

November 19, 2020
Charleston, SC

A meeting of Charleston County Council's Finance Committee was held at 5:00 pm on November 19, 2020, in the Beverly T. Craven Council Chambers, Second Floor of the Lonnie Hamilton, III Public Services Building, located at 4045 Bridge View Drive, North Charleston, South Carolina.

The following committee members were present: J. Elliott Summey, Chairman, who presided; Henry Darby, Jenny Costa Honeycutt, Anna Johnson, Brantley Moody, Teddie Pryor, A. Victor Rawl, Herb Sass, and Dickie Schweers.

County Administrator Bill Tuten and County Attorney Joe Dawson were also present.

The Chairman stated that the first item on the agenda was the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Pryor moved for approval of the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moody, and carried.

Consent Agenda items are as follows:

Item A:

County Administrator Bill Tuten and Contracts and Procurement Director Barrett J. Tolbert provided a report regarding the need to award a contract for the Rosebank Road Improvements Project on Wadmalaw Island, which includes roadway rocking and drainage repairs to approximately 1.4 miles of Rosebank Road. It was stated that specific work items involved in the execution of the project include, but are not limited to, traffic control, earthwork, road subbase and base installation, asphalt apron paving, shoulder grading to tie-in pavement to existing grade, storm drainage installation and improvements, pavement markings, and permanent grassing.

Bids were received in accordance with the terms and conditions of Invitation for Bid No. 5502-21C. The Minority Women Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (MWDBE) goal is 25%.

Rosebank
Road
Improvements
Project
(Wadmalaw
Island)

Award of
Contract

Bidder	Total Bid Price	MWDBE Percentage
Landscape Pavers, LLC Charleston, South Carolina 29417 Principal: Joyce Schirmer	\$396,444.00	100%
Allston Farrell Construction North Charleston, South Carolina 29406 Principal: Matt Farrell	\$463,182.53	19.9%
KTC Enterprises, Inc. Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461 Principal: Hugh Murchisen, Jr.	\$584,988.03	26%
Blutide Marine Construction Charleston, South Carolina 29407 Principal: Karl Rakes	\$586,627.79	0%

Green Wave Contracting, Inc. Georgetown, South Carolina 29440 Principal: Mendal Nettles, Jr.	\$608,856.00	25%
Banks Construction Company North Charleston, South Carolina 29418 Principal: Jafar Moghadam	\$613,765.62	9.3%
Blythe Development Company Charlotte, North Carolina 28273 Principal: Frank W. Blythe	\$697,228.50	25%
Lowcountry Sitework, LLC Charleston, South Carolina 29492 Principal: John Mazzarella	\$711,000.00	25.3%
IPW Construction Group, LLC Charleston, South Carolina 29423 Principal: Bryan Rembert	\$711,990.99	100%

Department Head recommended that Council authorize an award of contract for the Rosebank Road Improvements project to Landscape Pavers, LLC, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, in the amount of \$396,444.00 with the understanding that funding is currently available in the Transportation Sales Tax budget to complete this project, with potential funding from Federal Emergency Management Agency.

**Port Partner
Interagency
Network
Sustainment
with
Cybersecurity
Protection Grant

Request to
Accept**

Item B:

County Administrator Bill Tuten and Consolidated 9-1-1 Director James Lake provided a report regarding the need to accept the Port Partner Interagency Network Sustainment with Cybersecurity Protection grant. It was stated that the Charleston County Consolidated 9-1-1 Center seeks to accept \$173,834 in grant funding for the project entitled "Port Partner Interagency Network Sustainment with Cybersecurity Protections" for which the Notice of Award from FEMA through the FY 2020 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) has been received.

This funding will leverage prior PSGP grant funded design, installation, operation, maintenance and critical cybersecurity of the Interagency Network. The current capabilities of the Interagency Network will be sustained while ensuring continued encryption capabilities with ongoing security monitoring in support of local, state and federal public safety agencies responsible for security in the port community.

Charleston County Consolidated 9-1-1 Center will contract with the current uniquely qualified vendor (as indicated in grant application materials) to provide a turnkey operation, including cybersecurity protections, for maintenance and sustainment of seven (7) Interagency Network sites from July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023.

