

AMENDED
ANDERSON COUNTY COUNCIL
ANDERSON, SOUTH CAROLINA
Regular Meeting – May 6, 2003 - 6:00 p.m.
Linda N. Gilstrap, Clerk to Council

M I N U T E S

All area newspapers, radio stations and television stations were informed of this meeting in compliance with guidelines set forth in the *Freedom of Information Act*.

PRESENT

Chairman William C. Dees – District #6, Presiding
G. Fred Tolly – District #1
Gracie S. Floyd - District #2
Vice Chairman Larry E. Greer – District #3
Clint Wright – District #4
Mike Holden – District #5
M. Cindy Wilson – District #7
Joey Preston – Administrator
Tom Martin – County Attorney
Linda N. Gilstrap – Clerk to Council
Tammie Shealy - Deputy Clerk to Council

(During times of discussion and presentations the minutes are condensed and paraphrased.)

The official meeting of the Anderson County Council convened in the Council Chambers of the Historic Courthouse on Tuesday, May 6, 2003 at 6:00 p.m.

Chairman Bill Dees called the meeting to order and welcomed all present. Ms. Cindy Wilson gave the invocation and everyone stood and pledged allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

On the motion of Mr. Mike Holden, seconded by Ms. Cindy Wilson, Council voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the April 15, 2003 meeting as mailed.

Chairman Dees read Resolution #R2003-033 – a resolution recognizing and honoring Ms. Sallie Burr for her service to her community and Anderson County while serving as President of the Chambert Forrest Clean Sweep Partnership; and other matters related thereto. Mr. Larry E. Geer moved to ratify the resolution and Mr. Wright seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Chairman Dees presented Resolution #R2003-027 – a resolution recognizing and honoring Vicki Campbell-Howell for her selection as the Volunteer of the Year by the South Carolina Victim Assistant Network; and other matters related thereto. Mr. Greer moved to approve and Mr. Tolly seconded. Vote was unanimous. Mr. Greer read the entire resolution into the record and the framed resolution was presented to Ms. Howell. Council members commended Ms. Howell for her outstanding efforts to aid victims and their families.

Chairman Dees recognized Wesley Sattler, a Boy Scout from Troop 210 from Powdersville.

Chairman Dees thanked the American Legion Post 14 on Greenville, Howard Goodson who provided the County, free of charge, the cloth banners. Chairman Dees also thanked Mr. Greg Phillips and Ms. Debbie Hawkins of the Soft Touch Laundry and Cleaners for pressing the banners at no charge to the County.

Ms. Gracie S. Floyd asked that the County sponsor a Memorial Day Celebration at the Veteran's Monument this year. She asked Mr. Preston to try and arrange the celebration.

Chairman Dees announced that on Monday, May 12, 2003 at 6 p.m. there would be a memorial service sponsored by the FOP Lodge #10 Honors – America's 147 Fallen Officers who fell in 2002. The service will be held at the new Courthouse. May 15, 2003 is National Police Memorial Day in America.

On the motion of Ms. Wilson, seconded by Chairman Dees, Council voted unanimously to approve a Proclamation to declare May 2003 as Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month. Chairman Dees read the entire proclamation into the record.

On the motion of Chairman Dees, seconded by Mr. Tolly, Council voted unanimously to approve the week of May 18, 2003 as National Public Works Week in Anderson County. Council commended all the public works employees present from the County and the City for their outstanding dedication to the County of Anderson.

Chairman Dees read the title of Resolution #R2003-032 – a resolution recognizing and honoring Anderson County native Ruth Marie Tolly-Milliman for bringing recognition to Anderson County, the State of South Carolina and the United States by competing in and finishing second in the "Marathon Des Sables" in northern Africa; and other matters related thereto. Ms. Cindy Wilson moved to approve and Mr. Mike Holden seconded. Vote was unanimous. Chairman Dees read the resolution into the record and then presented a framed copy of the resolution to Ms. Milliman. Council commended Ms. Milliman for her outstanding achievement.

Mr. Bob Strother gave a brief update on the services of the Appalachian Council of Governments. He stated that the County's annual investment in the Appalachian COG is \$74,948 and the return to Anderson County on that investment in 2002 was \$10,960,661 – a return on investment ratio of \$146 to \$1. He explained additional services to Anderson County during 2002 and explained coming up projects during 2003. Council received as information.

Ms. Floyd announced that Anderson County would be hosting the May Council of Governments meeting on May 23 at the Anderson County Library.

