

PROPERTY TAX ROLLBACK DISCUSSION,
PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING
DARLINGTON COUNTY COUNCIL
DARLINGTON, SC

SEPTEMBER 21, 2015

A property tax discussion and public hearing and regular meeting of the County Council of Darlington County was held this 21st day of September 2015, at 5 p.m. and 6 p.m., respectively, at the Darlington County Courthouse Annex/EMS Building, 1625 Harry Byrd Highway, Darlington, South Carolina.

PROPERTY TAX ROLLBACK DISCUSSION

NOTICE OF MEETING

In compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the meeting notice, giving the date, time, and place of the meeting was mailed in advance to the local newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board at the entrance to the County Administrator's Office.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT – Property Tax Rollback Discussion

Chairman Bobby Hudson, Vice Chairman Robbin Brock, Chaplain Dannie Douglas, Jr., Mr. David Coker, Mrs. Wilhelmina P. Johnson, and Mr. Robert L. Kilgo, Jr.

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT – Property Tax Rollback Discussion

Mr. Marvin Le Flowers and Ms. Mozella Nicholson.

ALSO PRESENT – Property Tax Rollback Discussion

County Administrator Terence Arrington, Clerk to Council J. JaNet Bishop, Finance Director Sherman Dibble, Tax Assessor Kyle Johnson, Tax Assessor's Office Staff Rhonda Richardson and Kay Jeffords, Treasurer Belinda Copeland, Interim Emergency Medical Services Director Mac McDonald, Auditor Rosa Hudson, South Carolina Department of Revenue Representatives Sanford Houck, Lisa Stokes, and Amelia Ruple, and others.

REPORTERS PRESENT

Mr. Jim Faile of the Messenger, Ms. Samantha Lyles of the News and Press, and a reporter from WBTV 13.

Property Tax Rollback Discussion

Mr. Arrington reported that Council would have a discussion about Darlington County tax rollback, which has been an issue prior to his arrival. South Carolina Department of Revenue Representatives Sanford "Sandy" Houck, Lisa Stokes, and Amelia Ruple would lead the discussion.

Mr. Sanford Houck provided a handout (attached) entitled *Millage Calculation Presentation*. He pointed out that people use the term "rollback." However, there is a term in the Code which calls the rollback "millage" since it does not always end up as a rollback.

He explained that it has been found in numerous cases, in the past, that when the millage is recalculated, instead of rolling back the millage, it actually goes up. Mr. Houck stated that the current statute that limits millage, Section 6-1-320, states that a local governing body (County Council) is the authority to set millage. However, many people think that County Auditors are responsible for setting millage; but they are not. He said there is a court case that states that County Auditors do not have the authority to set millage. They have the authority to set millage for bonded indebtedness, but not for operating purposes. Therefore, County Council is the body responsible for setting the millage.

Mr. Houck explained that Section 6-1-320 talks about the limitations in a normal year and says the governing body may increase the millage rate (in a normal year and every year) by the CPI (consumer price indices) plus the growth of the taxing jurisdiction. Those numbers are published by the Office of Research and Statistics, which once was the State Budget and Control Board and now the Administration Division. These are the two things that Council are allowed to increase prior year's millage for.

In a reassessment year (Darlington County went through reassessment last year), the first thing that should have been done was to calculate the rollback millage. The formula for a rollback millage is prior year taxes levied divided by the new reassessment base after reassessment when the properties have been reappraised and the values have been changed up or down. Mr. Houck added that for the past 35 years, property values almost always increased. Real estate values have almost always gone up until about 2007 through 2009 when the real estate bubble burst. He said they have now noticed, in many places, declining values. That's where the term "rollback" millage came into play. However, many counties have gone through reassessment, the values declined, and after reassessment, the millage figures went up. This was unheard of in South Carolina until about 2007. Therefore, if it happens, it happens. Mr. Houck said the formula is simple. However, coming up with the numbers is somewhat of an issue always. But the numbers can go up or down based upon the new values in the county. He explained that CPI and growth can be added onto the millage from last year or, in a rollback situation, it can be added onto the rollback millage. Council is also allowed to go back three prior years to the one being worked on. If the county could have levied millage in the past, but chose not to, then Council would have the ability to now go back and pick up the millage that was left on the table and use it in the current year that you are setting the millage for. Mr. Houck stated that if Council has the opportunity to go up but does not want to go up, Council would not lose it; it would stay there for three years with the option of going back and picking it up.

