion
show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion
carries unanimously.

Moving on to item number 8(c), 2019-046, an
ordinance to approve an amendment to the fee in lieu of
tax agreement and infrastructure finance agreement
between Anderson County, South Carolina and Ortec, Inc.
so as to add the town of Pendleton as a party to the
agreements. Do we have a motion to put this on the
floor?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.

BRETT SANDERS: Second.

TOMMY DUNN: Motion by Ms. Wilson;
second by Mr. Sanders. Mr. Nelson.

BURRISS NELSON: Mr. Chairman, members of
council, thank you for allowing me to present.

This is merely the Ortec project, Projects Smokey
and Rocky, which total over forty million dollars in
capital investment. They’re in the old Westinghouse
Isola building. They bought that building and put the
manufacturing facility in there creating over a hundred
jobs. Payroll, their average pay is twenty-two dollars
an hour. Average annual salary is over four million
dollars. To be able to continue their operation, they
needed additional sewer and water service and they
annexed into the city of Pendleton. And of course, that adds on the Pendleton millage rate to the project. So it increased their millage. This discounts the property tax for that to even that up a little bit so they’re not paying quite as much as they were in the past, would have, if it just stayed in the county. So it’s an opportunity for them to be able to get additional infrastructure and put them together with the town of Pendleton and additionally to assist Pendleton in their tax base.

BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Yes, sir.

BRETT SANDERS: Mr. Nelson, this was actually an old Brownfield site; right?

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, sir.

BRETT SANDERS: So it’s a perfect example of utilizing and making use of a Brownfield site?

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, sir. It has some issues, but they’re working on cleaning it up. I believe they have a BCC.

GRACIE FLOYD: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: Mr. Nelson, Burriss, I have sixty jobs. Did I miswrite it down? You told me they were going to increase it to sixty jobs.

BURRISS NELSON: Well, they had forty that they had from Project Smokey, the original project. That was about a twenty million dollar capital investment. They continued to expand it another twenty million, adding additional employees. They’re over the hundred and five total jobs now.

GRACIE FLOYD: But they got sixty jobs, that’s what it is?

BURRISS NELSON: Originally. That was the original project. There’s two projects. They’ve just kept expanding and growing on the same site.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay.

TOMMY DUNN: Is that it? Keep in mind all we’re doing is just adding Pendleton to this agreement, from my understanding, the town of Pendleton.

BURRISS NELSON: Yes, sir.

TOMMY DUNN: All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Now we’ll be moving on to item number 9(a), 2019-036, a resolution authorizing, under certain conditions, the execution and delivery by Anderson
County, South Carolina of a fee in lieu of tax and incentive agreement with a company identified for the time being as Project Augustus with respect to commercial and/or industrial projects to be located at one or more locations in the county, whereby the project would be subject to payment of certain fees in lieu of taxes and the provision of certain special source revenue credits; and providing for related matters. This, along with the project we just vote on, two or three votes ago. Do we have a motion to move this forward?

JIMMY DAVIS: So moved.
CINDY WILSON: So moved.
TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Davis; second by Ms. Wilson. Mr. Nelson, do you want to comment on this?
BURRISS NELSON: Nothing other than you’re correct, sir, that’s the companion piece to 2019-044 at 8(c), item 8(c). Thank you, sir.
TOMMY DUNN: Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Now moving on to 9(b), 2019-037, a resolution to certify the Old Isola Laminate Systems Property at 500 Westinghouse Drive in Anderson County, South Carolina as an abandoned building site. Do we have a motion to move this forward?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.
TOMMY DUNN: Motion Ms. Wilson. Do we have a second?
CRAIG WOOTEN: Second.
TOMMY DUNN: Second Mr. Wooten. Mr. Nelson, do you want to say anything?
BURRISS NELSON: Mr. Chairman, members of council, thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain. Ortec took the -- has purchased what was in the beginning the Westinghouse facility, later became Isola, then was abandoned and empty for ten or eleven years with nothing there. They bought the building and began some repairs. Because it was an abandoned building, nothing there, they actually have a fully functional and operating business in there, they’re allowed to apply for this abandoned building credit. And it’s a credit against their corporate income tax. By this resolution we merely say that they are a company in good standing, hiring people, making capital investment, and they have certainly paid their property tax. So this is an opportunity for them to get a little bit of additional income in the house. And it’s nothing to do with the county other than we’re just
saying they’re a good company and they’re operating.