Project Total: \$231,778.46

- Federal Amount Requested (75%) = \$173,833.84
- Catch Match Amount Shared by Agencies (25%) = \$57,944.62

The Consolidated Dispatch Board has voted in support of this grant, including agreement by all participating agencies to share the 25% portion of the project total.

Department Head recommended that Council authorize the acceptance of the federally appropriated FEMA grant funding awarded via the Port Security Grant Program in the amount of \$173,833.84 in order to operate and sustain 7 Interagency network sites, including cybersecurity protection, in support of public safety and port security, from July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023, with the understanding that:

- Consolidated 911 Center is authorized to accept the remaining 25% cost of this project (\$58,944.62) from all participating agencies.
- Budget management and required reporting associated with these funds, once accepted, becomes the responsibility of the Consolidated 911 Center.
- No FTE's are associated with this award.

Item C:

**Hazardous
Materials
Emergency
Preparedness
(HMEP) Grant
(EMD)**

County Administrator Bill Tuten and Emergency Management Director Jason Patno provided a report regarding the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant (EMD). It was stated that funding is available through the U.S. Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program to provide advanced hazardous materials emergency planning and training to local first responder agencies.

**Request to
Accept**

The Emergency Management Department is requesting approval to receive \$83,600.00 in grant funding through the above referenced program in order to provide hazardous materials incident response training to law, medical, and fire personnel within Charleston County. Funding will also be used to purchase a tablet with accessories for training with the ProRae Guardian and supplies to include but not limited to: Public awareness materials, handouts, and displays, educational/training resources for the LEPC.

ITEM	COST
Training	\$49,400
Equipment	\$21,200
Supplies	\$13,000
Total	\$83,600

An in-kind or soft match is required. Salaries of Emergency Management Department personnel associated with the completion of projects identified in the grant scope of work will satisfy the match requirement.

There are no FTE's, vehicles, or reoccurring costs associated with the acceptance of the grant program.

Department Head recommended that Council approve the Emergency Management Department's request to receive grant funding in the amount of \$83,600 through the 2020-2021 Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant Program with the understanding that:

- The grant performance period is from October 1, 2020 through August 31, 2021.
- An in-kind or "soft" match on behalf of the Emergency Management Department is required. The salaries of Emergency Management Department personnel will satisfy the match requirement.

- There are no FTE's or vehicles associated with the above referenced grant program.

Item D:

**2020 Local
Emergency
Management
Performance
Grant (EMD)

Request to
Accept**

County Administrator Bill Tuten and Emergency Management Director Jason Patno provided a report regarding the 2020 Local Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMD). It was stated that through the Charleston County Emergency Management Department is requesting authorization to accept grant funding in the amount of \$91,730 through the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Local Emergency Management Performance Grant Program. Grant funding would be utilized to accomplish the following:

1. Offset the cost of department personnel.
2. Fund various emergency management projects that include but are not limited to; Emergency Operations Center improvements, disaster preparedness outreach, emergency management program enhancement and personnel training.
3. Fund the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) and Teen Community Emergency Response Team (TeenCERT) programs.

FY20 LEMPG Application

ITEM	COST
Personnel	\$40,000
Emergency Management Special Project	\$44,730
Community Emergency Response Team Program	\$7,000
Total	\$91,730

The Charleston County Emergency Management Department is requesting authorization to accept grant funding in the amount of \$31,979 through the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Local Emergency Management Performance Supplemental Grant Program. The supplemental grant this year is earmarked towards COVID-19 Response. Grant funding would be utilized to accomplish the following:

1. Fund the purchase and building expenses for an external refrigeration unit to store COVID-19 vaccinations. This same unit could double as food storage during EOC activations.
2. Fund Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and Cleaning Supplies for hurricane Shelters.

FY20 LEMPG Supplemental Application

ITEM	COST
Refrigeration Unit	\$25,000
PPE & Cleaning Supplies	\$6,979
Total	\$31,979

An in-kind or "soft" match on behalf of the department would be required. Salaries of department personnel associated with the completion of projects identified in the grant scope of work would be used to satisfy the match requirement. There are no FTE's or vehicles associated with the above referenced grant program.