Mr. Houck explained that at the end of all the calculation, if you don't have enough millage or think you have the millage that would be sufficient to fund the budgets, then you would have a third option – a two thirds vote of the governing body to suspend the limitation on millage and go up to whatever you need (Section 6-1-320(B)). He pointed out that there are seven factors for increasing the millage. Mr. Houck said you can go beyond the limitation with a two thirds vote of the governing body if (1) you ran a deficit the preceding year; (2) if there was some catastrophic event such as Hurricane Hugo in 1989 and you have a lot of county expenses; (3) compliance with a court order or decree stating that you have to do something, such as the State Supreme Court ordering the county to build a new jail; (4) if a plant in the county representing ten percent of the tax base closes;

(5) compliance with a regulation enacted by federal or state government such as doing something with the courthouse; (6) to purchase undeveloped real property in and around a military base to allow for a buffer between a military base and the normal citizens; or (7) to purchase special capital equipment and make expenditures related to the capital equipment. This would have to be in a county having a population of less than 100,000 and at least 40,000 acres of state forest lands.

Mr. Houck explained that if the tax was levied for items one, two, three, four, or five and you exceeded the limitation with a two-thirds vote, you would have to list the amount of the tax on the citizens' tax bill. The tax bills would have to show the amount of the tax as a separate surcharge. You could not just roll all the millage together. You would have to indicate on the bill, for example, that \$37 was going to support the new jail. This must be on the bill. He also stated that the millage is set for the number of years needed to pay off the jail or to pay off a deficit. Therefore, you would have to be very specific on the tax bill.

Mr. Kilgo asked whether this was a tax that was being paid back by a bond. Mr. Houck said no. He explained that there is no limit on bonded indebtedness. If you have bond payments, the Auditor is responsible for setting enough millage, whatever it is without a limit, for bond payments. The Auditor is responsible for setting this to make the bond payments so that your credit rating will not go down. He indicated that the legislation states that you set bond payments for whatever they need to be. The restrictions do not apply to bonded indebtedness or lease purchase payments for real property. If the county has a reserve fund used for unanticipated needs, you are allowed to replenish that money without being concerned with the limitation discussed earlier. Also, the restrictions do not affect some of the special purpose districts that have been setup in South Carolina. Therefore, if you have special purpose districts, they may be exempt from the limitation, too. They would still be limited under the provision that set them up and there are some restrictions in that section, as well. This would be a special purpose district and not a County Council issue.

Mr. Houck said he speaks with many County Councils, Auditors, Treasurers, and Assessors since all of these individuals play a part in setting the millage; even though the county governing body is the authority to set millage. He stated that the Assessor has the information for real estate and the Auditor has all the information for personal property and receives all the assessments from the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue does all the industrial appraisals and a lot of the business personal property assessments, utilities, railroads, etc. and sends it to the Auditor. Therefore, the Auditor is the gathering place for all your information. He said County Councils rely on the Auditor quit heavily to provide the information when looking at what can be done with less millage.

Mr. Houck said page four of the handout was a checklist or beginning process that every county does. It is a step-by-step analysis of what needs to be done. He explained that you start with the beginning millage from last year in a normal cycle, or if it was a reassessment year, your beginning point would be the rollback millage. You add the allowance for CPI and the allowance for population growth, if any. If either one of those are negative numbers, the legislature recognizes negative population growth. If you had a decline in population of one percent, it states that you do not use negative; you just look at the decline of one percent and consider it a zero. Therefore, you do not lose if you are

losing population or if the CPI was a negative. Item five states that if there is a need for millage for the seven items discussed earlier, it has to be done by a two-thirds vote of the governing body. If the millage was increased for items one through five, then it would have to be listed on the tax bill as a surcharge and the surcharge continues only for the years necessary. The restrictions listed in Section 6-1-320 would not apply to bonded indebtedness, payments for lease purchases, or millage levied to maintain a reserve account. Section 6-1-320 does not amend or repeal the rights of the legislative delegation if they have passed legislation at the State level capping millage on schools. This does not appeal or amend any caps on school millage that may be more restrictive.