TOMMY DUNN: Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

BURRISS NELSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you for your support.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you.

Moving on to item number 10, bid approvals. This will be bid number 20-004, the Chris Taylor Park improvements. This was put in the budget, voted on and passed, and this was put out for bids. Ms. Davis, do you want to add anything to this?

RITA DAVIS: I would like to point out that this is a furtherance of the projects that Mr. Wooten’s Park & Rec Ad Hoc Committee money was set aside, accommodations fee and council voted to do those projects and we’re just.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Do we have a motion to move this forward?

CRAIG WOOTEN: So moved.

TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Wooten. Do we have a second? Second Mr. Sanders. Any discussion?

CRAIG WOOTEN: Just for clarification, this is ATAX money which comes from outside the county in the form of revenue for people staying in hotels. So this is a positive thing that allows us to upgrade our parks for our children and our people to use.

TOMMY DUNN: All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Moving on to item number 11, Capital, this was voter registration and elections. This is -- we’ve all seen this. This is a place to help them store their equipment, get it to site and back to site in secure manner, what needs to be done. Ms. Wilson -- I’m sorry -- Ms. Davis, do you have anything you want to add?

RITA DAVIS: I would just like to say that we’ve put up to two hundred and fifty in contingency just because when the state had advised that we were getting new voting registration equipment, it’s here and so these carts will be able to -- actually it’s taller than me, which isn’t saying much, but you can put the actual apparatus where the ballots go into, this is for security purposes. The voting machines that fit that you walk up and vote on will be in there. All the items that the poll workers will need in their bags will be in this cart. And also there are seven partitions so that you can vote securely will be in there. So we’re asking council for
seventy-nine of these. These are our polling
precincts. So it is in the budget. The Department of
Homeland Security has approved these. I will point out
that the State Election Commission has negotiated and
it’s ten thousand dollars less than what they
originally had advised, print elect, the original quote
and so it’ll be Sole Source to them. And so this will
just ensure that each one of these polling locations
that the items are stored and secured and deployed in
an organized manner so that items aren’t left out
whenever -- because next Mr. Burns has to address how
are we going to get these to the polling locations?
Heretofore, poll workers and poll managers would just
come get their equipment. But these are so large that
this will facilitate the deployment of the necessary
equipment to the polling locations.

TOMMY DUNN: Do we have a motion to move
this forward?

CINDY WILSON: So moved.

TOMMY DUNN: Motion Ms. Wilson. Second
by Mr. Davis. Now discussion?

GRACIE FLOYD: Yes.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: All right. Mr. Burns,
remember that I called you over the weekend and when
you called me back I couldn’t remember.

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: That’s what it was I wanted
to talk to you about.

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: I saw the information when
it came to my house on Friday, but I was astounded by
the prices of them. They’re the most inexpensive
things that we can get?

RUSTY BURNS: Those are the ones that
have been approved by everybody, Homeland Security,
State Election Commission; they did the negotiation on
the purchase price. We budgeted, off the top of my
head, two hundred and twenty-five thousand, I think,
that Rita just stated, and I think we’re coming in
about half of that, Rita?

RITA DAVIS: Yes, sir, less.

RUSTY BURNS: Less than that. And so
this is money that council voted to put in the budget.
It just turns out to be only half as much as we needed.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. All right. So I
guess it turned out -- but gosh, when I saw the prices
of them. We’re getting how many of them?

RITA DAVIS: Seventy-nine.