Department Head recommended that Council approve the Emergency Management Department's request to accept grant funding in the amount of \$123,709 through the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Local Emergency Management Performance Grant Program with the understanding that:

- The grant performance period is July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021.
- An in-kind or "soft" match of behalf of the Emergency Management Department is required.
- There are no FTE's or vehicles associated with the above reference.

The previous item was the last item on the Consent Agenda.

The Chairman stated that the next item on the agenda was the Central Park and Riverland Drive Improvements.

**Central Park
Rd and
Riverland
Drive
Intersection
Improvements

Request to
Consider**

A report was furnished by County Administrator Bill Tuten and Public Works Director Steve Thigpen regarding the Central Park Road and Riverland Drive Intersection Improvements Project. It was stated that at the Finance Committee meeting on November 7, 2019, staff recommended moving forward with the design of Alternative 3, and a resolution authorizing the use of eminent domain on Central Park Road and Riverland Drive. Staff made this recommendation after completing 30% design plans on two alternatives in an effort to define the unknown design variables and to minimize their right of way (ROW) impacts. To reach 30% plans, the design team developed drainage plans, refined the multi-use path, reduced lane widths where feasible, and coordinated with utility companies and SCOOT. These additional steps revealed a 30% decrease in ROW needs for Alternative 3, from 2.2 acres to 1.5 acres. The ROW needs for Alternative 1 remained the same, 0.7 acres.

While Alternative 3 still has the largest impacts on right of way even with the 30% reduction, statistics show it is still the safest option. Roundabouts reduce injuries by 88% compared to a traffic signal, which reduces injuries by 54%. Alternative 3 also removes 6 less grand live oaks. The cost difference between the two alternatives is approximately 5% ranging from \$4.1 Million for Alternative 1 to \$4.3 Million for Alternative 3.

The item was discussed at the Finance Committee on November 21, 2019, and Senator Senn requested time to speak about her concerns with the project. She asked Council to please allow 90 days for the SCDOT to review the project and options and to provide input and Council approved her request.

On February 7, 2020, SCDOT provided a formal response and preliminary concepts which included another concept for consideration. In order to provide a reasonable comparison with this concept and the other two alternatives under consideration, a traffic study would need to be performed and 30% plans should be developed to quantify right-of-way impacts, tree impacts, and construction costs. Another public information meeting may also be needed.

Staff's recommendation to move forward with Alternative 3 is still pending. Once Council has reviewed and discussed the SCDOT's response and additional preliminary concept, staff requests Council provide direction on a path forward.

Department Head requested that Council provide staff with a director on a path forward.

Mrs. Honeycutt moved that Council approve moving forward with the design of Alternative 3 and adopt a resolution authorizing the use of eminent domain on Central Park Road and Riverland Drive. Mr. Moody seconded the motion.

Mr. Pryor asked if Council would be going against the wishes of the community, which wanted to set up a traffic light and sidewalks, which was a project Mrs. Honeycutt had talked to him about, as well.

Mrs. Honeycutt stated that those projects are already included in the plan for Alternative 3.

Mr. Pryor stated that it was his understanding that the community did not want the dog bone and that Senator Senn had proposed an alternative that included a turn lane and sidewalks, which the community does support and he thought the proposal today would be to add the sidewalks into that project.

Ms. Johnson stated that the community does not think the dog bone was the best option because it fails during peak traffic time at school drop off and pick up. She also said it was dangerous for pedestrians and bikers to cross the street because there is no opportunity to stop in a roundabout. She added that the DOT's corridor management information recommends a traffic light.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked Project Manager Devri Detoma if staff's recommendation had changed. Ms. Detoma stated that staff recommendation of Alternative 3 still stands, but at Senator Senn's request, action on Alternative 3 had been deferred to allow the SCDOT to weigh in on the alternatives. She stated that the new project proposed by the DOT mimics the original plan from 2013. She added that the City would not give municipal consent back then due to the number of trees the project impacted.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked if by referring to the project as a "dog bone" the project was actually two roundabouts connected by a median. Ms. Detoma stated that was correct.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked if Ms. Detoma was aware if DOT had just installed a roundabout at the intersection of Riverland and Camp Roads near this project. Ms. Detoma stated that the DOT had constructed a roundabout at that intersection.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked if there had been two public meetings to solicit public input on this project. Ms. Detoma stated there had been a public meeting in the community and another public meeting in Council Chambers.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked what the results of the data received from those public meetings was. Ms. Detoma stated that the first time 70% of respondents preferred Alternative 3 and the second time 53-54% of the respondents preferred Alternative 3. She added that the second time about 43% preferred Alternative 1 and the remaining respondents preferred a no build option.

