



GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Regular Meeting
January 7, 2020
6:02 p.m.

County Square – Council Chambers
301 University Ridge
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

Council Members

Mr. Butch Kirven, Chairman, District 27
Mr. Willis Meadows, Vice Chairman, District 19
Mrs. Xanthe Norris, Chairman Pro Tem, District 23
Mr. Joe Dill, District 17
Mr. Mike Barnes, District 18
Mr. Sid Cates, District 20
Mr. Rick Roberts, District 21
Mr. Bob Taylor, District 22
Mrs. Liz Seman, District 24
Mr. Ennis Fant, Sr., District 25
Mr. Lynn Ballard, District 26
Mr. Dan Tripp, District 28

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted on the bulletin board at the County Square and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned Citizens.

Council Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Joe Kernell, *County Administrator*
Mark Tollison, *County Attorney*
Jeff Wile, *Assistant County Attorney*
John Hansley, *Deputy County Administrator*
Regina McCaskill, *Clerk to Council*
Jessica Stone, *Deputy Clerk to Council*
Paula Gucker, *Assistant County Administrator, Public Works*
John Vandermosten, *Assistant County Administrator, Public Safety*
Bob Mihalic, *Governmental Relations Officer*
Shannon Herman, *Assistant County Administrator*
Nicole Wood, *Assistant to the County Administrator*

Others Present

Brad Love, Attorney – Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd

Call to Order

Chairman Kirven

Invocation – *Introduced by Councilor Joe Dill*

Ross Burgess
Bounty Hunters for Jesus – Road Ministry

Pledge of Allegiance

Item (4) Approval of Minutes

Action: Councilor Seman moved to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2019, Regular Council Meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (5) Community Heroes Presentation

Katrice Hardy, Executive Editor of the *Greenville News*, and Paul Hughes, President of Greenville Federal Credit Union, presented the Community Heroes Awards to Will Snipes and Jennifer Jones. The awards were presented to two citizens of Greenville County who had worked tirelessly and behind the scenes to make the community a better place.

Will Snipes was recognized for being a mentor to young people in the Blue Ridge / Travelers Rest area. Since 2005, he has led afterschool bible study sessions for the area's youth. Mr. Snipes, a local minister and camp counselor at LifeWay Camp, was nominated by a local teen who stated, "We will never know, on this side of heaven, the impact he has made to this community."

Jennifer Jones, an entrepreneur and married mother of three, founded the non-profit organization *Beauty Marks for Girls*. The program was designed to mentor young girls, ages 12 – 18, whose mothers were incarcerated. Ms. Hardy stated the girls were trained to be leaders; the program sought to break the cycle of generational incarceration, reduce recidivism and bring awareness of a vulnerable population affected by other's decisions.

Item (6) Public Hearings

a. MSI Mold Builders Southeast, Inc. (formerly Project Play Doh) / Fee in Lieu of Tax Agreement

A public hearing was held for the purpose of receiving comments from the public regarding an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement by and between Greenville County, South Carolina and MSI Mold Builders Southeast, Inc., with respect to certain economic development in the county, whereby such property would be subject to certain payments in lieu of taxes; and other matter related thereto.

There being no speakers, Councilor Seman declared the public hearing closed.

b. Greenville – Anderson Multi County Industrial Business Park Agreement Amendment (2010 Park) / Project Santa's Hat

A public hearing was held for the purpose of receiving comments from the public regarding an ordinance to amend an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial and business park (2010 Park) of Anderson and Greenville Counties so as to enlarge the park (Project Santa's Hat).

There being no speakers, Councilor Seman declared the public hearing closed.

Item (7) Appearances – current agenda items

- Ed Paxton, 1 York Circle, Greenville – appeared regarding Item 9.a. Formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation
- Susan McClarty, 204 E. Hillcrest Drive, Greenville - appeared regarding Item 9.a. Formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation

- Rebecca Warth, 1 Seawright Lane, Greenville - appeared regarding Item 9.a. Formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation
- David Stone, 27 Swanson Court, Greenville - appeared regarding Item 9.a. Formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation

Item (8) **Consent Agenda**

- a. **Waterline Grant Application – 204 Roberts Circle and 296 Roberts Circle (PWI)**
- b. **SC Hospital Preparedness Program Grant (Finance)**
- c. **SC Park and Recreation Development Fund Grant (Finance)**
- d. **Community Project Application / Travelers Rest Christmas Parade - \$2,000.00 (Finance)**
- e. **Community Project Application / City of Simpsonville Downtown Mural Project - \$5,000.00 (Finance)**

Action: Councilor Norris moved approval of the Consent Agenda Items.