GRACIE FLOYD: Yes.
RUSTY BURNS: For each polling place.
RITA DAVIS: And they’re huge.
GRACIE FLOYD: Well, we shall see. Thank you.
TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? I just want to point out, somebody made a statement earlier tonight about so-called we save about state mandates. This is another prime example right here; state mandate. It’s greatly needed. It ain’t our people in Anderson County’s fault, but that is a thing. Just keep on and on and on. More to come, we want good, safe, honest elections, and this is going to make it easier on our voter registration people, I think, to keep up with this. And they’ve worked out a good thing to store them and all, but it’s just another one of these things mandated and they don’t send a check with it. It ain’t just something we just make up in our minds.
CINDY WILSON: It’ll be really good to see how that paper ballot prints out. I’d like to see how all that process works. Thank you.
TOMMY DUNN: All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.
Moving on, approval of certification of the 2019 tax levy to county auditor. This is what we do every year. Mr. Hunter has asked for this. Hasn’t changed. Same thing. Be no tax increase. So do we have a motion to move this forward?
JIMMY DAVIS: So moved.
TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Davis; second Mr. Graham. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.
If there’s no objections, and this is in District 1, we’ve got three road, Bronson Ridge, Bronson Road and Greer Farm Lane. Mr. Burns, all of these has been recommended by our road department and met all our standards. Do we have a motion to move all three of these roads into our system?
CRAIG WOOTEN: So moved.
TOMMY DUNN: Motion Mr. Wooten. Do we have a second?
CINDY WILSON: Second.
TOMMY DUNN: Second Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. You approve this, Ms. Floyd?
GRACIE FLOYD: I raised my hand.
TOMMY DUNN: Okay. I’m sorry.
Show the motion carries unanimously.
Now moving on to item number 14, a report from the
RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, on August 30th at the Public Safety Meeting, item number 3 was for radio fees for Belton, Honea Path and Williamston. It really is not a fee. It’s actually basically a request from Williamston, I think was one radio; from Honea Path, I think was four radios, and for Belton, I think was two, if I remember correctly. This is a common practice with Mark Williamson basically renegotiating the contract with Pal 8. Actually this time when we come to council, it comes at no cost to us because he done a great job as far as renegotiating that contract. So basically this is nothing more than a proper procedure to ensure that we give radio communications to go ahead to move forward as far as cutting these radios on for these municipalities. This does come forth in a recommendation from Public Safety. And Mr. Chairman, I’d ask full council for support.

TOMMY DUNN: Doesn’t need a second coming from committee. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Moving on.

RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Next thing on the list was the inmate healthcare services. Major Vaughan, if you could step forward I’m sure you can probably explain some of this a little bit more. As he’s coming forward basically we’re looking at redoing the contractual agreement that provides healthcare to our inmates. And one thing, with our recommendation, that I definitely want to share with full council is the sheriff and his staff has basically been able to come up with the money that this is going to cost through their budget. So with that being said, again this is something that’s needed, something as far as moving the detention facility forward, especially with CJCC as far as providing proper care. This is basically putting us in place to where we need to be as far as the future.

Major Vaughan, if you want to go ahead and explain what you’ve got as far as your bids and what you’re looking at doing with this.

MAJOR VAUGHAN: Absolutely.

TOMMY DUNN: And before he gets started, I think all this is just a question and asking to go negotiate with this company.

MAJOR VAUGHAN: Absolutely. We’re not asking for any contracts. We don’t even have any
contract sitting before us now. As a part of the RFQ that we began back in May, RFQ’s came back that were scored. The company that ranked number one, the one that we’re actually trying to negotiate with now. However, the reason why we’re before council now is because that price tag and what’s (not speaking in mic or mic cutting out) this year is greater. So that was the only thing that we were asking permission to go forward with the number one. If not we have the number two that we can (mic cutting out) if negotiations does not work.

TOMMY DUNN: But y’all feel very strongly this is the way to go and your team scored this, this is the team. And in the long run it’s not going to be much money difference but more of service.

MAJOR VAUGHAN: Absolutely. With the services that this company is trying to provide us, we’re looking basically at a forty-four thousand dollar difference, what they’re providing us and we currently have. It’s not an amount, like Councilman Graham said, that the sheriff’s in full support of going forward with no negotiations. We’re not writing any contract right now. We’ll have to come back before the council just to go forward and have talks.

TOMMY DUNN: This coming from a committee, it doesn’t need a second. Now open the floor for discussion and questions. Mr. Sanders?

BRETT SANDERS: Yeah, with that difference there’s also a lot of intangibles that it’s hard to quantify, too.

MAJOR VAUGHAN: Absolutely. The increased amount of staff that they’re willing -- they’ve done an analysis with the difference in our average daily population from the contract we have now, they’ve actually done an analysis based on four hundred and twelve inmates in our facility. As of our average population this month, we’re at four oh nine. So they’re more in line with that, whereas our contract currently is for three seventy-five. So any inmate that we have in our facility over three seventy-five currently, we have to pay additional charges. Other intangibles that you brought up is CEO actually does the training for their medical staff. Strongly requires, very strong on his -- while we were talking to him -- having our detention staff there, our leaders, our shift supervisors and our booking officers be a part of the training. Also that’s something I can’t quantify because I don’t know the dollar amount that you would put on that. This company also has a ninety-eight percent retention. That’s a good thing.
And with the increase of the staffing that we have there, I don’t know how I could quantify whether additional staffing there is going to allow officers to bring individuals in our facility and not send them out to the ER.

