

CITY OF CHARLESTON TOURISM COMMISSION

June 23, 2021

A meeting of the Tourism Commission was held this date at **5:00 p.m.**, via Zoom Webinar.

Notice of this meeting was sent to all local news media.

PRESENT

James Saboe, Chair, Yvonne Broaddus, Alphonso Brown, Councilmember Marie Delcioppo, Lorraine Evans, Barry Kalinsky, Kayla Koszsla, Mayor's Designee, Ernest Long, Brumby McLeod, Victoria Moore, Roy H. Owen, Darryl Wade, Dr. Louis Weinstein, and Chad Yonce. **STAFF:** Lee B. Burbage, Tourism Commission Manager, Tim Domin, Esq, Clawson and Staubes, LLC, Dan Ricco, Director, City of Charleston Department of Livability and Tourism, Mallary Scheer, Assistant Corporation Counsel, City of Charleston Corporation Counsel Division, Shannon Tillman, Equine Manager, City of Charleston Department of Livability and Tourism, and Amy Southerland, Tourism and Special Events Manager, City of Charleston Department of Livability and Tourism.

The meeting was opened with a moment of silence.

Approval of minutes – December 9, 2020 (Amended) and February 24, 2021

Chair Saboe noted the reason there were two sets of minutes for approval was in their last meeting there was some discussion among the Commission to amend the previous minutes. The Commission decided move on and to accept the minutes for the time being with some adjustments. He took up the minutes separately

December 9, 2020 minutes – They made some basic wording changes. There was some discussion about the FOIA information given out by Mr. Domin. He did provide a follow up in the second meeting. Chair Saboe asked for comments regarding the minutes. There were none.

Motion: Councilmember Delcioppo moved for approval of the December 9, 2020 minutes

Second: Ms. Moore

The motion for approval of the December 9, 2020 minutes passed unanimously.

February 24, 2021 minutes – There were a couple of things highlighted that the Commission decided to follow up today or in a future meeting. Chair Saboe asked if anyone had any changes or amendments to the February 24, 2021 minutes. There were none.

Motion: Councilmember Delcioppo moved for approval of the February 24, 2021 minutes

Second: Mr. Yonce

The motion for approval of the February 24, 2021 minutes passed unanimously.

Public Input – Chair Saboe said there were seven people who called in and one letter to be read into the record. He said they would yield 2 minutes to every caller.

Mr. Burbage said there was a public comment from Harvey Low regarding the safety ordinance the Commission would be discussing this evening. He said he would enter any notes into the record but since there were so many speakers, he would summarize the comment.

The following comment by Harvey J. Loew was added to and made a part of the record:

To whom it may concern;

Safety to people and animals who are involved in the Carriage Ride tourism business, needs to be executed and not just expressed. Acting intelligently and prudently needs to be enforced. Common sense cannot be relied on, since the interpretations are varied. Below are researched safety compliancy principles at a minimum that require compliance.

Having “guard rails” of adults on the wagons at each end of the bench and at the back provides the very basic safety for children possibly crawling/falling out. Dismissing that provision removes any sort of safety provision for children on wagons and will surely be seized upon when lawsuits stemming from bodily injury of a child occur.

While The City states that it cannot conduct random drug testing of employees, the City can require that any company that receives a license to operate in the City of Charleston maintain a policy that requires random drug testing before, during employment and after any carriage-related incident.

The City should not rely on a standard that is not available to the public. Codifying “CONA (Carriage Operators of North America) Guidelines”, an acronym for the trade organization of the carriage Industry without delineating what that means (No person can view CONA guidelines unless they are a member of CONA) is not the norm in drafting laws. The liability of using guidelines only available to carriage trade members should be concerning to the legal staff and those who are responsible for the safety of the citizens and the public in Charleston.

Every operator make a report to the city upon adding animals to their herd that includes the animal’s name, microchip number, prior owner, and whether the animal has any prior experience working in Charleston and urban environments. It is literally just a reporting requirement. And the key here is to make these reports available to the public, so that residents and visitors have a minimum degree of transparency about whether the animals they encounter are brand new to the city’s streets (and presumably more likely to fright) or have a decade+ working in Charleston.