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (9) **Resolutions**

- a. **Formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation**

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption a resolution for the purpose of establishing the County Square Redevelopment Corporation, stating its purposes and appointing the members to the Board Of Directors of the Corporation.

Action: Vice-Chairman Meadows moved to hold the item until after the City of Greenville voted on the property zoning.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated Council had heard citizen comments about the project earlier in the meeting. The County was still negotiating with the City of Greenville in regards to the zoning request; nothing was “concrete” and Council did not know what was to be built. Mr. Meadows stated Greenville City Council was scheduled to vote on the issue on January 22; a meeting regarding the project was scheduled for Friday, January 10 at 7:30 p.m. at City Hall. Mr. Meadows urged his colleagues to attend. The City of Greenville had been very open regarding its expectations of the County; there was room for negotiating and room to work.

Mr. Meadows stated he did not know if his colleagues had read all of the information that was sent on the previous Friday regarding the project. The information was 110 pages; he asked how many Council Members had read all of it.

Councilor Tripp indicated he had read all of the information.

Vice-Chairman Meadows congratulated Mr. Tripp.

Chairman Kirven stated he had read all of the information but not in one sitting; he had read it over the past few months.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he was not aware it had been printed over the past few months. He urged his colleagues to read all of it; the law stipulated that Council was to appoint and elect the Board of Directors. Council had been given a slate with no input; there had been no opportunity to nominate individuals to the board.

Chairman Kirven stated the redevelopment of County Square had been going on for a couple of years; Council had been very active in various aspects of the planning process. Since the end of November 2019, he had made it a personal point to reach out and meet all the new City Council Members, existing members and community leaders to get a better perspective on their thoughts and ideas moving forward. He was very encouraged by what he had heard from everyone he had spoken to. The idea that the County moving forward was encumbered by the City Council's vote was simply false; the County could move forward with its new office building and the offsite building for state offices. The item on the floor was a procedural step to move in the direction that Council had already voted to go; it was "nothing new". The step was mandated by law; under the guidance and direction of the County's expert, outside legal counsel. Approval of the item would enable the County to continue to move forward without jeopardizing the costs involved in delays in timing that could affect the bond financing. He felt things were moving very well and there would be an opportunity to work with the City and the community. Mr. Kirven stated if the item was approved, it would not stop anything; the planning would continue. Approval would also help the City of Greenville make its determination. Mr. Kirven stated he would not advise Council to hold the item; he recommended approval.

Councilor Tripp stated he had read all of the information and was confused; there was nothing in the documents sent by Mr. Meadows that changed the dynamics on whether the County moved forward or not. He stated the County had signed agreements with the developer and a master plan was in place. The City of Greenville had a process in place and the County was going through the process. The City would try and get as much as possible from the deal and the County would do the same. Council had signed the agreement with the developer; there were legal obligations. Mr. Tripp stated Mr. Meadows kept stalling on the project which only hurt the County; he was opposed to holding the item.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated Mr. Tripp was confused; he had not sent the material to Council. There were two documents; one was about 40 pages and the other was 56 or 58 pages. The information outlined the corporation and what the County was obligating itself to. Mr. Meadows stated his proposed motion was in no way to stall the project; it was a good project. Holding the item was a way to look and see how the taxpayers' money would be used and whether it was being wasted or not. He did not feel that anyone on Council or even the County Administrator could answer questions about the project. Mr. Meadows stated he had sent a list of questions to Mr. Kernell and his reply was simply generalities; nothing was specific and could not be pinpointed. The cost of the project with a breakdown of expenses was unknown. Mr. Meadows agreed they were trying to "drag" their "feet"; however, they were simply trying to save the taxpayers' money or make sure the taxpayers were not getting "fleeced." Joe Kernell had already indicated that the County had the money to take care of the Halton Road project; the money was needed by April 1 and the item could certainly be passed prior to that date. He disagreed with Chairman Kirven; what the County proposed for the project was not what the City has indicated they would approve. The project had to work economically. Mr. Meadows stated he agreed with Mr. Kirven when he commented that Council had been "naïve" going into the project; they did not look at the whole process. The City of Greenville had been very open, gave specifics and had shown what they were asking for; he had no doubt that would be its final decision. Approval of the item was giving a "blank check" and "blank authority"; Mr. Meadows stated he would not vote for it.