Mrs. Honeycutt stated that it had been mentioned that the DOT had approved this new concept and asked if the DOT had any conflict with Alternative 3. Ms. Detoma stated that the DOT did not have any conflict with Alternative 3.

Mr. Pryor asked, regarding the survey, what the preference was for the people in the project area. Ms. Detoma stated that the data was not broken down in that manner because it was difficult to determine how to define project area for this purchase, but staff had produced heat maps to show where votes were condensed in different areas. Ms. Detoma displayed the heat maps.

Chairman Summey asked why the City would not give municipal consent to the original project. Ms. Detoma stated they objected to the number of trees impacted by the project, but that was when federal funds were attached to the project and also the City's leadership had changed since then and she was not sure where the City stood now.

Chairman Summey asked if it was the policy of the County to ask for municipal consent on road construction projects. Mr. Dawson stated that Council had agreed to those terms in its intergovernmental agreements.

Chairman Summey asked if the City would give municipal consent on any of the projects. Ms. Detoma stated that the City wrote a letter supporting Alternative 3 in 2018, but there was no indication of their support for the project in real time.

Chairman Summey asked how engaged the City had been in the development of this project. Ms. Detoma stated that she has been ensuring the City's Director of Transportation is aware of the project status, but he had given no indication of the City's position on the project.

Drawing attention back to the heat map, Mr. Pryor asked what the map showed. Ms. Detoma stated that it showed people who lived right at the intersection generally supported Alternative 1. Mr. Pryor asked if the people who supported Alternative 3 lived outside the area and travelled through.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked if the highest density area in support of Alternative 3 was within 100 yards of the intersection. Ms. Detoma confirmed that was correct. Mrs. Honeycutt asked if it was safe to say the people who were in dark purple also lived very close to the project area. Ms. Detoma stated that was fair and that she would say the darkest purple area looked like it was in the Woodland Shores area.

Mr. Pryor stated that the same residents of Woodland Shores did not want a turn lane and traffic light in their neighborhood, but now wanted to force a dog bone in this other neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson stated that the County had been working to get this project approved for at least three years where they had been going back and forth between the different alternatives and there was a struggle between whether to focus importance on the trees, the land, or the people. She added that Council did not seem to be considering those who live nearest the intersection. Ms. Johnson stated that she would like Council to come to a decision because it has been dragged out for a long time because the intersection is not safe. Ms. Johnson stated that she finds it ironic that the traffic in Woodland Shores needs to be improved and the intersection at Maybank Highway and Riverland Drive needs to be improved as well, but those projects are not approved because of the community input and protection of the trees. She added that this project in the African-American community is approved against the community's wishes and

that's not fair. It's not that the citizens don't want safety. They want safety, but they also want to protect their land.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked Ms. Detoma to confirm that the land affected by the encroachment of the roundabout was vacant. Ms. Detoma confirmed that was correct. Mrs. Honeycutt asked Ms. Detoma to confirm that there were no houses that came close to that area. Ms. Detoma stated that was correct. Mrs. Honeycutt asked if adding a light would result in an occupied home that someone currently lives in being torn down. Ms. Detoma confirmed that was correct. Mrs. Honeycutt asked if the new stop light project would result in the pole from a stop light being placed in an owner's front yard. Ms. Detoma stated that was correct. Mrs. Honeycutt asked how many times in the past the County had placed a stop light at a 3-way intersection of residential homes. Ms. Detoma stated she had looked into that and could not find another instance of that occurring.