Citizens Agenda: Mr. Ed Brickman urged Council to accept the Planning Commissions' changes to Stonehaven Subdivision. He said one change is I-1 to I-2 for the areas between Dunn and Dixon Roads and the railroad tracks. I-2 requires that various impacts studies be taken and analyzed. This would insure the health of the people and the environment in the surrounding areas. Ms. Margaret Gray referenced a change on a parcel of land on the Chateau Road near the Old Pearman Dairy Road. Currently it is classified R20 and a request has been received for RD-Residential Duplexes. Currently the planning staff has recommended that the frontage of the property be left zoned R-20 and recommends that the back could be zoned for duplexes. She asked that Council consider the parcel remain as R-20 as single-family residential homes like the rest of the subdivision. Ms. Elizabeth Gibson and Mr. Eric Vickery both asked that Council consider lowering the speed limit from 35 to 25 miles per hour on Paulan Road. It was determined after the traffic survey that traffic is traveling 55 mph. Mr. Bruce Stapleton explained to council the impact of the reassessment on his property on Lake Hartwell. He said that in 1997 his taxes went up 12%. It is now assessed at \$140,330 now according to the reassessment notice his property

has increased by 104% to \$284,080. He said that as a retired person on a fixed income this would be impossible for him to pay. He asked council to look into the increase. Mr. David Burriss a realtor, developer and commercial appraiser in Anderson spoke to council regarding a parcel of land on Whitehall Road. He said most of the concerns were traffic related and property value related. He said that the 4.8 area tract of land will have a maximal effect on the traffic when the real concern is that the when almost every major route coming in from the west of Anderson is a two-lane road. He said that he had studied property values, which co-exist with residential attached developments, and he has not seen any real negative impact on property values. Ms. Jeanie Smith asked Council to consider lowering the speed limit sign on Paulan Road. Mr. Ricky Whitlock asked Council to adopt an ordinance to help taxi drivers in the County to recoup payment from citizens who refuse payment. He said that the city had an ordinance. Mr. Bill Brock said that the County's present EMS providers system has been in existence for almost 40 years. He said that Council's QRV proposal was fantastic. He requested that the present providers be allowed to present proposals to be considered. Mr. Edward Evans of Hartwell Ridge said that he hopes to hear that Council will not use reassessment as an opportunity to do more taxing and spending. He urged council to keep in mind the citizens in the county who are on fixed incomes and he asked Council to curb spending for things not essential. Mr. Gregory Sears spoke on behalf of the County QRV program presented in the county budget. He said there were two options – MedShore or County individual agencies running it. The funding for the individual agencies are two-fold – collections for treatments/transport and county funding. He said no squad can survive on treatments/transport nor can they survive on county funding only. He said that the treatments/transport and the county funding must go hand in hand. Mr. Dan Harvell said that everyone received their reassessment notices and he hoped that council would be giving some assurance to the citizens to do the right thing concerning the budget. He said that in the list of on-going projects as well as completed projects; the County has spent \$514,000 on Erwin Road in Starr. He said that many members of the Taxpayers Association had questioned the need of the road and they were told that it would relieve the congestion at the middle school. He said they received reports of little traffic on the road so they did their own investigation and found that it was not used that much. He said they have a hard time understanding things like this.

Chairman Dees read third reading title of Ordinance #2003-014- an ordinance amending Section 50-96 of the Anderson Code of Ordinances pertaining to additional requirements for individual mobile home; and other matters relating thereto. Mr. Greer moved to approve on third and final reading and Ms. Wilson seconded. Council discussed. Ms. Floyd moved to amend the motion that this only applies in the event of a medical necessity or for a caregiver. Ms. Wilson seconded. Council discussed. Mr. Greer moved to amend the motion to insert the word "annually" (The section will read: Section 1 – second paragraph "For residential occupancy only, and where certified by a physician for medical necessity or for a caregiver, a mobile home and a house or two mobile homes may occupy one lot subject to DHEC approval, if not restricted by deed. Exception: On large tracts of ten acres or more, two mobile homes on ten acres and one additional mobile home on each additional ten acres will be permitted without a variance." Vote was unanimous. Mr. Greer moved to amend the amendment by inserting the word "annually". (The section to be inserted will read - and where annually certified by a physician for a medical necessity or for a caregiver. Mr. Wright seconded. Vote on the amendment was unanimous. Vote on the original ordinance as amended was unanimous.

Council recessed for 10 minutes at this time (7:35 p.m.). Chairman Dees called the meeting back to order.