Councilor Fant inquired about the prospective members of the Board of Directors; he wanted to know if Council had any input with the recommendations.

Joe Kernell stated the outside bond counsel made the recommendations; the nominees all had experience and knowledge regarding the financing involved.

Councilor Tripp stated he spent 12 years in the State Legislature and there was no one more of a “Dr. No” than himself. His mission in the State Legislature was to “kill bills”; he understood the mindset of Councilor Meadows. Mr. Tripp stated that Vice-Chairman Meadows kept throwing out politically popular phrases but there was no substance to them; he asked Mr. Meadows to show everyone what he was talking about. He would be in favor of Mr. Meadows’ motion if he could show how taxpayers’ money was being wasted. Mr. Meadows had yet to put any substance behind the phrases and it appeared to be a “stalling act.” Council had to decide if they were going to put the taxpayers’ money to work and bring the project online or continue to bicker and fight internally.

Councilor Seman stated that she had also spoken with several City Council Members regarding the project and she was encouraged by their responses. She was thankful for the continued dialogue with the citizens; she stressed the importance of relationships given the fact there were a number of new faces on City Council. Before she was elected to Council, she heard about the “split between City and County”; she felt things had gotten better over the last few years. Prior to the project, the City and the County had drifted away from having dialogue with each other as well as the other municipalities. Ms. Seman encouraged her colleagues to continue building relationships with the City of Greenville and the other municipalities. There was more accountability when dealing with people you know. Ms. Seman stated she was in favor of the item; she felt the conversation would be the same when the bond issue was on the floor. The County had legal obligations; she was concerned about timing and the County’s ability to go to the bond market when the rates were favorable. She was also concerned how the County would look to the rating agencies if there was no “unified voice” regarding the funds needed. Ms. Seman stated she was not in favor of “draining our cash” to pay for the Halton Road project. She planned to vote in favor of both items regarding the project.

Councilor Roberts thanked Chairman Kirven and Joe Kernell for meeting with him regarding the project; the meetings were very positive. He also met with two City Council Members the prior evening and he was very encouraged by their comments. There were two legislators in attendance as well as several citizens and businessmen. Mr. Roberts stated he had been advised to “respect the process”; Council had come a very long way in the last year and a half and needed to move forward. The City of Greenville moved its timeline and was eager to work with the County. There was a difference in being a “no guy” as opposed to asking very pertinent questions about how the County was going to spend \$120 million of taxpayers’ money. Mr. Roberts stated there had to be a middle ground; to hold the item was not a “kill the project.” The project would move forward and the City of Greenville would work with the County. Mr. Roberts stated to not wait an extra amount of time made no sense; he appreciated everyone’s questions and agreed there was a considerable amount of information given to Council. Mr. Roberts stated he had not had an opportunity to read all of the material and would like time to do so; he would also like for the City of Greenville to give feedback. He stated it would all work out and he supported holding the item for a few more weeks to allow the City of Greenville to go through its process.

Chairman Kirven stated he wanted to respond to Mr. Meadows’ comments regarding Council entering into the project naïvely. County Square was the most valuable piece of property in Greenville County; it was a valuable asset and it was just a question as to what was going to be done with the site. Coming from a County perspective, he was naïve about the intense influence the project would have on the surrounding neighborhoods. Greenville was a fairly small city with approximately 70,000 residents versus the County with over 500,000. He had a greater appreciation for the perspective of the citizens who would be affected by the project; therefore, he had a greater commitment to continue the process of working with the surrounding neighborhoods moving forward in reaching the goals of the development. The project would strengthen affordable housing, homelessness and all the things the County needed to do with the proceeds that would come from the development of the property.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he wanted to give Councilor Tripp an example of the issues he had concerns about. The County purchased the Halton Road building for \$33 million; 18 months prior to the purchase, it was sold for \$18.5 million. He stated that was a waste of taxpayers’ money.

Chairman Kirven stated another example of wasted taxpayer money occurred a few years ago. The County had some bonds that required issuance. The item had to be presented to the Finance Committee; the Chairman of the committee refused to put the item on the agenda for several months. That delay ended up costing the County several hundred thousand dollars.

Councilor Taylor stated money had a lot to do with the issues Council faced. Over the years that he had worked with Joe Kernell, and he had seen his explanation of how things would be accomplished. The County worked with some of the best bond attorneys in Greenville to help navigate the process. In the last ten years, Greenville County had been shorted \$50 million from the State; in spite of that, the budget has been maintained. Mr. Taylor stated he had read most of the information regarding the project. He understood most of it but there were things he did not understand; however, he knew he was able to get the answers he needed. Council Members kept talking about needing time; he recommended they read the information and ask questions, if needed.