~ County Auditor Rosa Hudson arrived at 5:18 p.m. ~

Mr. Houck asked whether Darlington County Council has the authority to approve school district millage. Since the response was no, he confirmed that the school district has the authority to set their own millage. However, they would still be required to follow the same limitations as the county.

Mr. Houck read a statement from the handout regarding rollback millage which stated, *“Rollback millage is calculated by dividing the prior year property taxes levied as adjusted by abatements and additions.”* He explained that if you have your tax levied from last year (everything that was billed) and you had adds and property taken off, this will probably be a realist number now. That number is the first part of the formula. Prior year taxes levied, adjusted for abatements and additions. This is divided by the new value in the year that the value was derived from a countywide equalization/reassessment program. The amount of assessed value and the new assessed value from the Auditor would be adjusted for properties not previously taxed (new stuff). Additions to property (property where someone has added an extra building) should be removed, along with renovation of existing structures and assessments attributable to increases in value due to an assessable transfer of interest. He stated that in 2006, South Carolina passed major real estate property tax legislation. Reassessment values were capped in a reassessment year and they could not increase more than fifteen percent. This remains until the property goes through an assessable transfer of interest. A simple example is that when a person’s property is capped, when it is sold to someone else, the cap is removed and the property goes to full market value. This increase in value is an increase because of an ATI (Assessable Transfer of Interest). The Tax Assessor keeps up with this in most cases. The reason for this is that it is additional money that the county will have. This is new money outside the rim of the millage calculation. The county is allowed to get this increase in new money. The formula is prior year taxes levied and adjusted divided by your adjusted total assessed value.

Mr. Houck explained that, normally, in South Carolina, the assessed value would have probably gone up because of increase in property value. If this happens, the millage will actually roll back even though citizens’ values went up; the millage comes down. He stated that for the last couple years, this has not always been the case. When counties went through reassessment and looked at the new reassessment base, the values actually were less than the year before. The formula says you are entitled to the same amount of money. So when you calculate the rollback and it is actually higher than it was the year before, this

is not unusual today. He said hopefully, we will get back to normal times. Mr. Houck said there was an Attorney General's ruling that states whatever the calculation is, we call it a rollback, but it could be a roll forward. Therefore, it is sort of a miss-normal to call it rollback.

Mr. Houck pointed out that page six of his handout contained a checklist of the things you need to look at when going through reassessment. He said the assessments should be a compilation of all taxable property in the county. Fee-in-Lieu-of-Tax properties are not taxable property and are not involved in the millage calculations. Real property assessed by the county would be the properties that the Assessor's Office would be responsible for such as owner occupied residential property, including mobile homes. Mr. Houck said these properties use to always go up during reassessment. This is not the case anymore, especially in some counties. He also stated that lake and ocean properties have declined during the last real estate bubble burst. Agriculture property does not change in value. All other properties including commercial, second homes, etc. may go up or down. All this is from the Assessor's office.