Please make this a priority in your interest to serve public and animal safety.

*Harvey J Loew
4186 Duck Club Rd
Ravenel SC 29470*

Phone Call - Brian Turner, Preservation Society of Charleston

- Last year they supported the City Council’s direction to have Livability and Tourism and City’s Legal staff review the existing policy regarding carriage rides; they were grateful for the work of Mr. Riccio and Ms. Scheer for following this extensive review and provided a number of feasible policies that would protect Charleston’s reputation as one of the world’s great tourist destinations
- They believed it would send the wrong message to the Commission to reject these comments and safety measures, especially those squarely designed to ensure passenger safety; they saw many of these rules as basic and of minimal economic impact; among them were:
 - rules to protect children by ensuring their place in the interior of carriages
 - licensing and training requirements for carriage operators
 - annual inspections of carriages to ensure they were safe for our streets
 - they strongly supported the provisions that would improve emergency response in case of accidents, this was particularly timely in light of last Saturday’s well publicized incident at Meeting and Broad Streets
- The Commission has the opportunity to assure the public that the safety of carriage passengers was of tantamount concern
- The Society emphasized the measures proposed by the department and City’s legal staff had been carefully vetted in a way that would help reduce the City’s legal exposure
- This was reason enough to adopt them but most importantly adopting common sense measures sent the right message to our visitors; Charleston must be a model for good tourism management

The Society urged the Commission to take seriously its civic responsibility to protect the health and safety of the millions who have the privilege of visiting the City. They looked forward to robust discussion and further engagement on this important issue.

Perrin Lawson, Charleston Area Convention and Visitor Bureau / Explore Charleston

- They asked for deferral of the proposed ordinances; they only became aware they had been in process a couple of days ago; they haven't had an opportunity to take an in depth look at them nor have the carriage industry had a chance to look at them; he thought it was only fair that they be allowed to look at them to see what impact they would have on the industry
- They weren't saying to reject them or that some or all of them might not be good; at this point it only seemed fair that they take a in depth look at them and have some discussion with those who were involved in crafting it

Mr. Brown asked if there was any reason why they couldn't see the phone callers on screen.

Mr. Burbage believed it was the limitation of Zoom. They had to have their cameras on. If they had their cameras on he could promote them to panelist. He asked if that was what the Commission members wanted him to do.

Mr. Owen said he would support that.

Elizabeth Fort, Charlestowne Neighborhood Association (CNA)

- She asked when were the ordinances introduced; based on Mr. Lawson's remarks, she was confused; she asked when did the public know this was happening; Mr. Lawson said he didn't have an opportunity to review and she was curious as to when this was online for those people to review

Mr. Domin told Mrs. Fort they don't take questions during the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mrs. Fort

- CNA was formed in 1978 to represent residents living south of Broad; they currently have 616 members
- The CNA supported efforts to establish and maintain reasonable, effective regulations to ensure the health and safety citizens, passengers, workers and animals in the carriage industry; CNA endorsed the citizens safety ordinance proposed by the City in its original, unedited form
- The City had a duty to regulate any industry operating on public rights-of-way, especially those with multiple safety concerns; the safety of carriages was a matter of paramount importance not only for the people riding on the wagons but for everyone in the downtown area because the wagons were prevalent; CNA felt strongly the minimal safeguards included in the original citizens safety ordinance are necessary given the increased congestion on sidewalks and streets
- While the City states it couldn't conduct random drug testing of employees, the City could and should require any company that receives a license to operate in the City maintain a policy that requires random drug testing before and during employment, and after any carriage related incident
- The City should not rely on any standard that is not available to the public, specifically CONA (Carriage Operators of North America); the liability of using guidelines only available to carriage trade members should be concerning to the legal staff and those who are responsible for the safety of citizens and tourists in Charleston
- Every horse carriage operator should be required to report to the City when adding animals to the herd; this report should include the animal's name, license check number, prior owner and whether the animal had any prior experience working in Charleston and

urban environments; these reports should be available to the public, residents and visitors to have a minimum degree of transparency about whether the animals are brand new to the congested city streets or have experience working in urban environments