Motion to hold was denied by a vote of six (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Roberts, Fant and Ballard) in favor and six (Cates, Taylor, Norris, Seman, Kirven and Tripp) in favor.

Motion to approve the resolution for the formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation was denied by a vote of six (Cates, Taylor, Norris, Seman, Kirven and Tripp) in favor and six (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Roberts, Fant and Ballard) in opposition.

b. Greater Greenville Sanitation District Annexation / Mountain Creek Church Road and State Park Road Area - Request for Public Hearing

Action: Councilor Seman moved for adoption a resolution to hold a public hearing to consider enlarging the Greater Greenville Sanitation District to include certain properties located in the Greater Mountain Creek Church Road and State Park Road area of Greenville County.

Motion carried unanimously.

c. Greater Greenville Sanitation District Annexation / 548 Old Howell Road and 471 Mountain Creek Road - Request for Public Hearing

Action: Councilor Seman moved for adoption a resolution to hold a public hearing to consider enlarging the Greater Greenville Sanitation District to include 548 Old Howell Road and 471 Mountain Creek Road.

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (10) Ordinances – Third Reading

a. Zoning Ordinances

i. CZ-2019-39: Property of Gordon E. Mann, located on West Blue Ridge Drive, Colonial Avenue and Eli Street, requesting rezoning from C-2 to S-1.

Action: Councilor Dill moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Action: Councilor Cates moved to return item to the Planning and Development Committee as there were issues that needed to be reconciled.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the property was located in his district and he agreed with Mr. Cates' motion.

Motion to return the item to the Planning and Development Committee carried unanimously.

- ii. **CZ-2019-77:** Property of Passco Navarro Greenville, LLC and International Properties, LLC, located on Grove Reserve Parkway, requesting rezoning from C-3 to I-1.

Action: Councilor Dill moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Greenville County Comprehensive Plan “Plan Greenville County” (CP-2019-05)

Action: Councilor Dill moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance to adopt a Comprehensive Plan for the County of Greenville in compliance with S.C. Code Section 6-29-510.

Motion carried unanimously.

c. MSI Mold Builders Southeast, Inc. (formerly Project Play Doh) / Fee in Lieu of Tax Agreement

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement by and between Greenville County, South Carolina, and MSI Mold Builders Southeast, Inc. with respect to certain economic development property in the county, whereby such property would be subject to certain payments in lieu of taxes; and other matters related thereto.

Motion carried unanimously.

d. Project Woods / Fee in Lieu of Tax Agreement

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement by and between Greenville County, South Carolina and a company or companies known to the county at this time as Project Woods, with respect to certain economic development property in the county, whereby such property would be subject to certain payments in lieu of taxes; and other matters related thereto.

Action: Councilor Taylor moved to hold the item until the Council meeting on February 4 to give time for a public hearing to be scheduled.

Motion to hold carried unanimously.

e. University Ridge Economic Development Project / Bond Anticipation Notes and Related Agreements

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of documents relating to the provision of county-owned facilities; consenting to and approving the issuance in one or more series from time to time of not exceeding \$120,000,000 County Square Redevelopment Corporation Installment Purchase Revenue Bonds, by County Square Redevelopment Corporation and the issuance in one or more series from time to time of bond anticipation notes of the corporation to provide funding to finance the costs of acquiring, constructing, equipping, and installing various county facilities and the acquisition of land related thereto; consenting to and approving the execution of one or more base lease and conveyance agreements by and between the county and the corporation; consenting to and approving the execution of one or more Public Facilities Purchase And Occupancy Agreements relating thereto by and between the county and the corporation; consenting to the form of one or more trust agreements to be entered into by the corporation and the trustee for the bonds; and together therewith assignments to the trustee of certain rights to payment and other rights of the corporation, under the facilities agreement; and making provision for all other matters relating to the foregoing.

Councilor Roberts inquired about the impact the Council's decision to deny the resolution for the formation of the County Square Redevelopment Corporation would have on the bond issue.

Action:

Councilor Roberts then made a motion to hold the item.

Councilor Tripp inquired about the costs to the taxpayers if the bond was delayed.

Joe Kernell stated he would have to say that currently there would be no costs to the taxpayers; however, there could be in the future depending on the rates. Timing was the issue for when the debt was sold; it would not be sold for a couple of weeks out.