Chairman Dees read the title for second reading of Ordinance #2003-010 – an ordinance amending Ordinance #99-004, the Anderson County Zoning Ordinance, as adopted July 20, 1999, by amending the Anderson County Official Zoning Map to adopt a zoning map in the Centerville A Voting Precinct. A public hearing was held and the following people expressed their views: Mr. Bob Snider, speaking for the residents of Gilmer Estates, said that on March 13 a meeting was held to discuss the changes to the Centerville A Zoning Map. At that time orange forms (zoning map change forms) were given to make known their desire to change the proposed zoning of the afford mentioned property from RM-1 to R-20. The outcome of the 133 forms turned in was: 132 in favor of R-20 or R-40, and 1 in favor of RM-1 zoning. On April 8, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission; and citizens vocalized their concerns that the property be zoned R-20. They came to find out that the opinions expressed on the orange forms that “would speak for themselves,” were not true. Mr. Ricketson brought before the Planning Commission that the property be zoned RM-1 – ignoring the voice of the community. He urged council to vote the property R-20. Mr. Frank Osika of Hilldale Drive of the Dunhill Community asked Council to consider changing the section zoned R-20 (which is east of Hilldale) to the Industrial Zone. They feel that if their property is at least zoned industrial the values will remain the same or maybe improve with time. Mr. Edward Evans said that Quail Ridge Road, Partridge and Bobwhite are all at least one acre lots and requested that they be zone R-40. He also addressed the traffic and the growth in the area. Mr. Steve Kirby of Dunhill asked what kind of buffer would exist between their single-family homes and the apartments or duplexes. He also asked what kind of impact this would have on their sewer system. No further comments the public hearing was declared closed. Ms. Wilson moved to approve the ordinance on second reading and Mr. Holden seconded. Mr. Holden moved to amend the motion to change the property designation at the entrance of Gilmer Estates to R-20. Mr. Tolly seconded. Vote was unanimous. Mr. Holden moved to change the property designation for the entire property off Chantilly Woods going into Chateau Woods be zoned R-20. Mr. Tolly seconded and vote was unanimous. Mr. Holden moved that the property designation for the property located on Whitehall Road and the corner of Kisler Road is changed to R-A (110 Acres). Mr. Tolly seconded and vote was unanimous. Mr. Holden moved to change the property designation on Dixon Road past Dunhill Subdivision from R-20 to RM-1. Ms. Wilson seconded and vote was unanimous. Mr. Wright said that he thought the request to change the property designation for a portion of land near Hilldale be addressed later because of certain questions regarding vacant lots that needed to be resolved. Vote on the original motion as amended was unanimous.

Mr. Dees read the title for second reading of Ordinance #2003-016 – Proposed Anderson County Budget for fiscal year 2003-2004. A public hearing was held. The following individuals spoke: Ms. Bennie Sue West asked about the purpose of rental fees on page 63 in the amount of \$200,715. She asked if it was for new employees. Mr. Charles Crowe said that he was concerned that the county may be taking advantage of this reassessment year and increasing property values to the tune (according to press) of 2.7 million dollars. He asked if the state law, relating to reassessment years, in preparing a budget has been followed on increasing revenues. He also asked if any new services had been added. He said that according to the proposed budget the county is paying \$3,222,821 for health insurance for employees. He asked if the staff searched around for a better price. He also said that in the current budget the county borrowed \$1,394,830 for benefits. He said that according to the public notice published the total debt service 13 mils brought in \$7,547,000 why then in the 03-04 budget, 9.4 mils brings in \$7,600,000? He asked that under the Summary of Revenues 02-03 \$3,690,860 counted from the fund balance and this year there is no fund balance in the budget. Why was the Sheriff's budget pulled out and lined as an item all by itself? Account #100-104 in the summary of Revenue – Fee-in-lieu of Taxes – the

County received almost a million dollars in the proposed budget. He asked why it wasn't included in the last budget. Ms. Peggy Taylor said that she wanted to destroy a myth that the members Taxpayers Association do not believe in taxes – she said that they do because taxes are a necessary part of the government. She said that she had a problem with how the county's tax dollars are being spent. Law enforcement, roads and bridges should be a priority in the budget. In 2000, Moreland and Associates did a study and found that \$71,000,000 was needed to fix 18 county roads and replace 38 bridges. She said that the County continues to budget roads that are not needed such as the Starr By-pass, which cost \$514,000. She said that the County has a bridge engineer with a salary of \$50,000-\$70,000 with a budget of \$100,000. She complained and said believes they are not good a steward with the county money. She said that the County borrowed \$1.3 million for pay raises. Mr. Joey Preston asked Ms. Peggy Taylor why they think the County has borrowed money for pay raises. She said that it came from him and he then asked her to show him in the budget where it shows that the county borrowed the money for pay raises. She suggested that the Council freeze raises for one year and evaluate jobs, illuminate the "slush fund", consolidate the park police, and put under the Sheriff's office. She said that the budget last year was \$98,000,000 and this year \$88,000,000.