So another big thing is that’s going to increase our overtime. And one thing that they’ve actually listed in their proposal is having psychiatry four hours a week as part of our mental health initiative as far as the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee.

RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Major Vaughan.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else?

CINDY WILSON: May I ask a quick question?

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Wilson.

CINDY WILSON: I know this is a very complicated area to work through. But is it feasible to look at going back to a similar model that we were using before we had an outside carrier come in where we had staff and in-house people to monitor the health out at the jail?

MAJOR VAUGHAN: That was before the position I’m in now. We’ve had a contract with outside independent contracting for medical since 2013. We’re big on doing our due diligence, going through and looking at these contract a little bit more frequently. Since I’ve been involved with the detention center since 2017, I started going down that road and I’ve had a lot of help from our detention staff. So I can’t a hundred percent answer that question (mic cutting out) with respect to the liability. Going back with our own places all the liability back on the county.

CINDY WILSON: Well, it does kind of spread it a little bit with an outside entity. But we’re still in the chain of title, so to speak. They’ll come after us, too, if any mistakes are made.

Thank you.

RAY GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman?

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: Just to kind of help answer some of that. Ms. Wilson some of the biggest things is there’s so many regulations now. And when you look at malpractice and everything else as far as on the doctor’s standpoint. And plus, you know, again the liability that it would put on the county. You know, some things are left best separated. And in having an outside contractor, per se, doing this, in my opinion it takes the ball out of their court as far as saying, well, this inmate needs to go to the hospital or they don’t need to go to the hospital. There’s no rhyme or reason for them to say yes or no. It puts it out into
an outside contractor. That liability in itself is
tremendous. Not saying that our guys would do
something like that, but you can bet your tail they’re
going to -- if something happened, some attorney is
going to step up and say, well, they didn’t send that
individual to the hospital because. And I mean doing a
separate contract, that kind of removes that liability,
as well.

So there’s several different things. I know they
have looked at -- they have been looking at this quite
a bit trying to determine what is the best direction.
It goes back looking at the CJCC, all the work and
effort that Anderson County has put in that. This
literally is following right in suit as far as what the
recommendations for that is. Moving that forward,
advancing to basically reduce recidivism, reduce some
of the issues where patients with some type of mental
health issues as far as coming back and forth in the
hospital -- I mean to the jail. Literally I mean it’s
a revolving door almost. And providing this different
level of care is hopefully going to prepare us to
reduce that, as well, and give us better -- basically
get these patients -- or these inmates back into the
community and be a law abiding citizen, hopefully,
through the proper care.

TOMMY DUNN: Anyone else? All in favor
of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show
the motion carries unanimously.

Thank you, Major.

Moving on now to item number 5, East-West Connector
safety plan.

RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Wooten, would you like to do this?

CRAIG WOOTEN: Sure.

RAY GRAHAM: I know you have spearheaded
this and I think it’s a great plan.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Yes. Last council meeting
I had spoke with Chairman Graham about adding to the
agenda of the Public Safety meeting a safety plan for
the connector because we had talked about from the
money that was coming from the state that was sent to
us, they would expand the connector. And there’s more
and more people walking or riding bikes on it. Fearful
at Ingles on 81; fearful at Applebee’s on Clemson
Boulevard and even at the movie theater there will be a
lot of kids and bikes crossing. That’s really busy
intersections, so we wanted to make sure that we do
that in a safe way. And then also any time you’ve got
a lot of people of all ages you want to make sure that
maybe we could have a blue light stand where, you know,
you get the phone or you hit the emergency button if
you’re having chest pains or if a strange person is
following you or something like that. So these are
pretty inexpensive ways to make it safer. And we
talked with Steve Kelly, the EMS director, about the
easiest way to deploy these things. These will be
things that we’re going to try to do over time as the
budget allows and do it with recommendations of EMS and
police.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Wooten.

RAY GRAHAM: One thing on that, we did
look at some pricing on this and surprisingly it’s
actually a fairly reasonable cost on this. Hopefully
that is something we can move forward with. That was
definitely, again, a great idea Mr. Wooten came up with
on that.

Going on down as far as franchise agreement and
application process. We’re still working through --
we’ve got that in place. As council members know, we
voted on that last year. And we have got one
individual that’s looking at possibly doing an
application and going through the process. So we’re
trying to work out some kinks on that as far as
requirements and what we need to do on that.
Definitely have some more information on that probably
in meetings to come.