Chairman Kirven inquired about how long it would take to get the bonds to market and sold in order to settle the debt such as Halton Road.

Joe Kernell stated it would take at least 60 days, if not longer. The County would have to visit the rating agencies and go through the rating process.

Chairman Kirven stated it could not be done the next day.

Action:

Councilor Dill moved to hold the item until they could hold a meeting to resolve any issues Council Member had.

Councilor Taylor stated Council could have a workshop; however, the process would take time and certain work had to be done.

Councilor Dill stated he was in favor of a meeting as opposed to a workshop. He would like for Council to "hammer out the issues" and be able to vote to approve, deny or take another direction on the issue. Mr. Dill stated he understood staff's dilemma; they were hired to do a job and then Council "pulled back the reins." He read the information about the proposed corporation and it made him very uneasy. He spoke with Joe Kernell, who was able to explain the purpose of the corporation; he felt that some of his colleagues did not understand.

Chairman Kirven requested Brad Love come to the podium and explain the need for the proposed corporation. Mr. Kirven stated the corporation was not something that was "thought up" by himself, Joe Kernell or John Hansley; it was recommended by an expert in the field.

Councilor Cates inquired about the last possible date Council could act in order to get everything done on time.

Brad Love stated the resolution would create the County Square Redevelopment Corporation as part of an installment purchase revenue bond structure. A corporation was required to be in place with a board independent from the County. The names suggested as possible board members were all individuals with experience in dealing with bond issues. Mr. Love stated it was up to Council to approve the suggested members or recommend others. State law required that in order to do an installment purchase revenue bond, there must be a non-profit corporation which was a non-governmental affiliate of the County to issue the debt. In order to issue the debt, the corporation had to be created.

Chairman Kirven inquired could Council have appointed an ad hoc committee comprised of Council Members to serve the same purpose as the proposed corporation.

Brad Love stated in order to be a 63-20 federal corporation, the board had to be a separate non-profit corporation in order to comply with state and federal law purposes.

Chairman Kirven stated it appeared there was no other alternative.

Brad Love agreed, the County could only do an installment purchase with the type of corporation as specified in the resolution. The County already had several corporations in place but the board members were either County Council Members or County employees.

Councilor Roberts thanked Brad Love for all of his hard work. He had read the names of the suggested board members and they were “great.” Mr. Roberts inquired who would be responsible for paying off the bonds, the corporation or the taxpayers.

Brad Love stated the corporation could only approve what the County authorized.

Councilor Roberts stated if the County authorized \$120 million the corporation could pay out \$120 million.

Brad Love stated the money could only be paid out for projects the County had authorized. In the documents that would be signed between the County and the corporation, the County would specify the projects that were to be completed. The projects would have to be publicly owned. The documents would also specify how the County would pay for the project; the corporation would meet and authorize the same amount. Mr. Love stated the County would enter into an agreement with the corporation each time a borrowing occurred. While the authorization would be for \$120 million, the amount needed for each series would be approved, not the entire \$120 million. If the County Administrator stated \$80 million was needed for the first series, the corporation would only approve the \$80 million. The corporation could not issue \$120 million without approval from the County. The corporation was the issuer of the debt, not the County; the County would agree to make acquisition payments to the corporation.

Councilor Cates inquired about the deadline for approval of the \$120 million bond if April 1 was the deadline for Halton Road.

Brad Love stated that once Council approved the bond, it would then be presented to the rating agencies by the financial advisor. The rating agencies would take a few weeks to come back with a rating which would be based on the County’s AAA bond rating. Installment purchases generally received AA ratings as they were usually a “few tics” below the underlying rating. The County would then go to the market with the underwriter to sell the bond. Mr. Love stated if the ordinance was adopted in February, there would be enough time to close on the Halton Road building, but it would be close.

Councilor Cates asked if the approval would need to be the first week of February.

Brad Love stated it would be “tight” with the second reading but it was possible.

Councilor Fant felt all of his colleagues were in favor of the project; however, it was still unknown what the City of Greenville would do regarding the zoning request. The City could not stop the project but could make the County build something unwanted like “little four story huts” or something that reduced the value of the land. Council had a fiduciary obligation to the taxpayers to show how the money would be spent; the item should be held until the City made its decision. Council could then make an intelligent and informed decision.

Councilor Seman stated it appeared that Councilor Fant felt no one cared. Council had been given the information needed to make an informed decision; however, due to procedural things that had happened earlier in the meeting, the correct action at this point would be to hold the item. Ms. Seman stated she was happy to make a motion to hold.