A few meetings back, Mr. Greer stated that the last budget was not \$91,000,000. Mr. Dan Harvell said there are a great number of County roads that do not have the white lines and then makes it difficult to drive at night or when it is raining. Also a lot of these roads that feed into major arteries does not have stop ahead signs. He said less than 2 years ago, members of the Tax Payers association went over the budget line by line and recommended to Council ways to cut the budget. Since 1997 the county budgets have grown from approximately \$30,000,000 to \$90,000,000, he said. While the county has experienced considerable growth through the years that boosted the tax cafés allowing such sending to take place, this near expedient growth and spending has put the County taxpayers in a precarious situation, he said. Less than two years ago, the members of the Tax Payers Association carefully went over the budget and then presented to county council ways to cut the budget and based on the recommendation he suggested that Council could drop \$3,000,000 more off of their recommendation. He said the average citizen in Anderson County cannot afford excessive tax bills. Mr. Harvell also complained about transfers being reported to County Council according to County ordinance. Ms. Pat Hasenfuss said that she heard that the Council would not answer any questions and she asked how citizens could get the answers. Mr. Preston said that after he gets a verbatim transcript he would respond to the questions. The public hearing was declared closed. Mr. Tolly moved to approve the budget ordinance #2003-016. Ms. Wilson said that she only received the ordinance the day before and has not had time to study. However, everywhere she looks it appears to be a tax increase for the citizens of the County. She said she could not support a budget with a tax increase. She talked about the legal costs that the County pays. She said that if Council does justice for the people of Anderson, Council must take a look at the budget and cut all unnecessary expenses. Mr. Greer said he wanted to clear up a misconception regarding remarks made about insurance and retirement. He said that the County does not pay for his insurance and other members of Council. He said that Anderson County was required by the State of South Carolina to pay the employees portion of retirement and the proposed budget does not include merit and pay raises for employees this year. He said that if citizens did not like their reassessment figures they could appeal it. **Mr. William Dees:** "Thank you, uh, as the chairman I'd also like to tell you that I paid in the South Carolina State Police Retirement 34 years 5 months and twenty days I didn't count it, they did. And I appreciate every dime I get back. I paid my own health insurance. That's it. And like Mr. Greer said, the state of South Carolina requires the county, not just this county, all the counties, as far as I know, to pay the employer's portion of the retirement into the retirement system. Didn't do me a bit of good. Wish it did. I'd have about thirty-nine years now."

But in any event, uh, I will not vilify any reporter, uh; if the reporter made a mistake, that's his, you believe it, that's you. I know what I said and that's it. Thank you. Any other comments from Council."

Mr. Clint Wright said that he expected people to appeal their reassessment; however he has the utmost confidence in the Assessor and his appraisers. He said that we are spending less money this year than we did last year. Mr. Holden also said that if citizens were unhappy with the reassessment that the appeals process was in place for that. Mr. Joey Preston said that no one could answer EVERY question regarding the budget. Mr. Preston asked Ms. Wilson what she meant about budget transfers. She said that in the Legal consulting account in #5013 (Administrator's Budget) it was budgeted at a quarter of a million for legal consulting and at six months. And looking at the weekly general ledger account – the Administrator's department continues to pay substantial legal bills. She asked how the County was able to pay above a quarter of a million for legal fees without reported transfers. He asked Ms. Wilson to give him the specifics; and he will give her detailed answers.

Mr. Preston: "Mr. Chairman, thank you for that, now I want to talk a little about the situation with the state of South Carolina it is 2.7 million dollars and then I'm going to have um Ms. Smith if you like she can come up and explain the revenue side which is what Mr. Greer was talking about earlier the revenue budget the expense budget. What Mr. Greer said tonight was absolutely true. Now in what was happening and what was transpiring along the way. The state of South Carolina, you got, I going to try to break it down and to make it simple and Nick told me to do exactly what I did a few minutes, a few minutes, ago. Nick's a reporter with the Independent-Mail has been writing these articles. It's for the uh for the tv camera. You got three, you got, three different sources of revenue that comes into the tax pot. There's the manufacturing part of it, which we won't know until probably til the fall until the department of revenue sends us our numbers from, from the state. We don't know. There's the vehicle tax part of that which is what Anna Marie and Gina have been working with to try and figure out what this ratchet down is going to do and how much money that's going to generate, or not generate. Then there's the real estate piece of this pie. You mix all that together. What we're coming with, coming out with is is that if you look at the amount of money we have lost or no longer receive from vehicle taxes to date this doesn't include what's going to happen next year, and we this was a coincidence we talked about this today, but it is about 2.7 million dollars. That's what we've lost. That's what the state of South Carolina because of the referendum that the general assembly allowed people to vote on and get people a choice to select whether or not they wanted to pay vehicle taxes or not, or to cut their vehicle taxes. That will decrease our revenue by 2.7 million dollars. Next year it will probably be closer to about 700 thousand dollars too. Add that to it. It's gone it's permanently gone; we'll never have that money at all. From here on out. If you look at what has been proposed to be recovered through the reassessment process which I don't like any more than any one than any of you, it's 2.7 million dollars. I think we've, we've worked as hard as we possibly can we've, we've developed a budget the best budget that we can put before you. And I, we can we can probably go through and nickel and dime it and what you'll going to end up with is still about a 2.7 million dollar deficit. Because of that vehicle tax roll back. Now, Clint today you mentioned to me about you talked about the reassessment process and what all's going to happen. And Tom correct me if I'm wrong but I'm going to try and keep it simple and not get too complicated, but when all these numbers come in, in the fall we don't really know what they're going to be yet, we have a good idea but we're not sure. When they all come in, in the fall and everything is calculated then that levy that 75 mil levy which is what's proposed for this budget will roll back but it will come back to where it's needed in order to provide that revenue that was lost as result of the vehicle tax loss or ratchet down. What