Personal property under the county's jurisdiction includes motor vehicles, watercraft and motors, aircraft, and all other personal property. Properties assessed by the Department of Revenue include the normal manufactures, utilities, railroad property, and business personal property. This information flows from the Department of Revenue to the Auditor's Office. The Tax Assessor's Office may receive a copy. Mr. Houck stated that when you look at your reassessment base in any year, except in reassessment years, owner occupied properties can go up or down depending upon the market. If it goes down, this being a significant part of the tax base, the millage probably would not get rolled back like a lot of people think. Agriculture property does not change. Commercial property depends upon the market. Motor vehicles are a declining part of your assessment base and have been for a long time. The reason for this is that the cars you had last year are going to be at least five percent less because State law mandates that DOR (South Carolina Department of Revenue) lower those values a minimum of five percent. They can go down more depending on what the depreciation shows. But your vehicle assessment base, at a minimum, will go down five percent. As people buy new cars as things get better, these new properties, if you can identify them, need to be set aside because they were not previously taxed. This money can be set aside for new needs of the county. Watercraft and motors are not a significant part of it. Manufactures in South Carolina, in a reassessment year, will typically go down between twelve percent and fifteen percent because most of the manufacture assessments are based on personal property that is depreciating at a rate of eight percent to twelve percent per year depending upon the type of manufacture. Therefore, this part of your equation, typically, will always go down every year because of the depreciation allowed on personal property. In normal situations, you would not see drastic changes in manufacturing real estate values. Utilities and railroad are a fairly stable part of the tax base along with business personal property, which depreciates normally about fifteen percent to eighteen percent per year. Mr. Houck suggested that you look at the base every year, certainly in reassessment years. He tells counties to pay attention to new things because you can set all the new property aside and set your millage, which will be

multiplied by the new assessment base that the new properties have generated. This will help the county to have a cushion to use as the county sees fit.

Mr. Houck said page seven of the handout recapped what he had discussed. He pointed out that item four should state that the Auditor is not the responsible party for the calculation of operating millage. County Council is the authority to approve the operating millage. Once council does so, each year, Council should certify with the County Auditor that the millage has been set in compliance with the laws that limit millage. Mr. Houck referred to Section 12-43-285 on page nine of the handout, which states that the governing body is responsible for certifying that the millage is set properly. If Council does not set the millage properly, Council could (1) issue refunds or (2) take the excess money, once it is known, set it aside and use that to offset next year's budget. It would be handled as a credit the following year. For example, if the county needed \$10 million and collected an extra \$500,000; next year, Council would set the millage to generate only \$9.5 million instead of \$10 million. He advised the County Treasurer to do this once it is known. Someone would have to say, "*We have excess collection and here is how we are going to handle it.*"

Mr. Houck also mentioned another fund that comes from the Department of Revenue called Motor Carriers (18 wheelers) and Inventory. These small insignificant payments go to the county from the State and are not related to the assessment or millage. The Fee-In-Lieu of Tax would be the big ticket items and are not dependent upon setting the millage. They have a set millage with the company or a millage that is adjusted every five year. These are payments to the county from a company and are not dependent on the millage you are working with. He suggested that the county take the fee payments and subtract them from the budget because you want to get to a budget that is funded purely and simply by tax payers and tax dollars.

On page 8 of the handout, Mr. Houck pointed out that if you calculate your rollback millage and the result was an increase in millage instead of a lower millage; nothing was done wrong. The calculation is what it is. He also stated that it is easy to talk about the millage, but coming up with the numbers is the tough part.

Mr. Kilgo asked that if reassessment was completed in 2014, prior to July 1st, the rollback or roll forward should take place in the 2014 tax notice. Mr. Houck responded that if reassessment was implemented in 2014 and the tax bills went out in 2014 with new values that would be your roll back or roll forward millage.

Mr. Kilgo asked what agent should have determined this. If not the Auditor, who should have determined it for County Council? He asked whether Council should rely on the County Administrator, the Finance Director, or the Assessor? Mr. Houck said everybody should be working together. The certification would come from the Chairman of County Council or it may come from the County Administrator.

Mr. Kilgo stated that he wished Council would have had this explanation last September instead of this September because Council has been living with information received haphazardly and answers that they don't get. He thanked Mr. Houck for explaining this to Council. He would now have to ask questions of the Administration to determine where we are.