Tyler Jones, Charleston CARES (Carriage Association for Responsible Equine Safety)

- While their position remains that this entire ordinance was unnecessary and superfluous, especially since it was written by an special interest group whose sole purpose was to ban carriage tours in the City, they have always been willing to sit down and discuss ways to remain the safest and best carriage community in the entire country, but this ordinance doesn't do that; it creates arbitrary rules and regulations in the hopes of appeasing a political group, not because they were necessary or warranted
- There were some of the sections of the ordinance they generally weren't opposed to but not without significant changes to correct some obvious flaws and avoid unintended consequences such as
 - Section 11 (b) required their companies give the City 48-hours notice before a night tour; the problem with that was most of the night tours were booked the day of a tour, which meant this section would essentially ban all night tours in Charleston; this wasn't the intent of the City but it was an oversight in the language that need to be corrected
- They pointed out several of these types of seemingly minor but really consequential flaws in the City 's version of the ordinance and concluded that more time was needed to prevent more of these unintended consequences; the City agreed with several of them
- The worse thing they could do tonight was rush through an ordinance that wasn't ready and this version wasn't near ready; this wasn't the fault of the City, it demonstrated the need for more communication, time and collaboration with the industry it sought to impact
- They asked that the Routes, Parking and Tourism Rules Subcommittee report be deferred or send it back to the subcommittee to allow for more time to work out these flaws, as well as giving the Commission more time to have conversation with the industry to determine what they were trying to do, how would it impact their businesses and for the industry to be able to answer their questions;
- They also asked the Commission to follow the guidance of the other two committees that rejected the ordinance they reviewed

John Mulherin – Director, Charleston Tour Association (CTA)

Mr. Mulherin noted he was a working certified tour guide and a member of the Palmetto Guild. Most local tourism companies and tour guides were due paying members of the CTA, as well as all of the carriage company members of Charleston. He had three observations on behalf of the CTA:

- The CTA recognized the need to engage on an ongoing basis with all constituents in local tourism to address and resolve the many issues and opportunities presented them in this dynamic market; this engagement included rule making and fair, consistent enforcement of existing ordinances
- CTA perceives that the process of receiving, drafting and evaluating a comprehensive ordinance proposed by a single interest group, like the Charleston Carriage Horse Advocates (CCHA), is deeply flawed and inappropriate; this was evident in the numerous impractical, expensive and unrealistic provisions that had been drafted and reviewed for almost a full year; the rejection of the majority of provisions by the subcommittees seems to confirm the poor quality, bias and impracticality of these proposals
- The CTA endorsed and supported the recommendation of CARES to defer consideration of the Routes, Parking and Tourism Rules Subcommittee to permit more objective and thorough consideration and revision; they also supported the

recommendation of the subcommittees' recommendation to reject majority of these provisions to be adopted tonight by the full commission

Nicholas Green – attorney with Orrick, Harrington and Sutcliffe, LLC, representing Charleston Carriage Horse Advocates (CCHA)

- He took on the case for CCHA for two reasons
 - He believed in free speech and assembly; this organization has been under attack by the carriage industry in the public sphere and in court for expressing its generally held beliefs; that doesn't make them wrong and it doesn't make their beliefs unworthy of consideration
 - He believed in the right to petition government for change; he believed that regulation of this industry is desperately needed for the benefit of the visitors, residents and his children who walk the sidewalks of the city everyday adjacent to carriages as they go to and from school, the park and simply enjoy being in Charleston
- The simple fact having observed the subcommittee meetings and based upon his experience handling hundreds of bills and state legislatures around the country is that the regulatory process for this industry seems broken
- They don't impose meaningful regulation before or after accidents happen, they tried their best to not do anything; they assumed that simple, common sense safety proposals would inordinately impact these businesses without considering any of the real countervailing safety considerations
- The current state of affairs creates tremendous risks for the Charleston brand, prevents operators from enjoying a level playing field with each other and other tourism industry participants, and underscores a lack of leadership at all levels of our city government; the Commission had that chance to change that narrative, he urged them to seize that opportunity
- This week there was an accident that involved injuries to a driver and passenger; both were transported to the hospital; a driver from another company apparently abandoned his/her carriage to tame a spooked horse

Mr. Burbage told Mr. Green that his time had expired.