Mr. Pryor stated that constructing the roundabout does not make sense because it is not the safest option and that the project would take the road closer to a number of houses. He added that the County opposed roundabouts in Park West and Orange Grove Road because the residents did not want it and this neighborhood deserves that same respect.

Mr. Rawl asked Ms. Detoma what the current safety status was. Ms. Detoma stated she was not aware of the number of accidents since the original study for this project had been done, but when they looked at it during project development, there were 22 collisions in a 3 year period. Mr. Rawl asked Ms. Detoma what instigated the need to improve the intersection. Ms. Detoma stated that the City of Charleston asked for it with the 2016 Sales Tax Referendum. She added that there was \$15 million dedicated to James Island and the stakeholders prioritized this intersection, Camp and Fort Johnson, Secessionville and Fort Johnson, and Folly Road sidewalks. Mr. Rawl asked if all the other projects had been completed. Ms. Detoma stated the two intersection projects had, but only a portion of Folly Road sidewalks had been done because of the limited budget and the need to determine how much the Central Park at Riverland project would cost before moving forward with another segment of sidewalks on Folly Road.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked Ms. Detoma if the road within the roundabout encroached outside the existing right-of-way. Ms. Detoma stated the only area outside of the existing right-of-way was a small triangle portion of land near the school. Mrs. Honeycutt stated that she wanted to make sure the term failed is being correctly used and asked if the roundabout would have a level C service only during school peak hours. Ms. Detoma stated that was correct, and that when traffic engineers plan for 20 years, they look for a level C or better so this was not a failure. Mrs. Honeycutt asked if the safety aspect of a roundabout is that there is not a turn point of contact because everyone has to turn right in the roundabout. Ms. DeToma stated that was correct as well as the cars are travelling at a much slower speed.

South Carolina State Senator Sandy Senn stated that it has been an honor working with Council for the past four years and she wished luck to the two Councilmembers who would be leaving in January 2021. She stated that in 2012 the Department of Transportation had approved a traffic light at this intersection and, while the County had never placed a traffic light in a similar setting, the DOT had and recommended it here. Senator Senn stated that in 2012 there were about 11 trees that would be impacted; however, in the newer version there will be only 8 trees impacted, one of which is a gum tree, two of which are dead or dying, and one of which can likely be avoided. She stated

that it is not fair to say that the City may not approve if the City asked for safety to occur in that area. She added that a no build option would be the worst possible outcome. She stated that since the intersection had been bush hogged at the beginning of the school year, people had started to make their own turn lane at this intersection by just driving between the 2 trees so now there is a beaten down path that allows traffic to flow a little better. She stated that the real danger in this area is that people are constantly stopping to let other drivers cross the traffic and someone is not expecting the traffic to be stopped and collides with the car in front of them. She added that since DOT had this project funded in 2012, DOT likely had it on their radar for 10 years as an intersection in need of help. Senator Senn stated that the reason why the citizens do not want the dog bone is because it costs \$2 million, which could go to Folly Road sidewalks, but it also ruins the neighborhood where people have lived for generations. She added that the one house that will be impacted by the traffic light scenario will have to come down eventually as 1/3 of the house, at no fault of the landowner who was given a permit, is situated illegally in a DOT right-of-way. The traffic light would be the best option. She stated that the construction of the Mark Clark will come about 500 feet of that area which may solve a lot of the problems and may eviscerate the need for the stop light at all. She stated that the Blake family and their neighbors have asked her to advocate first for the stop light, second for a compromise plan and that Alternative 3 would be the last option before no build.

Mr. Pryor asked if the item could be sent back to staff to coordinate with the City of Charleston to ask which option is preferred. The Chairman stated that would take an amendment to the motion currently on the floor. Mr. Pryor asked if Mrs. Honeycutt would consider an amendment. Mrs. Honeycutt stated that there is a letter from the City of Charleston endorsing Alternative 3 and that she had been working on this project for two years. The letter was in the packet from the very beginning of her time on Council when this project initially began being deferred and there was no need for further delay so she called for the question.