Dispatch, Steve has implemented some new SOGs as
far as the EMS dispatch. Basically some of the issues
we’ve had in the past as far as (change of audio)
procedures. We’ve got great dispatchers; great EMS
providers. Basically we just had to get everybody on
the same page. That’s what this amounts to in a
nutshell. Steve has done great as far as implementing
these SOGs, along with staff at dispatch, and Director
Baker. Again, that’s already -- technically has
already been implemented and we’re just sharing an
update on that.

EMS fee schedule. As everyone knows we did not do
an increase as far as on the EMS supplement that the
county does to the providers this year. They basically
came to us wanting us to consider a possible EMS fee
increase. We’ve done that about a little over two
years ago. And basically what that does, in a
nutshell, the county regulates what they can and cannot
charge for a simple trip to the hospital, what it cost
for drugs or what not. With the cost of drugs and
everything else skyrocketing, they’re basically wanting
to come up with a fee. Basically what we’ve done is we
recommended -- kind of left it at the table right now,
but the committee recommended to Steve to go back to
the Chiefs Association to basically, you know, poll the
local counties. Let’s see what they’re doing with the
fees. Let’s see what -- are we in line with it, do we
need to go up, is it something we’re hitting our
taxpayers on? Is it something their insurance is going
to cover? Basically where’s the money being left on
the table? I think every one of the members of Public
Safety, along with Ms. Wilson that was there, our
biggest concern is, is this going to put another burden
on the taxpayers or is this something that the
insurance will cover? So we’re looking into that, as
well, and hopefully we’ll have some more information to
bring back to full council on that.

There’s some discussion on medical control. We’re
probably going to have some changes on that due to Dr.
Stoll was looking at possibly relinquishing that
position due to some obligations he has. With that
being said, we’re probably looking at appointing
another medical control doctor. Naturally that will be
brought before full council for full council’s support
as we move forward with that.

EMD process with new radio system. We’ve kind of
put that back with Steve and Mark Williams as far as --
got some ideas as far as what we can possibly go with.
The biggest thing is making sure it’s going to interact
with the radio equipment and computer system that Mark
and them is discussing possibly going with in the near
future. So again, there’s some more information to be
gained on that.

A lot of information that was shared at this
meeting, we had a lot to go over, but really the ones
that, again, that Public Safety had a vote on and
brought back to full council has already been taken
care of, but I did want to keep everybody informed as
far as where we stand on some of this. Definitely got
a lot going on and I’m sure we’re going to be
discussing it some more at the next few meetings.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TOMMY DUNN: Appreciate you, Chairman
Graham. I’d just like to add one comment. If you
would because it’s very important and this has been
going on way too long, this medical control thing. We
should have something in place on that. Should have
done had something.

RAY GRAHAM: I agree.

TOMMY DUNN: I understand about the
doctor, but we need to move on. I understand -- I
think they’re waiting on a new doctor to come in town
that’s going to be in this. But if it ain’t, we need
to get this one took care of. This affects our
citizens and everybody around. It’s about quality control. And we don’t this study a few years ago. That’s one of the recommendations, we need to get this and improve on this. So we need to make this happen enough to move this on.

RAY GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I agree a hundred percent on that. And we did discuss that. I think our EMS system has made great strides in moving forward. As fellow council members can attest to this, that was one thing that I did say point blank we have failed on. And if it’s okay with council, I will go back to Steve and let him know that we do need to move through this process and try to get something in place. We definitely don’t want to hurry up by no means, but we want to put the right person in the position. But in the same respect, it is a very key part of this process.

TOMMY DUNN: I don’t think we’ll be hearing it after waiting as long as we’ve waited on it.

RAY GRAHAM: I agree.

TOMMY DUNN: I appreciate it.

Now moving on to item number 15, appointments. Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I’d like to put in the form of a motion for Harold D. Durham, Jr. to fill a vacancy on the Land Use and Zoning Board of Appeals.

TOMMY DUNN: Have a motion. Do I have a second? Second Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? I think that’s a fine appointment and will do well. All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

I think Ms. Wilson has got something.

CINDY WILSON: I do. With our disbanding of the Citizen Advisory Zoning Board groups for District 7, I have some wonderful volunteers. Tonight I would like to appoint Ms. Catherine Bucks to the Behavioral Service Board and Ms. Catherine Hamby to the ATAX Board. Their applications are on file from Citizen Advisory ---

TOMMY DUNN: I see them here. We have a motion by Ms. Wilson. Do we have a second? Have a second from Mr. Sanders. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Anyone else have any appointments?