Mr. Green said he would continue to speak.

Councilmember Delcioppo called a point of order. She noted Mr. Green was allotted 2 minutes. She asked Mr. Domin to correct her if she was wrong.

Mr. Domin told Mr. Green he was absolutely not in order to continue speaking. He said Mr. Green could have asked the Chair for permission and he did not. He said his time was up.

Mr. Green asked the Chair for permission to continue to speak.

Chair Saboe declined Mr. Green's request to continue to speak. He said they needed to move forward.

Mr. Green said he appreciated the Commission's consideration of the ordinances and he asked them to pass the city's proposed ordinance. He said he wished they had a better process for this.

Mr. Kalinsky noted while he was only speaking for himself, he hoped others as well didn't appreciate the 50 to 75 emails they all probably received in their inboxes today. He was in favor of public input and full discussion, but it seemed that one or two emails would have sufficed. He counted about 65 of them when he lost count. Most of them were from out of state, which he found to be an ineffective tool and a waste of time. He knew they couldn't limit it but he wanted to state publicly he didn't appreciate the inconsiderate behavior of whoever was behind it.

Mr. Brumby and Mr. Yonce concurred with Mr. Kalinsky's comment.

Mr. Wade also concurred saying just because you can do something doesn't mean you should do something. There were appropriate ways of approaching people and that wasn't it.

Mr. Long said he also agreed.

Mr. Owen asked who was behind it.

Mr. Domin stated he didn't know that they should get into much more of a discussion because they were in the public comments section. He asked if there were any additional comments.

Angela Koffler, representing the Historic Ansonborough Neighborhood Association (HANA)

- HANA supports efforts to establish and maintain reasonable, effective regulations to ensure the health and safety of citizens, passengers and working animals
- They endorsed the amendment to Chapter 29 of the City Code regarding safety, updating the language with requirements for hitching/unhitching carriage animals
- The association appreciated the Commission's efforts to enhance the safety aspects of the carriage trade through enhancing the safety of their neighborhood

Mr. Burbage said the one other person who signed up to speak withdrew her request before the meeting began.

Chair Saboe reminded the Commission as a whole how they were recommended by the City and Legal staffs to address some of the subcommittees. They were asked to take the requested ordinance and hash it through based on the focus of the subcommittee level:

- Tour Guide Subcommittee covered Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed changes that dealt mostly dealing with licensing
- Routes, Parking and Touring Rules Subcommittee dealt with Section 4-7, and Sections 9-12 that regarded training, design, safety and compliance
- Quality of Life Subcommittee had Section 8, which concerned emergency and passenger safety.

Chair Saboe asked the chairs of each subcommittee, as well as the members of the subcommittee, to tell the Commission what they discussed and the Commission would have discussion as a committee in general.

Subcommittee Reports

- *Tour Guide Subcommittee*, Chad Yonce, Chair
 - The subcommittee met Tuesday, June 8 to discuss Sections 1 through 3 of the preliminary carriage proposal; the sections' reviewed pertained to:
 - Requirements for drivers of animal drawn vehicles
 - The creation and requirement of animal drawn vehicle drivers license
 - The process to obtain an animal drawn vehicle's drivers license including background checks
 - The reasons for suspension of an animal drawn vehicle' drivers license
 - A number of concerns were raised regarding the licensing and background searches of carriage drivers; several committee members felt this sort of licensing or permitting was unnecessary
 - The Tour Guide Subcommittee voted 3 to 1 to disapprove Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the proposal

Mr. Brumby wanted to confirm the instructions were either to move it towards the full Tourism Commission or not. He asked if that was accurate.