has happened, what has happened and we've been talking about this year after year after year and you all have heard it and have seen it and counties are experiencing this all across the state, school districts are going to experience it we sat in here with the department of revenue two weeks ago and met, had every single school district in this county and every municipality but two were represented. They heard what they're going to have to do and they and they saw the situation they understand it. And I don't know what's going to happen on that end. And I can't from a county's perspective we just we have to look at what we're doing. And I know you all get telephone calls about school taxes too, more than likely those school taxes are going to go up. But I can't stand here and, and, and, and say that recommend that we place on the back of county government services the burden that schools are going to have to encounter. I don't like it any more than anyone else in this room, but I don't know what, what another answer is and that and that is to go is to recover this growth in through reassessment but it is because of the South Carolina general assembly. Yes it is absolutely."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "No, not all."

Mr. Mike Holden: "I agree that most of it is."

Mr. Joey Preston: "They have put us in this position; and Mr. Dees we've talked about this before. Revenue shortfalls in this county are not a result of our local economy. It's a result of South Carolina tax policy. You can analyze it to death you can see what we have lost in state aided subdivisions what's been cut: vehicle tax cuts, video poker cuts. If, if they had just left vehicle taxes alone, and taken the state aided subdivisions the way they've done it and done away with uh, video poker, this wouldn't be an issue tonight. And what I'd like to do at this point is to turn it over to, to Gina to, to explain the revenue side."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Mr. Chairman, May I ask a question please, for clarification."

Mr. William Dees: "Ms. Wilson."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Yes sir, thank you. Mr. Preston what did you say about a loss in vehicle tax of share coming from the state what, what is the difference you said there?"

Mr. Joey Preston: "Cumulative, 2.7 million to date."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Cumulative, but how many years does that involve?"

Mr. Joey Preston: "Two and a half."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "That's actually two and a half years and that's actually cumulative, cumulative through the end of FY 04. So, so through the 03-04."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Because the difference according to the summary of revenues between um, what was sent last year (figure not clear on tape) and this year anticipated um, 3,341,625 is 925,780 and the cut to local government funds from uh, while this year the, the budget for local government funds was 7,782,140 minus the 7,549,355. So we, we didn't get cut too badly from local government funds, we do have almost a million dollar difference to the negative in vehicle taxes for this year."

Mr. Joey Preston: "Ms. Smith can answer that. But she was going to do that in the revenue answer."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "Ms. Wilson, I believe what you're looking at is the actual difference between the 02-03 budgeted revenues for vehicle taxes and the projected 03-04 revenues for vehicle taxes. Uh, the 2.7 million dollars that you continue to hear us talk about the loss that is a true loss, that is revenue that we would have received if the assessment ratio had remained at the 10.5%. Now, you really got two things going on impacting that revenue and any revenue you've got growth, new construction driving revenues up, you've got other negative impacts driving it down. So the net of those two items is what you're looking at in the budget, the revenue summary sheets. The 2.7 million that we're talking about is revenue that we would have received had it not been for this change in assessment."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "When you factor that in, does that include maybe the local downturn in the economy, and perhaps people aren't buying as many bigger fine cars?"