Mr. Houck pointed out that coming up with the numbers is the tough part and the real issue. Also, many times, the staff will be working with the unknown. The Department

of Revenue sends the county their manufacturing certification. If one of them has an appeal, the Department of Revenue will send it to that county as "Under Appeal," not knowing what it will be settled for. This would be the same for utilities. Therefore, most counties are very conservative when setting the millage because you don't know. He concluded by stating that the worst thing you could do is to set the millage too low. You try to set it as best you can with the information you have.

There being no further comments, the discussion ended at 5:39 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING

NOTICE OF MEETING

In compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda, giving the date, time, and place of the meeting was mailed in advance to the local newspapers, persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board at the entrance to the County Administrator's Office.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Bobby Hudson, Vice Chairman Robbin Brock, Chaplain Dannie Douglas, Jr., Mr. David Coker, Mr. Marvin Le Flowers, Mrs. Wilhelmina P. Johnson, Ms. Mozella Nicholson, and Mr. Robert L. Kilgo, Jr.

ALSO PRESENT – Property Tax Rollback Discussion

County Administrator Terence Arrington, County Attorney James C. Cox, Jr., Clerk to Council J. JaNet Bishop, Finance Director Sherman Dibble, Tax Assessor Kyle Johnson, Tax Assessor's Office Staff Rhonda Richardson and Kay Jeffords, Treasurer Belinda Copeland, Interim Emergency Preparedness Director Mac McDonald, Codes Enforcement Director Randy Evans, Central Communications Director Gary White, IT Manager Arthur Moore, Planning Director Doug Reimold, Human Resources Manager Ginger Winburn, Chief Deputy Sheriff James Hudson, Historical Commission Director Brian Gandy, Economic Development Director Frank Willis, Library Director Jimmy Epling, Elections/Voter Registration Director Hoyt Campbell, Tax Collector Mae Helen Burch, Airport Manager Barry Kennett, Recycling Coordinator Paula Newton, Corrections Director Waddell Coe, and others.

REPORTERS PRESENT

Mr. Jim Faile of the Messenger and Ms. Samantha Lyles of the News and Press.

Recognition of Employees

Chairman Hudson presented a plaque to Ms. Judy Ammons for 15 years of service with Darlington County. She was not present at the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance No. 15-24, An Ordinance To Amend Darlington County Code Of Ordinances, Chapter 2 (Administration), Article V. (Finance), Division 7 (Fees), Item 5. (Environmental Services Dumping Fees/Charges) To Revise The Fee For Disposal Of Construction Materials To Accommodate Small Commercial/Private Companies Using The County's Construction And Demolition Landfill

Chairman Hudson declared the public hearing open at 6:03 p.m. to receive comments on Ordinance No. 15-24.

There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance No. 15-25, An Ordinance To Amend Ordinance No. 15-21 (Darlington County FY15/16 Budget Ordinance) For A Supplemental Appropriation To Receive And Expend Unclaimed State Lottery Funds For Darlington County Library System, And Establish The Effective Date Of This Ordinance

Chairman Hudson declared the public hearing open to receive comments on Ordinance No. 15-25.

There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance No. 15-26, An Ordinance To Amend The Darlington County Code Of Ordinances To Add A New Section (Chapter 7 - Airport) Establishing The Minimum Requirements For Airport Aeronautical Services And Airport Vehicle Operations At The Darlington County Airport

Chairman Hudson declared the public hearing open to receive comments on Ordinance No. 15-26.

There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance No. 15-27, An Ordinance To Amend Ordinance No. 15-21 (Darlington County FY15/16 Budget Ordinance) For A Supplemental Appropriation To Provide Funds For The FY 2015 Apron Taxilanes Rehab And Shoulder Demo And To Establish The Effective Date Of This Ordinance

Chairman Hudson declared the public hearing open to receive comments on Ordinance No. 15-27.

There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Ordinance No. 15-28, An Ordinance Authorizing Pursuant To Title 12, Chapter 44 Of The Code Of Laws Of South Carolina 1976, As Amended, The Execution And Delivery Of A Fee-In-Lieu Of Ad Valorem Taxes Agreement, By And Between Darlington County, South Carolina, And A Company Known To The County As Project Beacon IX, As Sponsor, And One Or More Sponsor Affiliates To Provide For A Fee-In-Lieu Of Ad Valorem Taxes Incentive And Certain Special Source Revenue Credits; And Other Related Matters

Chairman Hudson declared the public hearing open to receive comments on Ordinance No. 15-28.