Chair Saboe said yes. The subcommittees were to get into a deeper dive on the wording and conversations, analyze it to see if the recommendations made sense, and bring it forward. Even if Mr. Yonce's committee said it was unfavorable, the Commission still could review it. It went on record that the particular focus of the subcommittee came back to the point where they didn't see merit in some of the changes.

Mr. Wade asked why they found the license unnecessary and what their basic thoughts were.

Mr. Yonce said it wasn't a unanimous decision. One of the things they wanted to keep in mind as they went through the proposal was keeping in mind where they were with respect to coming out of COVID and just the burden the industries had in general. They felt the licensing requirement was unnecessary based on past performance of the industry.

- *Routes, Parking and Tourism Rules Subcommittee*, Brumby McLeod, Chair
 - The subcommittee met Wednesday, June 9 to discuss Sections 4-7 and 9-12 of the city's proposed carriage ordinance; three of the four committee members were present; they heard from similar people, Nicholas Green and some others that night;
 - The sections pertained to a series of:
 - safety and training requirements
 - annual training certification
 - design safety standards
 - adding lighting to the carriages
 - how to size equipment appropriately on the mules and horses
 - issuance of certificates for appropriateness
 - carriages following all posted traffic signs and not allowed to operate after sundown
 - amending the carriage companies to have an employee trained in equine triage and first aid
 - amending the ordinance when you're involved in accident or incident be inspected by a licensed equine vet
 - He, Councilmember Delcioppio and Mrs. Evans recognized the burden; after discussion, Mrs. Evans moved that they weren't necessarily approving it but thought it should go to the Commission; the motion was approved 2 to 1 with the idea to send these sections to the full Commission for review but with the stipulation that these ordinances be further studied and explored

Mrs. Evans said they have "kicked this can down the road" for years and finally got something that was workable. They felt most of it was very acceptable and if not they could massage it and bring it up to a degree where people would agree was the best way to go. She said someone had to do something to make it end. They couldn't please everybody all the time.

Chair Saboe said they were going to come back to this. They were trying to go through all the subcommittees and they would address conversation as a whole.

- *Quality of Life Subcommittee*, Barry Kalinsky, Chair
- They met Thursday, June 10, all members were present
- They were to review Section 8 of the preliminary carriage proposal; the first section dealt with the emergency ordinance giving the Livability and Tourism Department the right to call carriages off the street under emergency situations; the second section was about passenger safety

- They discussed each separately and voted 3 to 1 in favor of Section A of the emergency ordinance which gave the Department of Livability and Tourism the right to call carriages off the street under emergency situations
- With discussion from the City, they voted unanimously to remove Sections B, C and D of the emergency ordinance that dealt with carriage companies providing an annual emergency plan to the city and requiring each carriage to hold emergency training sessions for its employees thinking that part was a little duplicitous
- In regards to the passenger safety ordinance, they felt that more details needed to be provided, the language needed to be changed; they voted to unfavorably report the passenger safety ordinance
- After reviewing Section A, they had a long discussion about other issues outside of the carriage industry that might be important to the Commission members; all the members of his subcommittee have forwarded to Chair Saboe thoughtful lists of other issues that the Commission could discuss and review in the not too distance future

Chair Saboe said he forwarded the lists to Mr. Burbage and they were in the process of discussion. He spoke to Mr. Riccio about it and they all agreed these recommendations to continue to have the Commission drive the focus of what they were discussing. Everyone thought it was positive and they needed figure out a way of managing it, perhaps more monthly subcommittee meetings within the focus of that particular subcommittee and let the Commissioners drive the discussion of what they would like to talk about and focus on in terms of their purview, which was on the tourism side.