Chairman Kirven stated a motion to hold had already been made.

Action: Councilor Seman called for the question.

Without objection, the question was called.

Chairman Kirven stated Councilor Dill had requested a meeting to further discuss the item.

Councilor Dill stated it should be a Committee of the Whole meeting as opposed to a workshop.

Chairman Kirven stated Councilor Dill's request would be taken under advisement. A workshop was no problem and could be scheduled immediately. A Special Called meeting would have to be considered more carefully.

Councilor Dill stated Council needed to get together and "get it over with." He did not want to come to a Council meeting and go through the same process again.

Chairman Kirven stated Councilor Roberts' motion on the floor was to hold the item which was an open-ended motion. He asked Mr. Roberts if he wanted to put any time limits on the motion.

Vice-Chairman Meadows inquired about amending Councilor Roberts' motion. Based on the information given by Attorney Love, the time constraints could be met as long as the item passed by the end of February. If the item was held until after the City of Greenville made a decision on January 22, Council would know what could be built on the property.

Action: Vice-Chairman Meadows moved to amend Councilor Roberts' motion to hold the item until after January 22nd.

Joe Kernell stated first reading on the zoning request was scheduled for January 22; second reading would not occur until February. Council already knew about most of the plans for the new County Square building; the design was nearly completed. The only unknown at this time was the zoning for the rest of the site. The County was not affected but the developer was; the zoning would determine what the developer could put in place. The developer had already indicated they were not concerned about the zoning and were actually contemplating withdrawing the request. All the agreements that were approved by Council were legally binding and there were dollars attached to them; the agreements gave the developer the role of developing the property. The County would only build its new office on the site.

Councilor Fant stated he was not talking about the County building; he was referring to what the developers would be building on the site.

Joe Kernell stated the County was not involved in what the developer built; with the exception of the new County building, the County was neither the builder nor the developer for the property. The developer, or someone they brought in, would decide what would be built. It did not matter what heights were approved; the developer would decide what would be built. Mr. Kernell stated it was a multi-faceted project; at the end of the day, the developer would determine the projects for the property. The developer would decide what type of projects would be brought in for the property; 53% of the projects were to be multi-family housing. Georgetown Roca-Point would determine the additional projects. The County's concern was to maximize the value of its property.

Chairman Kirven stated ideas continued to "percolate up" about the neighborhoods and the increased affordable housing that would be woven into the development. Mr. Kirven stated he was encouraged about the conversations he had with others regarding the project; exciting things would be happening that would be good for the surrounding neighborhoods. Regardless of Council's vote on the item, planning and working with the City of Greenville would continue until the desired results were received.

Action: Vice-Chairman Meadows revised his motion to hold the item until the second Council meeting in February.

Councilor Tripp stated given all the information provided, it appeared that holding the item until the second Council meeting in February would be “cutting it too close” to get the bond issued by April 1. The County would have to “walk away from Halton Road” or use general fund money to purchase the building if the bond was not issued by April 1. Mr. Tripp asked Joe Kernell how much would that cost the taxpayers.

Joe Kernell stated the County had already exercised the option to purchase from County Council; \$3.5 million was the down payment for the purchase of Halton Road. If the purchase did not occur, it would switch to a long-term lease (10 years) which would not be beneficial to the County. The down payment would be forfeited. Mr. Kirven stated there was no advantage to lease Halton Road; lease rates were higher than the bond payments. It made “no financial sense” not to close on the property.

Councilor Fant suggested finding “common ground.” Mr. Meadows’ motion was to hold the item until the second Council meeting in February; that was too late. He suggested “on or before” the City’s second reading. If the City of Greenville acted with leadership and vision; recognized the urgency of the situation and moved forward, the County could deal with the issue at during the first Council meeting in February.

Action: Councilor Fant moved to amend Councilor Meadows’ motion to hold the item until on or before the first County Council meeting in February (4th).

Vice-Chairman Meadows agreed to Councilor Fant’s amendment.

Motion to hold the item until on or before the first County Council meeting in February carried with eleven (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Cates, Roberts, Norris, Seman, Fant, Ballard, Kirven and Tripp) voting in favor and one (Taylor) voting in opposition.

f. Greenville – Anderson Multi County Industrial Business Park Agreement Amendment (2010 Park) / Project Santa’s Hat

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance to amend an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial and business park (2010 Park) of Anderson and Greenville Counties so as to enlarge the Park (Project Santa’s Hat).