The question being called, the Chairman called for a roll call vote to approve moving forward with the design of Alternative 3 and adopted a resolution authorizing the use of eminent domain on Central Park Road and Riverland Drive. The roll was called and votes recorded as follows:

Darby	- nay
Honeycutt	- aye
Johnson	- nay
Moody	- aye
Pryor	- nay
Rawl	- aye
Sass	- aye
Schweers	- aye
Summey	- nay

The vote being five (5) ayes and four (4) nays, the motion carried.

Mr. Pryor made a motion to remove this item from the Council agenda on November 19, 2020, and move it to the agenda on December 8, 2020. Ms. Johnson seconded the motion.

The Chairman called for a roll call. The roll was called and votes recorded as follows:

Darby	- aye
Honeycutt	- nay
Johnson	- aye
Moody	- nay
Pryor	- aye
Rawl	- nay
Sass	- aye
Schweers	- nay
Summey	- nay

The vote being four (4) ayes and five (5) nays, the motion failed.

Mr. Darby stated he would like to change his vote on the motion to approve Alternative 3 to aye; therefore, the final recorded vote was six (6) ayes and three (3) nays.

The Chairman stated that the next item on the agenda was the Affordable Housing Committee.

**Affordable
Housing
Committee**

A report was provided by the Special Housing Committee under date of November 19, 2020, that it considered the information presented by Housing Task Force Member Josh Dix and the discussion of Committee members.

**Request to
Consider**

The Special Housing Committee recommended that the Finance Committee recommend that Council authorize the Affordable Housing Task Force to reconvene in order to make recommendations to the Special Housing Committee regarding a proposal to assist with workforce and affordable housing to include an ordinance to set up a Housing Trust Fund.

Mr. Rawl moved for the committee recommendation, seconded by Ms. Johnson, and carried.

The Chairman announced that the next item on the agenda was proposed Financial Incentives for International Longshoremen’s Association. The Chairman recused himself from participating in this item stating a conflict of interest due to a former contractual relationship with the ILA for expansion at another site. He turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Moody to chair.

**Financial
Incentives for
International
Longshoremen’s
Association**

**Request to
Approve**

A report was furnished by County Administrator Bill Tuten and Economic Development Director Steve Dykes regarding financial incentives for International Longshoremen’s Association. It was stated that The International Longshoremen’s Association (ILA), Local 1422 in Charleston has grown dramatically in recent years, and is projected to double in size over the next 18 months, in sync with the Port of Charleston expansion. ILA, Local 1422 is gearing up for future demands created by the cruise industry, military work at Joint Base Charleston (pre-positioned ships), the automobile industry (particularly BMW and Volvo), and the opening of the new Leatherman Container Terminal at the former Navy Base (which will also feature 24-hour barge service from Wando Terminal).

In fall 2019, the Economic Development Director began conversations with representatives of the ILA, Local 1422 concerning their purchase and re-development of property at 4349 Corporate Road in North Charleston. The organization had reached a decision to sell their long-standing headquarters location at 1142 Morrison Drive. Given its size and centrality (near I-26 and I-526), they favored the Corporate Road site as their future headquarters to serve their vast tri-county membership.

In December 2019, ILA, Local 1422 acquired the Corporate Rd. property and have commenced their investment of over \$20 million to improve the property and upfit the current structures. Having outgrown the footprint and building at Morrison Drive, this new site offers enhanced availability for parking and a state-of-the art headquarters complex to accommodate the needs of the over 2,500 ILA members who will report daily for work assignments.

In recognition of the unique and instrumental role that ILA, Local 1422, plays in the daily success of the Port of Charleston operations, the Economic Development Director committed to assist this new headquarters project with a \$140,000 infrastructure and site development grant to help offset a portion of the earthwork, drainage improvements and other site development expenses. This grant will be administered by the Economic Development Department on a reimbursable basis upon receipt of proper documentation expenditures made upon eligible cost items.

Department Head recommended that Council approve a \$140,000 Economic Development Fund infrastructure and site development grant to be utilized for the use of the International Longshoremen's Association, Local 1422, to offset a portion of the drainage improvements and other site development expenses at their new headquarters at 4349 Corporate Road with the understanding that this grant is to be administered by the Economic Development Department on a reimbursable basis upon receipt of proper invoices and documentation.