Chair Saboe noted that Mr. Kalinsky's committee "attacked" a little different. They went section by section, and also adjusted some of the wording. There was some discussion in his committee that some things needed to be adjusted and worded. That was why Mr. Kalinsky thought some clauses were favorable than some others, which he thought was a good approach to that.

Chair Saboe said now they needed to talk about the process of where they were in looking at this ordinance and breaking up into sections . He couldn't recall a time where the subcommittees had to address so much change in terms of the recommendations so he was very sensitive to the fact there was a lot here and there was a lot to review. He was sure some of the Commission members probably needed some more information or just needed to understand what their thoughts were and where they were in the process.

Mr. Riccio asked Ms. Scheer to give an overview.

Ms. Scheer said the Commission would be recommending that all of the changes either go to City Council, who would be able to recommend maybe some sections go forward, some sections don't. The Commission could recommend no changes or vote for the Legal staff to take it back to the drawing board.

Items for Discussion (Action may or may not be taken on any of the below items):

Ms. Scheer offered to do a quick review of the ordinance. Mr. Riccio asked Ms. Scheer to do an overview for the Commission as to how they got to this point.

Ms. Scheer said there was an equine incident about a year ago. Staff received input from CCHA with the proposed ordinance. City staff put in countless hours reviewing the ordinance working towards creating an ordinance that was best practices. She noted that Equine Manager Shannon Tilman's input was invaluable to this.

Ms. Scheer said this ordinance was coming before the Commission for consideration. She would be happy to message it more. The input came from the City staff who was trying to be proactive in this situation versus than reactive, which had been concerned in the past. This was sent out to interested parties in February. Both sides reached out to staff and they spoke to both sides. Input provided to the staff from both sides was sent to the Tourism Commission members.

In reference to the subcommittee reports, Ms. Scheer said the Tour Guide Subcommittee did a lot more massaging. The Quality of Life Subcommittee did acknowledge the importance of the emergency component, Section 8, of the full ordinance.

- Review Exhibit 1 of the preliminary carriage proposal:
 - Section 29-204, Section 1 - Certified changes are being made to Chapter 29
 - Section 29-204, Section 2 – Basic requirements for drivers of Animal-Drawn Vehicles:
 - Minimum age for drivers – 18
 - Have to have animal drawn carriage drivers license
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (1)
 - Have to have the license to legally operate within the City limits, with the exception that if someone was actively training to receive their permit
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (2) - What the application would entail for somebody to receive their permit; basic information and proof of certification; they heard a lot of talk about CONA, staff felt CONA have standard guidelines that staff reviewed and thought are very good solid foundation, however with all the comments, if it was something the Commission wants she would be happy to codify more specifics into that versus just being deferential to CONA
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (3) – In reference to background checks, the ordinance would require that any tour guide operator would need to have a background check to ensure they didn't have any felony, misdemeanor involving sexual offense, animal abuse or any violent acts against personal property; Ms. Sheer noted the Tour Guide Subcommittee discussed striking the word "misdemeanor" but they decided to not move this entire section forward
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (4) – Approving the carriage driver permit once the background check has been approved
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (5) – Fees were very regulated in the state; these would only be minimal to cover the cost of processing the permit
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (6) – The process to renew the permit
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (8) – Process to revoke or suspend the permit
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (9) – An appeals process
 - Section 29-204, Section 3 (10) – Another appeals process should any of the previous suspensions or revocations occur
 - Section 29-212, Section 4 (m) Annual Training Certifications
 - Section 29-212 Section 4 (m) (1-3) – Staff felt it was important there be an annual training for carriage operators and tour guides, they felt it was important to have a training program for any employee who comes into contact with the animals; basic training for any employee who operates within the carriage company; they recognized that each level of the employee was a different level of expertise but they should still have basic standards when it came to those operations; staff asked that they would report back to the city on an annual basis that the training was completed and up to date
 - Section 29-207 Design and Safety Standards; Annual Carriage Inspection
 - Section 29-207, Section 5 (b) – The Routes, Parking and Touring Rules Subcommittee discussed having the animal drawn carriages inspected

by a third party, a engineer or mechanic, ensuring all of the carriages were still in proper roadway condition