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "Uh. One thing I do is I, I follow nationwide auto sales. I really look at that more than I do Anderson. I can't find a lot of data for local auto sales. Um, so my theory is as the U.S. goes, so goes South Carolina to a large degree, so goes Anderson County. And I believe if um, I'm not mistaken the year 2000 was a record year for car sales, new car sales,"

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Yeah, it was."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "Okay, um 2001 was very close to being another record year. Those were some peak years, if you'll go look at national auto sale trends. You'll see that we have just come out of a period of peak auto sales. Everything I read tells me that car sales are going to continue to be strong, but not as strong as they were, so I, I think that we've seen a peak in car sales and we're going to start seeing a downturn in new cars coming on. And we have built that into this budget. Did that answer your question? Maybe."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Kind of, sort of. I mean we're dealing with theoretical figures at this point. Thank you."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "But, we, we do try to anticipate, we for certain look at past trends, because that's real good data. You've got that. And then you try to look at the national economy translate that to what's going on locally and in Anderson County and try to anticipate what the future trends will be. And it's always a big challenge."

Ms. M. Cindy Wilson: "Definitely."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "For that, this particular revenue source, or any revenue source."

"Explain that briefly."

Mrs. Gina Humphrey: "Um what I thought I might do and some of this might be review for, for most of you, is just to kind of explain in executive, um, summary of what, what we go through every year when we do sit down and start projecting property tax revenues. That's not the other revenue source that the county has. It's, um, the one I specialize in and I'm thankful it's the only one I have to specialize in, but it is a big part of revenue base. Um, this first thing I do will be to

go to the auditor's office. And any successful revenue projection is going to be based on good relationships. If I can't get good information from other county offices then, then I'm already dead in the water to begin with, so the first thing I do is go to these other county officials and get the data I need to make these projections. The starting point of course is the assessment totals, and the auditor is the owner of that information. Um, if you ever looked at assessment totals, I believe she calls it her month end report, but it's broken out by types of properties, broken out by homes, real estate whether it's rental homes or residential homes, vehicle are broken out, even in that category boats and campers and things of that nature, motorcycles are broken out. So you, you could get very detailed and we do get very detailed in our projections of the various types, but we look at what we know we have as of a certain day this particular I started this back in February I'm sorry first of March so I took the end of February's report I looked at what the assessment totals were as of the end of February. Now this year's extremely interesting year because not only do we have normal growth occurring, this is reassessment year, so that's, that's an additional kind of monkey wrench thrown into the plan. I go category by category and try to project where I think those assessment totals are going to be because that's, that's the underlying tax base. That's the base from which these revenues are derived. Um, I look at homes, stay in contact with Mike Freeman, we talk about new construction, you know you've heard that term several times, New construction basically is new homes that are being constructed and added to the tax base. We have built in new construction, an estimate for that based on what he has as of right now. Reassessment is a big part of that. I think several months ago, Mr. Freeman pulled a sample of reassessed properties to try to calculate what the average increase would be and if I'm not mistaken I think his average his increase turned out to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 22, 23 maybe up to 25%. So looking at that sample, Um, we decided to use 20% in our budget because we felt like that would be conservative. And that's not 20% of the total assessment, that's just a 20% increase of just that type of property. So, what, what the budget is based on is a 20% increase in the assessed value of real estate of homes of what Mike Freeman's office is responsible for. So, I would liken it to a giant puzzle. You start out with a corner piece; and you start adding all the pieces in until you feel like you've got the best, most complete picture you can get. Um, collection rate is another factor in this budget. We have used a 95% collection rate. Um, in previous years, we have used higher collection rates. We have used up to 98% collection rate at one point in time. I'm personally more comfortable with the 95%. We recently had a program written by the MIS department that will allow us to definitively know what the collection rate is. And to my knowledge that something we have never had before. Um, in each year, I try to refine the process. It's a learning process every year. Every year I feel like we get better and better at it, and we try to refine it. Reassessment year is, this is the second reassessment year I have lived through, if you what to called it that. Um, this is my 6th, 7th, 6th year of revenue projections. My personal goal, and no one has really set this for me, but my personal goal is to come within 5%. I want what I projected to be within 5% of actual at year-end. And we've done that every year; we've come very, very, very close a lot of years. So you take all these pieces, you look at past trends, you talk with your peers, you talk with people in various industries. You try to get a feel for where it's going and then you project where it is going. Of course, with reassessment year, the roll back levies come into play and that's a lot of fun to do too because you actually have to calculate a roll back levy for each type of fund that you have. The roll back calculation is just this simple. It is an equation with a numerator and a denominator. The numerator in that equation is prior year revenues, prior year collections for that particular type of fund. We don't know that yet because the actual roll back levies won't be calculated until the fall. At that point in time, the prior year collections will be June 30 2003. So the numerator, we don't know yet. We can guesstimate pretty darn close. The denominator is that equation is assessment, the fall assessment totals, again we don't know that either, we have good idea, but it's fall assessment totals minus new construction.