There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

REGULAR MEETING

Call To Order/Invocation/Pledge Of Allegiance

Chairman Hudson called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. Mr. Douglas presented the invocation and Mr. Flowers led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Amendment To The Agenda

MOTION was made by Mr. Brock and seconded by Mr. Kilgo to amend the agenda to go to executive session.

The motion carried unanimously.

Vote For Executive Session - Receipt Of Legal Advice Regarding The Waiver Of The Solid Waste Fee For Vacant Mobile Home Lots In Mobile Home Parks

MOTION was made by Mr. Brock and seconded by Mr. Kilgo to include the following individuals in executive session for receipt of legal advice regarding the waiver of the solid waste fee for vacant mobile home lots in mobile home parks: Central Communications Director Gary White, 911 Addressing Manager Helen McFadden, Tax Collector Mae Helen Burch, Planning Director Doug Reimold, Tax Assessor Kyle Johnson, Tax Assessor's Office Staff Rhonda Richardson and Kay Jeffords, Recycling Coordinator Paula Newton, Finance Director Sherman Dibble, Codes Enforcement Director Randy Evans, County Administrator Terence Arrington, County Attorney James C. Cox, Jr., and Council members.

The motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session

Council members and the individuals listed went into executive session at 6:09 p.m. Councilwoman Mozella Nicholson arrived at 6:09 p.m. and went into executive session.

Upon Council reconvening at 6:26 p.m., Chairman Hudson announced that no action was taken in executive session.

Citizens' Comments

Mr. Norm Steadman announced that Greater Hartsville Chamber of Commerce will partner with the State Chamber of Commerce to host a legislative event and Pee Dee Regional Grassroots meeting on October 5, 2015, at the Darlington Raceway at 4:30 p.m. During this event, the State Chamber will set its legislative agenda for the year. He encouraged local legislators, business leaders, and local people to register, attend, and participate in this event.

Personal Appearances

There were no personal appearances.

Consent Agenda

Included in the Consent Agenda were the following:

ITEMS

ACTION

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| A. Building Permit Types, August 2015 | Receive As Information |
| B. Building Inspections, July & August 2015 | Receive As Information |
| C. Animal Control Report, August 2015 | Receive As Information |
| D. Marlboro/Darlington County Beaver Program Reports, June, July, August 2015 | Receive As Information |
| E. Planning Commission Minutes, July 21, 2015 | Receive As Information |
| F. Invitation To SC Chamber's Pee Dee Grassroots Meeting & Legislative Reception, October 15 th , Darlington Raceway | Receive As Information |
| G. Historical Commission Minutes, June 2015 | Receive As Information |
| H. Registration For SC Association Of Counties Fall Meeting Of Of The County Council Coalition & Institute Of Government, October 22-23, 2015, Columbia | Receive As Information |

MOTION was made by Mr. Flowers and seconded by Mr. Douglas to receive the Consent Agenda items as information.

The motion carried unanimously.

Approval Of Minutes - Minutes Of Public Hearing & Regular Meeting, August 17, 2015

MOTION was made by Mrs. Johnson and seconded by Mr. Douglas to approve the minutes of August 17, 2015.

The motion carried unanimously.

Approval Of Minutes - Minutes Of Special Meeting, August 24, 2015

MOTION was made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve the minutes of August 24, 2015.

The motion carried unanimously.