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (11) Ordinances – Second Reading

a. Zoning Ordinances

i. CZ-2019-70: Property of Woodside Church of God Inc., located on Cedar Lane Road, requesting rezoning from S-1 to C-3. The Planning Commission and the Committee recommended approval.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the property was located in his district. He had received a number of calls about the item and he recommended denial of the request.

Councilor Seman stated both the Planning Commission and the Committee had recommended approval.

Councilor Dill stated he would like some type of information regarding Mr. Meadows’ recommendation to deny the request.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the developer was planning to build low income housing; there was an abundance of low income housing in the area.

Councilor Dill stated voting against the item at second reading would “kill it.”

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he had requested to hold the item but did not receive any response; he would prefer to hold it.

Councilor Fant inquired about sending the item back to the Planning and Development Committee.

Councilor Dill stated that would be the “wise thing to do.”

Action: Vice-Chairman Meadows moved to send the item back to the Planning and Development Committee.

Motion to send the item back to the Planning and Development Committee carried unanimously.

- ii. **CZ-2019-73:** Property of Hollingsworth Funds, Inc. c/o Ken Hunt, located on Holland Road, requesting rezoning from R-12 to R-M14. The Planning Commission had no recommendation and the Committee recommended denial.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Councilor Seman submitted a written abstention and recused herself from discussion and voting on the item due to a potential conflict of interest. Councilor Seman left the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Councilor Cates left the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Councilor Tripp stated the property was in his district and he recommended denial.

Motion was denied by a vote of ten (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Roberts, Taylor, Norris, Fant, Ballard, Kirven and Tripp) in opposition, one (Cates) absent and one (Seman) written recusal.

Councilor Seman returned to the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

- iii. **CZ-2019-76:** Property of DD&P Properties LLC, located on Shelter Court, requesting rezoning from I-1 to S-1. The Planning Commission and the Committee recommended approval.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present. *(Councilor Cates was absent during voting.)*

Councilor Cates returned to the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

- iv. **CZ-2019-78:** Property of Alexis Carpio De Jesus, located at 620 Piedmont Highway, requesting rezoning from S-1 to R-S. The Planning Commission and the Committee recommended approval.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Motion carried unanimously.

- v. **CZ-2019-79:** Property of 720 Club LLC, located at 720 Mauldin Road, requesting rezoning from S-1 to C-3. The Planning Commission and the Committee recommended approval.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Motion carried unanimously.

- vi. **CZ-2019-81:** Property of Sook Young Yoon c/o Kelly Company, Inc., located at 2164 E. Coleman Road, requesting rezoning from R-S to R-20. The Planning Commission and the Committee recommended approval.

Action: On behalf of the Committee, Councilor Dill moved approval of the ordinance at second reading.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Greenville County Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment / Taylors Main Street Development District (CZ-2019-63)

Action: Councilor Dill moved for approval at second reading ordinance to amend the Greenville County Zoning Ordinance to add the Taylors Main Street Development District to Article 8: Special Review and Review District Regulations; and to define the boundaries of the Taylors Main Street Development District on the official zoning map of Greenville County. The Planning Commission and Committee recommended approval.

Action: Councilor Barnes moved to hold the item.

Motion to hold carried unanimously.

c. Project Tiger / Fee in Lieu of Tax Agreement

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for approval at second reading an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement but and between Greenville County, South Carolina and a company or companies known to the county at this time as Project Tiger with respect to certain economic development property in the county, whereby such property would be subject to certain payments in lieu of taxes; and other matters related thereto; and to delay third reading of the item until the meeting of February 4th in order to coincide with the scheduled public hearing.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Boiling Springs Fire District / Authorize the Issuance of Debt

Action: Councilor Taylor moved for approval at second reading an ordinance finding that the Boiling Springs Fire District, South Carolina, may issue not exceeding \$1,700,000 of General Obligation Bonds and to provide for the publication of notice of the said finding and authorization.

Motion carried unanimously.

Item (12) Committee Reports

No report.

Item (13) Appearances by Citizens

- Jack Logan, 5051 Old Augusta Road, Apt. C, Greenville – appeared regarding County Administrator
- Keith Dewese, 115 Webster Street, Slater – appeared regarding Collection System Alliance
- John Gregory, 2504 Wade Hampton Boulevard, Greenville – appeared regarding Steam Center

Item (14) Administrator's Report

Joe Kernell reported that Greenville County Animal Care was now considered a “no kill” facility with a 91% “save rate”; the staff had worked the last four years to reach the great milestone. The facility was basically saving as many animals as possible and would continue to do so. Mr. Kernell thanked County Council for working with staff to achieve the goal.