Moving on now, requests by council members. Mr. Davis.

JIMMY DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. From District 6's special projects fund, I would like to
allocate one thousand five hundred dollars to the Wren High Bass Team -- it’s not the Wren High, it’s the Wren Bass Team; middle school is included. And I would also like to allocate one hundred dollars to FAVOR of Anderson. I make that in the form of a motion.

TOMMY DUNN: Have a motion. Do I have a second?

CINDY WILSON: Second.

TOMMY DUNN: Second Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously. Anything else, Mr. Davis?

JIMMY DAVIS: No, sir.

TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: Yes, sir. I’d like to put them all ---

TOMMY DUNN: Go ahead. That’ll be fine.

BRETT SANDERS: --- if I could. First Tee of the Upstate, I’d like to give five hundred; Anderson County Humane Society, three hundred; Faces and Voices of Recovery, two hundred. I’d like to put that in the form of a motion.

TOMMY DUNN: Have a motion by Mr. Sanders. Have a second?

CINDY WILSON: Second.

TOMMY DUNN: Second Ms. Wilson. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously. Anything else, Mr. Sanders?

BRETT SANDERS: No, sir. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: (Mic not on)

TOMMY DUNN: That’s a group; they’ve been around a long time. I think they’re on Whitner Street. They do work for women that’s been battered or abused and other things, a shelter. And I think this request is they requested for a frigidaire. They’re in need of a frigidaire and they’re trying to get money up to get a frigidaire.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay. Mr. Dunn, I don’t know how to do this, but may I suggest that they get in touch with the Frigidaire company?

TOMMY DUNN: They have. They said they quit doing that. They won’t do nothing else, is my understanding.

GRACIE FLOYD: Oh, you’re kidding?

TOMMY DUNN: Yes, ma’am. Anything else?

Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If it’s okay I’ll do all ---
TOMMY DUNN: Yes, sir.

RAY GRAHAM: --- mine together, as well.

Just want to mention one thing before I do this. Anderson Pregnancy Care, I hate I missed the presentation at an earlier meeting. I had a prior engagement I could not get away from. But they definitely do great work. Ms. Audrey Shaw, she is just absolutely -- does wonderful with that program. With that being said, when they actually brought their request forth is when I was at Hilton Head at the conference. I’d like to do twenty-five hundred dollars to Anderson Pregnancy Care. I’d like to do five thousand dollars to City of Belton Parks & Recreational Department; I’d like to do a hundred dollars to Anderson County Humane Society. I bring that in forth of a motion.


Mr. Wooten.

CRAIG WOOTEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I’ll put three together and make a motion to do three hundred dollars for the Humane Society; three hundred dollars for the Lights of Hope; and three hundred dollars for the Faces and Voices of Recovery. I put that in the form of a motion.

TOMMY DUNN: Second Ms. Wilson; motion by Mr. Wooten. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Ms. Wilson?

CINDY WILSON: Thank you. From District 7's recreation fund, may I appropriate three hundred for the Anderson County Humane Society; one hundred for the Lights of Hope; and one hundred dollars for the FAVOR request.

TOMMY DUNN: We have a motion by Ms. Wilson. Have a second? Second Mr. Davis. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.

Mr. Burns.

RUSTY BURNS: Nothing at this time.

TOMMY DUNN: No, hang on just a minute now. Hang on. Look here, ain’t nobody wanting to get out of here no more worser than me and Ms. Floyd, but you’ve just got to settle down here a minute.