Approval Of Minutes - Minutes Of Joint Meeting Of Darlington County's Municipal Councils, County Council, Board Of Education, & Legislative Delegation, August 31, 2015

MOTION was made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve the minutes of August 31, 2015.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinances

Ordinance No. 15-24, An Ordinance To Amend Darlington County Code Of Ordinances, Chapter 2 (Administration), Article V. (Finance), Division 7 (Fees), Item 5. (Environmental Services Dumping Fees/Charges) To Revise The Fee For Disposal Of Construction Materials To Accommodate Small Commercial/Private Companies Using The County's Construction And Demolition Landfill - **THIRD READING**

MOTION was made by Mr. Brock and seconded by Mr. Flowers to approve third reading of Ordinance No. 15-24.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 15-25, An Ordinance To Amend Ordinance No. 15-21 (Darlington County FY15/16 Budget Ordinance) For A Supplemental Appropriation To Receive And Expend Unclaimed State Lottery Funds For Darlington County Library System, And Establish The Effective Date Of This Ordinance - **THIRD READING**

MOTION was made by Ms. Nicholson and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve third reading of Ordinance No. 15-25.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 15-26, An Ordinance To Amend The Darlington County Code Of Ordinances To Add A New Section (Chapter 7 - Airport) Establishing The Minimum Requirements For Airport Aeronautical Services And Airport Vehicle Operations At The Darlington County Airport - **THIRD READING**

MOTION was made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve third reading of Ordinance No. 15-26.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 15-27, An Ordinance To Amend Ordinance No. 15-21 (Darlington County FY15/16 Budget Ordinance) For A Supplemental Appropriation To Provide Funds For The FY 2015 Apron Taxilanes Rehab And Shoulder Demo And To Establish The Effective Date Of This Ordinance - **THIRD READING**

MOTION was made by Mr. Brock and seconded by Mr. Douglas to approve third reading of Ordinance No. 15-27.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 15-28, An Ordinance Authorizing Pursuant To Title 12, Chapter 44 Of The Code Of Laws Of South Carolina 1976, As Amended, The Execution And Delivery Of A Fee-In-Lieu Of Ad Valorem Taxes Agreement, By And Between Darlington County, South Carolina, And A Company Known To The County As Project Beacon IX, As Sponsor, And One Or More Sponsor Affiliates To Provide For A Fee-In-Lieu Of Ad Valorem Taxes Incentive And Certain Special Source Revenue Credits; And Other Related Matters - **SECOND READING**

MOTION was made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve second reading of Ordinance No. 15-28.

The motion carried unanimously.

Resolutions

There were no resolutions.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Other Items

Annual Appointments & Appointments To Fill Vacancies On County Boards & Commissions: Alcohol & Drug Citizen Advisory Committee (Hudson – Appt. Needed Due To Non Attendance), Airport Commission (Flowers), Construction Board of Adjustment & Appeals (Douglas, Flowers), Library Board (Flowers), Parks & Recreation Commission (Flowers – Appt. Needed Due To Non Attendance), Planning Commission (Douglas, Flowers)

Each Council member carried over his/her appointment(s).

Purchase Of 12 Radios (6 Portables WT & 6 Mobiles) For The Narcotics Units Using Non-Budgeted Federal Drug Funds

MOTION was made by Mrs. Johnson and seconded by Mr. Douglas to approve the purchase of 12 radios for the Narcotics Unit at \$17,820 using non-budgeted federal drug funds.

Mr. Kilgo said that even though this was a sole source purchase, he had no objection since it was through State Contract.

The motion carried unanimously.

Green Infrastructure Grant Award from SC Forestry Commission, \$20,000 (Does Not Require Cash Match)

MOTION was made by Mr. Douglas and seconded by Ms. Nicholson to approve the Green Infrastructure Grant Award from South Carolina Forestry Commission.

The motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Update - Mr. Terence Arrington, County Administrator

Mr. Arrington gave each Council members a FY15/16 budget document that included a budget message. The information will be available on the county's website. He thanked the staff compiling the information.

Mr. Arrington also expressed his appreciation to the staff for work during the recent race event. He mentioned that grass cutting along the roadways was delayed due to the equipment being down in the Roads and Bridges Department. He commended Mr. Richardson for his work.