We don't know that either. So, that's what make this sort of a challenge to me and actually I think it's fun, is that you're dealing with so many unknowns. And I think a lot of people don't really realize that. That when you setting the budget in the spring of the year, you've having to guesstimate, you know make educated guesstimates about where each of these numbers will lie. And if you goofed really bad in any one area it won't be a pretty picture in the fall."

Mr. Tom Martin: "And you don't have any choice as to when to set it."

Ms. Gina Humphrey: "Well, that's correct."

Mr. Tom Martin: "Go ahead and state that."

Ms. Gina Humphrey: "Yeah, you don't, you don't have a choice in that matter. I mean, we are we're mandated by state law to go through the roll back levy calculations. So, it's like pinning Jell-O to a wall, and we do our best with it every year. And I think GOD has shown in us in a lot of ways and has given some, given some people, good relationships, good data. And to me, that's what it's all about, if I didn't have the right relationships, with the right people I may as well go home. If there's any particular question about that, I'll be glad to answer or explain anything else."

Mr. William Dees: "Any of Council have any questions of Ms. Humphrey?"

Mr. Mike Holden: "No, no questions, I just think good presentation."

Mr. Mike Freeman gave a brief explanation of the reassessment and the process. Mr. Tom Martin also explained the reassessment values and the process. Mr. Greer said that he was worried that the County will not be able to recruit industry and commercial growth because the taxes are so high. He said LOUD AND CLEAR that the people of his school district cannot stand anymore taxes. He said that he doesn't like the position that he has been placed in – voting for or against the budget. He said if he votes for the budget, (based on what he sees) he is voting for a tax increase. He said the people, that he represents, will pay more taxes; and it is because of agencies and entities that the council cannot control. As a representative of those people, he resents the County being placed in a position of having to fund state level services with property taxes. Ms. Wilson stated that she has been through the budget and cannot find any mention of the controversial Beaverdam Creek Project. Mr. Holden moved to amend the budget by taking the road-paving budget for all seven district, lump them together, and then divide equally between the seven districts. Mr. Tolly seconded. Council discussed. Mr. Greer called for the question. Mr. Wright seconded the call and vote was unanimous. Vote was two in favor (Holden, Tolly), four opposed (Wilson, Wright, Greer, Dees), and one abstention (Floyd). The amendment made by Mr. Holden failed. Vote on the second reading of the budget was five in favor (Wright, Dees, Holden, Tolly, Floyd) and two opposed (Greer, Wilson). Motion carried.

Council recessed for 5 minutes at this time. Chairman Dees called the meeting back to order

Chairman Dees read the title of Ordinance #2003-020 – an ordinance providing for the regulation of taxicabs and taxicab services in Anderson County, South Carolina; and other matters related thereto. Ms. Floyd and Mr. Martin explained the reason for the taxicab ordinance and explained that the title was all that was completed at this time. Ms. Floyd moved to approve the ordinance on first reading by title only and Mr. Holden seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Chairman Dees read title of Ordinance #2003-018 – an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of an agreement between Anderson County, South Carolina and Fraenkische USA, LP for granting certain infrastructure credits to Fraenkische USA, LP. Mr. Tolly moved to approve on first reading and Mr. Greer seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Chairman Dees read title of Ordinance #2003-019 – an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement between Anderson County, South Carolina, as lessor, and Fraenkische USA, LP: and other matters relating thereto including without limitation, payment of a fee in lieu of taxes. On the motion of Mr. Tolly, seconded by Mr. Greer, Council voted unanimously to approve on first reading.

Chairman Dees read title of Resolution #R2003-031 – a resolution approving the renewal by Anderson County, South Carolina, of a \$4,000,000 Special Source Revenue Bond Anticipation Note, 2002 (Michelin Project) pursuant to the provisions of South Carolina Code annotated Section 4-29-68 and Title 11, Chapter 17; providing for the form and details of the \$4,000,000 Special Source Revenue Bond Anticipation Note, 2003 (Michelin Project); providing for the payment of the 2003 Note; and other matters relating thereto. On the motion of Mr. Greer, seconded by Mr. Wright, Council voted unanimously to approve the resolution as presented.

On the motion of Mr. Tolly, seconded by Mr. Dees, Council voted unanimously to approve the appointment of Ms. Deno Hicks to the Land Use Board of Assessment and Appeals.