It’s my understanding, you correct me if I’m wrong, FAVOR needed eight hundred dollars; is that right?
1 RUSTY BURNS: Correct.
2 TOMMY DUNN: I just want to make sure they get what they need. So I think my calculation is they got seven. From District 5's account, give one hundred to FAVOR, to give them a total of eight hundred dollars; and give three hundred dollars to the Humane Society for the Fur Ball. Put that in the form of a motion.
3 BRETT SANDERS: Second.
4 TOMMY DUNN: Second by Mr. Sanders. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion show of hands. Opposed like sign. Show the motion carries unanimously.
5 Now you can hit it.
6 RUSTY BURNS: My answer still stands.
7 TOMMY DUNN: Now citizens comments.
8 When Mr. Harmon calls your name, please state your name and district for the record. You have three minutes.
9 Address the Chair, please. Mr. Harmon.
10 LEON HARMON: Mr. Chairman, first speaker is Rick Freemantle.
11 RICK FREEMANTLE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. I’m from District 7. Been meaning to get here and comment on the latest happenings with Mr. Preston. There’s two of you on this council I really want to give a special thanks to for sticking to this. I know you guys got a lot of grief from a lot of people. Some of you new folks, if you helped with this my thanks goes out to you also. I know there was a lot of discussion about how much money this was costing the county. Sometimes money doesn’t need to be the issue. And this was a perfect example. The precedence set with this case is going to help people in this state for generations to come. No longer will we have clowns sit in positions where they can have anticipatory breaches of contracts. How I wish I could get away with that. But anyways, I know you guys went through a lot of grief. I know it was a long tough-fought battle. And I really want to commend you for sticking to it and doing the right thing in spite of all the grief you caught. I know I come here and give you guys grief a lot of times. This is one time where you really deserve a huge pat on the back. Thank you.
12 TOMMY DUNN: Mr. Harmon.
13 LEON HARMON: Next speaker signed up is Mark Powell. I don’t believe he’s here tonight.
14 TOMMY DUNN: He left the building.
15 LEON HARMON: Next speaker is Elizabeth Fant.
ELIZABETH FANT: Elizabeth Fant, District 3.

The road thing. I guess I’m leaning towards a road fee because I don’t think that if we do it -- really what I’d like to do is do a one cent sales tax if we thought we really needed the road money, but I don’t want to do that because the sales tax gets collected in Columbia and then they send us what they want to send us basically. If you are aware, the Legislation changed the aid to subdivision formula in May. Did you know that? So they’re not going to give us any more than they want to. Likewise, as somebody pointed out today, I don’t know why it is that the rest of you all won’t sit on them more because you’re citizens just like the rest of us, even if you are a council person, and they shouldn’t be allowed to do that. It’s our money, our tax money, that goes to Columbia. We’re supposed to get a share back. It should be the fair share. I get very upset when I hear that they’re spending forty million for a Carolina Panthers exit ramp. They’re spending -- even on the radio this morning they were talking about how Darlington car thing gets a hundred thousand dollars last year. Talking about the Carolina Law Library, that they’re going to do another one and that’s going to cost three hundred million. And I understand there’s a bonus of about three hundred and fifty million sitting in Columbia and they dang share it with us. It’s our money.

We should be able to find some money out of the general budget -- general fund budget. And I don’t understand, if we’re going to do that, why don’t we just go ahead just like we do for the library and just like we do for Tri-County Tech, we set aside a certain millage every year for roads.

That being said, do you remember when we used to get an inspection sticker on our car. Used to cost about ten bucks. They stopped doing that because all you had to do was find a buddy who would check off the stuff whether you had raw tires or no horn or whatever. I’d like to see, if we go forward with this, that there be a whole lot more discussion. I don’t want to have second reading until you all have had your little budget workshop thing, and you don’t need to do it at twelve o’clock in the middle of the day. You need to do it at night when other people can come like citizens tonight.

Here’s what I suggest. I know I’m probably going to run out of time. If you do a road fee, do a twelve dollar fee per vehicle. That’s twenty-five cents a week per vehicle. If you’ve got four vehicles at home, that’s only forty-eight dollars a year. If you’re
Cromer & Son food thing, you can probably get by with a reasonable amount. These people have got a fleet of vehicles. We do it for two years sunset, not four. Of course it’ll take a year for the money to ---

LEON HARMON: Time, Mr. Chairman.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Harmon.

Next.

LEON HARMON: No one else is signed up.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. We’re going to have comments from council. Mr. Davis.

JIMMY DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just want to say Celebrate Anderson was one of the best times I’ve had in a long time. And I thank all the county staff that worked so hard to put it on. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Mr. Sanders.

BRETT SANDERS: Likewise. I was back out there today. Everything is spotless, looking great. I know everyone worked hard, overtime. It was a spectacular event and I appreciate all the hard work that the county put into it.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Ms. Floyd.

GRACIE FLOYD: Mr. Burns, it’s hurricane season again.

RUSTY BURNS: Yes, ma’am.

GRACIE FLOYD: And as you know, in the past, not eight years is a long time ago but in the last five years, we’ve had a lot of our workers exiting, going down to the coast to work. As you know, I have always been against that because it’s double payment. Now, a lot of you may not have realized this. But every time they went down to the coast to pass out water, they were getting paid from the FEMA people and then they were getting money for their jobs that they left here to go down there.