Floor Repair - Probate Office & County Administrator's Office. Mr. Arrington pointed out information in the agenda package regarding floor repair for the Probate Office and the

County Administrator's Office. Pictures of the current carpet and quotes for the repair were included in the agenda package. Mr. Arrington stated that he wanted Council to know what project the staff was working on to improve the condition of the offices. This was being presented as information.

County Administrator's Office Layout. Mr. Arrington also pointed out that the agenda package included information about the office layout change in the County Administrator's Office. He stated that the county recently hired an Information Technology Manager and needed to find space to accommodate this employee in the County Administrator's office. The IT Manager was currently working in the conference room. The office layout plan included an additional cubicle for the IT Manager. A diagram of the proposed office layout and the quotes for cubicles were included in the agenda package.

Mr. Kilgo pointed out that the staff did not obtain a bid from the office furniture vendor in Darlington County.

Mr. Arrington stated that the staff did not solicit bids and he was unaware of the vendor Mr. Kilgo was referring to. However, he would obtain a quote from that vendor. Mr. Arrington stated that because of the dollar amount, he did not want to spend the money without Council knowing what the purchase was for.

Procurement Of Google Apps For County Email Account Hosting & Collaborating Software. Mr. Arrington explained that the current email structure for the county was dilapidated. The agenda package included a quote from Goggle Apps and Microsoft 365. He proposed going with Goggle Apps to handle the email structure which was a lot cheaper and would meet the county's growing needs including the ability to share documents and space. He was presenting this as information so that Council would be aware of how the staff tends to proceed.

Requests / Comments – Members Of Council

Mr. Kilgo stated that Darlington County vendors should have a chance at bidding on things. He also mentioned that the county was spending money with Herald Office Supplies for paper, etc. when there was an office supply store across the street from the courthouse (Darlington Office Supply). He said it was time for the county to look at local county vendors before sending money outside the county. Mr. Kilgo asked the staff to look at the possibility of video recording the Council meetings and posting the videos on the county website so that the citizens can see what happens at the meetings.

Mr. Flowers requested that the staff obtain information for the next Council meeting for a \$3 million bond for improvements of the landfill and the recycling centers. He suggested looking at bonds that will be retiring in the near future.

Mrs. Johnson read a prepared statement about government working for the people. She also talked about the need for corrective plans to show the defined rights-of-way for all roads. Mrs. Johnson also talked about the need for an accurate count of properties owned by the county, the safety of retention ponds and ditches, maintenance on the ditch behind

Pecan Grove Apartments, and Taco Bell customers using Patience Street and Juleswood Drive. She also provided a handout about The Great American Cleanup scheduled for April 2015.

Mr. Brock commended the staff for their work during the recent race events. He suggested that the county find someone to help with tax issues regarding mobile homes and people who are not paying their fair share and lost revenue.

Mr. Douglas asked the staff to find out how much it will cost to update the landfill. He thanked everyone for attend the meeting.

Ms. Nicholson wished ~~everyone~~ *the Jewish citizens of Darlington County* a happy holiday, *Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur*.

Chairman Hudson asked Mr. Willis to provide an update on the I-20/340 Industrial Park. Economic Development Director Frank Willis reported that the I-20/340 Industrial Park was complete. All the infrastructure was in place. The only thing that needs to be done is an entrance way and erect a sign. The park was finished and open for business. Mr. Willis suggested that Council give the Park a formal name. He introduced his staff, Ms. Monica Perry.

Chairman Hudson reminded Council of the Grand Opening for Fire Station 6 located at 109 Kingston Road, McBee. He commended the race events and the parades.

Adjournment

MOTION was made by Mr. Kilgo to adjourn the meeting. There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. JaNet Bishop, Clerk to Council

Bobby Hudson, Chairman
Darlington County Council

Approved at meeting of October 5, 2015, as amended.

Amendment To The Minutes. At its meeting on October 5, 2015, Darlington County Council amended the minutes to reflect (on page 14) that Ms. Nicholson wished a happy holiday (Rosh Hashanah and Yam Kippur) to the Jewish citizens of Darlington County.