Mr. Holden moved to appoint Mr. Skip Gilmer to the Gun Range Advisory Committee and Mr. Dees seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Clint Wright moved to appoint Mr. Jimmy Jackson and Mr. David Crenshaw to the Gun Range Advisory Committee. Mr. Greer seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Wright moved to reappoint the following citizens to serve on the boards listed: reappoint Ms. Teri Earle on Accommodations Tax Advisory Committee, Mr. Ken Lowery on Airport Commission, Mr. Johnnie Meehan on the Board of Assessment Appeals, Mr. Jimmy Davis on the Construction Board of Adjustment and Appeals, Mr. Greg Clodfelter on the Economic Advisory Board, Ms. Mary S. Hartsell on the Human Relations Council, Mr. John Gates – Sports and Entertainment. Mr. Greer seconded the motion and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Holden moved to appropriate \$3,000 from District #5's Recreation Account to the Park Police to help with the purchase of 6 – 2 way radios. Mr. Dees seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Greer moved to appropriate \$2,686.94 from District #3's Paving Account to pave for 300' of 24" concrete pipe to be installed under the parking area at the new Iva Fire Department. Mr. Dees seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Greer moved to appropriate \$667 each to the Ebenezer Fire Department, Flatrock Fire Department and the Sandy Springs Fire Department for assistance with installation of signs. Funds to come from District #3's Recreation Account. Mr. Holden seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Greer moved to appropriate \$1,000 from District #3's Recreation Account to the Starr Athletic Association to help with operation expenses. Mr. Wright seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Greer moved to appropriate \$1,999 to Iva for lights on the tennis courts to be paid upon presentation of an invoice. The funds to come from the District #3's Recreation account. Mr. Wright seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Wright moved to appropriate \$1,000 from District #4's Recreation Account for the Townville Recreation Department and Mr. Holden seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Wright moved to appropriate \$1,000 from District #4's Recreation Account for the New Light Community center for programming and Mr. Greer seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Wright moved to appropriate \$1,750 for the Hopewell Fire Department from District #4's Recreation Account and Mr. Tolly seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Tolly moved to appropriate \$500 from District #1's Recreation Account for the T.L. Hanna High School Band and Mr. Holden seconded. Vote was unanimous.

Mr. Dees moved to approve fencing and lights for the Hurricane Springs Park for a total of \$4,235 (\$2,385 – fencing, \$1,850 for lighting) to be paid upon receipt of invoices. Ms. Wilson seconded and vote was unanimous.

Ms. Wilson talked about the speed on Paulan Road and moved to reduce the speed from 35 mph to 25 mph and post to reflect the change. Mr. Wright seconded and vote was unanimous.

Ms. Wilson moved to appropriate \$1,750 for the Hopewell Fire Department from District #7's Paving account for repairing and resealing. Mr. Wright seconded and vote was unanimous.

Ms. Wilson moved to appropriate \$200 from District #7's Recreation Account for the T.L. Hanna Band. Mr. Holden seconded and vote was unanimous.

Mr. Martin reported that the County might be subject to State in regard to changing the speed limit on Paulan Road. He cited State Law Section 56-5-1540 giving the authority to local authorities. The law states that minimum speed can only be 35 mph. Ms. Wilson asked that the speed limit change be researched and staff do everything within their power for the speed limit to be 25 mph.

On the motion of Mr. Holden, seconded by Mr. Dees, Council voted unanimously to accept Chasewater and Amberwood Subdivisions into the County road system.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

- a. Certificates and Training:
 1. Mr. Jerry J. Stamps and Mr. James a. Patterson – Certified Pesticide Applicator License
 2. Mr. Jerry Shealy – IS-240 Leadership and Influence Certification, IS-242 Effective Communication Certification, and IS-241 Decision Making and Problem Solving Certification
 3. Mr. John Ferguson and Mr. James Whittaker – Introduction to Management and Supervision
- b. Letters of Appreciation:

1. For: Mr. John Ferguson From: Mr. John Wright and Mr. John T. Garman-Chamber of Commerce
 2. For: Mr. Aaron Smart's Crew (Mr. Ray Jarrard, and Mr. Gerome Tedford) From: Mr. Ed Hudson
 3. For: Road Maintenance Employee-Mr. Andy Driver From: Ms. Juanita Hood
 4. For: Mr. Holt Hopkins Department From: Mr. Gus Loukides
 5. For: Anderson County Council and Administration From: Mr. Brian Bayne and family of SPC. Derek Bayne
- c. EMS Grant-in-Aid Contract reimbursement
 - d. Department of Revenue – approved issuance of Assessment Notices for 2003
 - e. Minutes:
 1. Anderson County Transportation Division – Safety Meeting of April 18, 2003
 2. Anderson County Transportation Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes
 - f. Reports:
 1. Recreation Report
 2. Detention Center Litter Reports – March 31-April 4, 2003, April 7-11, 2003, April 14-18, 2003, and April 21-25, 2003

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda N. Gilstrap, Clerk to Council
ANDERSON COUNTY COUNCIL