Mr. Pryor moved for the Department Head recommendation, seconded by Ms. Johnson.

Mr. Moody stated that he had a hard time understanding why this organization needed this handout. He stated from a financial standpoint, the ILA must be strong as they only took out an \$800,000 loan on this \$10.5 million dollar property so they put down over \$9 million on this purchase. He added that the ILA was going to make this move with or without the economic development incentives.

Mr. Pryor stated that Firefly Distillery got similar incentives when it moved from Johns Island to North Charleston and Council supported it. He stated that it is not about the finances, but doing what is right.

Mrs. Honeycutt asked Mr. Dykes if the International Longshoremen's Association employs people. Mr. Dykes stated that he is unsure. Mr. Dykes stated that this was an effort to help an organization that supports the port and the port is the engine for growth statewide. He stated that, in addition to this incentive, the Legal Department helped with title and easement searches. His department also assisted with looking into adding parking and the drainage impacts with the City of North Charleston. Mr. Dykes stated that he looked at the grant and decided it was appropriate for Charleston County to lend a hand in 25% of the cost of the site work. He stated that in the last 15 years, Charleston

County has brought 14 grants in and 9 of those were site development grants. Mrs. Honeycutt added that she struggled with this project when there is no funding to help to rehabilitate the Joseph Floyd Manor.

Mr. Schweers asked Mr. Dykes if the state is allocating any resources to this move. Mr. Dykes stated that the state was not asked to be involved.

Mr. Pryor stated that this project is no different from when Charleston County gave \$350,000 to install a traffic signal at the Cummings expansion. That grant was based on allowing people to safely go in and out of the plant. He added that regarding Joseph Floyd Manor, the state does not allow Economic Development funds to be used for housing, but he was quite sure Mr. Dykes would extend a grant for that project.

International Longshoremen's Association President Kenneth Riley stated that the port is the economic engine and the ILA is the fuel to the engine. Without the bargaining power of the International Longshoremen's Association, the economic impact would not be available. He stated that if the International Longshoremen's Association is not able to move and expand, the port and the state will suffer. The site gives the International Longshoremen's Association the potential for growth, but the ILA had also considered expanding to sites in Savannah. The North Charleston site gave them easy access to both Charleston and Savannah and the demand is high for their current building on Morrison Drive. Mr. Riley stated that in addition to this expansion, he wished the International Longshoremen's Association could improve the side road near their property because over 3,000 trucks will be coming in and out of the new site and Bridge View Drive is already crowded sometimes due to its proximity to the boat landing.

Mr. Sass asked Mr. Riley if they plan on hiring more staff. Mr. Riley stated that they have already brought on an additional 2500 more people to support the expansion.

Mr. Sass stated that the side road is very narrow and built through a marsh and it would be a very expensive proposition to expand it.

Ms. Johnson stated that years ago there were efforts to widen and deepen the port to allow larger ships through. She asked Mr. Riley if there was an increase in employees in order to accommodate the new work. Mr. Riley stated Ms. Johnson was correct.

Mr. Darby stated that he did not understand why some Councilmembers were questioning this project.

The Vice Chairman called for a roll call vote. The roll was called and votes recorded as follows:

Darby	- aye
Honeycutt	- aye
Johnson	- aye
Moody	- nay
Pryor	- aye
Rawl	- aye
Sass	- aye
Schweers	- nay
Summey	- abstain

The vote being six (6) ayes, two (2) nays, and one (1) abstention. The Vice Chairman declared the motion had carried.

The Chairman stated there was a need for Executive Session to discuss personnel matters.

Mr. Moody moved to enter Executive Session. Mrs. Honeycutt seconded the motion, and carried.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would enter into Executive Session.

At the conclusion of the Executive Session, the Chairman stated that the Committee had returned from Executive Session and that no action or votes had been taken during Executive Session.

There being no further business to come before the Body, the Chairman declared the meeting to be adjourned.

Kristen L. Salisbury
Clerk of Council