Now, a lot of these were office workers. Mr. Burns, I don’t mind our people who specialize in this kind of thing going down; EMS, the roads and bridges, the people who cut the trees, the people who suck up the water that they do here for us. I think that they ought to be down there. But Mr. Burns, I don’t think no secretary or no office worker or anybody else should be going down there to get that extra money. I have been against that from the first. All right. And I’m hoping that that’s a practice that we won’t have to be doing any more. You can just leave your job -- walk off your job to go down there to get that money.

Okay. We’re closing Allen Park. That’s one of the parks around the Broadway Lake. Okay. We’re closing it because it wasn’t being used that much. And when it
was being used, it wasn’t being used (not speaking into mic). So this is a park that we’re closing.

If you missed the trip to ITT, you missed it. We had a good time. I have -- my son have told me about a place in Charlotte just like that that he has worked. They have a full cafeteria; they have a full gym; they have -- it’s just a wonderful place. ITT. If you can ever get an invitation up there, please, please go.

Where were you?

CRAIG WOOTEN: My wife informed me I was taking the kids to school that morning.

GRACIE FLOYD: That’s no excuse because you could have dropped them off and come on up.

CRAIG WOOTEN: I don’t know if I could have made it in time.

GRACIE FLOYD: Yeah, he made it. Brett made it; didn’t you?

BRETT SANDERS: No. I was out of town.

GRACIE FLOYD: Okay, yeah. We had a good time. But we need to start going. But you missed those horses, the Clydesdale. Oh, man, they were beautiful. They were just absolutely beautiful. And I can’t think of nothing else better that you had going other than your family. Now I can excuse families for anything; okay?

CRAIG WOOTEN: Okay.

GRACIE FLOYD: But a job and other stuff y’all are doing, you should have been there.

And Mr. Burns, may I suggest something, please? When we are invited to places like that, why don’t we call one or two of our constituents and see if they would like to go just to see the thing because they can help us spread the good news out there; okay? They wouldn’t mind. Three more plates wouldn’t hurt. Mr. Dunn ate heartily. It was just that good in the cafeteria. Anyway, that’s all I had to say. And I thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Mr. Graham.

RAY GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know it’s getting late, but Mr. Burns, if you would, by all means let all of our county employees know that worked so hard on Celebrate Anderson. I know they’re already planning for next year. I mean it’s just a tremendous amount of work that goes into it. Definitely had a great time. As always, I think we top ourselves every year. It’s just a great event. Good for everyone’s families, our employees, our community. Glad Anderson County is able to take part in that. That’s all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Thank you. Mr. Wooten.
CRAIG WOOTEN: Just real quickly, I feel like I don’t get constituent calls for two weeks and then I’ll get six in one day. And when that happens staff has been so helpful in getting back to people in a timely manner with either an answer or help with their problem. I appreciate that.


CINDY WILSON: Well, I heard from a lot of 4-H’ers and pony clubbers and their families, so please pass on to Ms. Adrienne Cole how much they appreciated that ability to get up close with the Clydesdales. And thank y’all for your prayers. I appreciate it. Thank you.

TOMMY DUNN: Yes, ma’am. Just a couple of things. I want the whole council to wish Mr. Harmon a happy birthday. Appreciate all you do and hope you have a good birthday. And I think you had a good surprise, I think Saturday you said your son got to come back, so I know you enjoyed that.

LEON HARMON: I did, Mr. Dunn. He was able -- he and his wife were able to come over from Germany. He has to go back tomorrow. They don’t give him much time off. He flies airplanes in the Air Force. But thank you very much. I appreciate that.

TOMMY DUNN: I also want to thank Mr. Burns, you and your staff, for putting Celebrate Anderson together. And the clean-up, the process it goes through. Y’all don’t realize, this thing don’t just start Labor Day weekend. It starts back with them working, getting money raised. Appreciate all the staff and all the hard work.

Just want to also thank again, Mr. Wooten, for bringing our six o’clock agenda to on the pregnancy thing. Appreciate all you do on that and your leadership on that, Mr. Wooten.

I also want, the last thing, just bring up, I was told today, Anderson County has passed Spartanburg on our median pay. So we’re number two now. And that’s great. Chasing that. That’s only a good thing for Anderson County. That means people’s got good jobs. They’re able to buy things and that’s what it’s all about.

Y’all have a good night.

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:55 P.M.)