Item (15) Requests and Motions by Council Members

- Chairman Kirven announced three appointments to the Appalachian Council of Governments Board of Directors; Dr. Grady Butler, Councilor Ennis Fant and Don Godbey were reappointed to the board. Councilor Dill would continue to serve as Chairman.
- Councilor Fant recognized the attendees from Vision 25 and District 25 in the audience. A new CRM was recently enacted in District 25 breaking down the registered voters by precincts; Mr. Fant stated he would be able to get messages to the residents based on what was happening in the various neighborhoods and communities.

Mr. Fant stated he had three ideas ready to roll out for 2020; the first was to set Greenlink up as a separate SPD (Special Purpose District) with its own taxing authority and board which would still be appointed by the City and the County. This would prevent Greenlink from being a “political football” every two years in the County’s budget; Greenlink would be able to raise money as needed and operate on its own.

- Councilor Ballard stated Council had just passed the Comprehensive Plan and he was not looking forward to the next few weeks. There were two upcoming zoning requests in his district that were “totally out of sync” with the Comprehensive Plan; he assumed other Council Members would be faced with the same dilemma.
- Councilor Dill stated the evening’s meeting had been good and he felt Council had accomplished quite a bit. It was his opinion that the “final scenario” would be good for everyone; he was interested in the next meeting with the City of Greenville.

Mr. Dill stated he was interested in making Greenville County a “sanctuary for babies.”

Mr. Dill stated every time he rode by the Bon Secours Wellness Center, he was alerted to the “hole” to the right of the center; County Council gave the old Memorial Auditorium to the City of Greenville and it was demolished. He did not want something similar to happen and this was why he voted to hold the County Square Project. It was his opinion the County was being led “down the Yellow Brick Road”; he wanted all his colleagues to be secure in their decision to proceed with the project. The project was the biggest thing to happen to South Carolina and possibly the Southeast; it would create jobs as well as tax relief for the citizens of Greenville County.

- Councilor Meadows stated he wanted to remind his colleagues they had agreed to set goals for the budget during the last year’s Council Retreat. Council was to set those goals during the second week of January, the costs of the goals was due in February and the funding sources identified by March. He stated the budget was to be ready by April. It appeared that Council had a lot of work to do.

Chairman Kirven stated Council Members were to take responsibility for certain functional areas on a volunteer basis. They were to form groups to follow-up and develop goals and objectives to be presented to full Council; it did not appear anyone had done so.

Joe Kernell stated the County was currently in the middle of a two year budget; the schedule as outlined by Mr. Meadows would not come into play until the following year.

- Councilor Roberts stated he was glad to hear the good news about Animal Care.

Mr. Roberts stated that a good friend of his, Sam Wyche, recently passed away. Mr. Wyche had done a lot for Greenville as well as for Furman University.

Councilor Roberts stated he looked forward to working with his colleagues on the County Square Project as soon as the City of Greenville made its final decision regarding the zoning of the property.

- Councilor Norris stated that Ken Gibson, Lottie Gibson's son, was now a member of the City Council. She stated that work had already started for the children in her district, which was near the Phillis Wheatley Center.

Former Senator Ralph Anderson recently passed as well as Dr. Morris Hall. Both were great individuals who had worked hard for the City of Greenville.

Ms. Norris stated she looked forward to "doing great things" in the future. In particular, she planned to work with Deb Long and take care of recreation issues in the Berea and Legacy Academy areas.

Ms. Norris recognized residents of District 23 who were in attendance.

- Councilor Seman reported that SCTAC and Lockheed Martin were honored to host Governor McMaster, the Ambassador of Bahrain and other dignitaries at the F-16 Block 70 Production Initiation Ceremony on December 17. Many more F-16 Viper celebrations were scheduled.

Ms. Seman thanked all the staff members, volunteers and stakeholders who served over the last year in regards to the Comprehensive Plan. She agreed with Councilor Ballard; the hard work started now. Hopefully, Council would have the will to do what was right and be able to enforce the plan.

Councilor Seman thanked the staff of Animal Care as well as all the volunteers. She was a "proud mom" to Owen, a rescue from the shelter.

Item (16)

Adjournment

Councilor Seman moved to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Regina G. McCaskill
Clerk to Council