- Section 29-212, Section 6 (c) (1) – Have more adequate LED lighting on the carriages, especially when there was inclement weather or at night, and high reflective markers on the front, back and sides of the carriage
- Section 29-212, Section 7 (f) (6) (7) – Properly fitted collars, harnesses, all of their tack and equipment, ensuring it was properly fitted and adequate
- Section 29-213 (a) Emergency Procedures – After some massaging in the Quality of Life Subcommittee, they voted to move the emergency procedures forward with the revisions; this would give the Livability Department the discussion that if there was some immediate emergency, albeit weather, it could be some sort of spontaneous protest, it gave the department the ability to use its discretion if they perceive there to be a substantial risk
- Section 29-214 Passenger Safety – Quality of Life also considered passenger safety; this was not recommended to move forward, only the emergency procedures was recommended to go forward to full Commission; during discussion the word “chaperone” was proposed to be added and it did appear in the draft; the city felt it was important to have some sort of age regulations, guarantee that there was a chaperone, and there not be minor children in the back seats or on the sides as there had been an incident where a child had fallen; the committee wanted to massage that section more
- Section 29-219 - Need to be compliant to the requirements or the City would refuse the Certificate of Appropriateness
- Section 29-224 Compliance Required– Additional section for the totality of everything; lets one know there were consequences for violating any of these ordinances within the City of Charleston
- Section 29-225
 - (a) City staff felt it was important that carriages do follow posted traffic signs
 - (b) They found a concern with the carriages operating in the evening; there was discussion with the carriage industry regarding the 48 hours’ notice, but there was a concern about carriages operating in the evenings when there is no City staff to be managing
- Section 12
 - Require at least one employee per shift trained in equine triage and first aid
 - Any reportable accident be inspected by an equine vet certifying the animal was healthy; there was discussion in the Routes, Parking and Touring Rules Subcommittee that it might be more appropriate to have the discretion of the City’s equine manager but that was the deference for the Commission to consider
 - Any carriage in a reportable accident would need to be inspected before returning to service

Councilmember Delcioppo asked Mr. Domin if they needed to get a motion on the floor and a second, and then open for discussion.

Mr. Domin said they could either move into a discussion or most appropriately have some kind of motion would be fine as well. He added they hadn’t been too formal in the past about requiring a motion to have discussion.

Councilmember Delcioppo said whatever was the will of the Commission, she was fine either way.

Chair Saboe said he didn't know if they had to have a motion but right now they were still in the discussion phase of trying to figure out how everyone felt about where they were. There were a lot of changes and a lot of discussions. Some of the subcommittees liked some wording and some not the other. He asked Mr. Riccio to say how the City felt about this. When the ordinance was brought to the City, Mr. Riccio some errors in some of the things that were there and some of the things that had been a pressure point for the City over the years.

Mr. Riccio said he knew people were frustrated by the emails and trying to sit through the issues they were dealing with. He went back two years ago when an incident occurred with a carriage company where the horse was loose and ran through the streets half hitched and half not hitched, and received horrific injuries as a result of the incident, which resulted in putting that animal down. Hence some of the emergency ordinances they saw was having someone trained in emergency triage to treat that animal right after an incident.

Following that incident they did an investigation. They reached out to the carriage industry because they were the ones who did this work every day. He discussed it with Ms. Tilman asking how to avoid this situation from occurring again when unhitching a horse or mule and keep it from escaping halfway hitched. The answer was to have a full hitching process – a lead line from each side of the harness to the horse or mule.

They came up with an ordinance. They had legal draft it and it was adopted with the intent to possibly prevent future issues like this happening with the horse coming loose. After this ordinance was passed in August 2020, City Council was given a 12-page document from the CCHA and Mr. Green giving them ordinances that needed to be amended to address concerns they felt were important. It was the staff's duty to accommodate that but the manner in which it was presented to City Council was not in the manner that it would be done through proper channels and protocol through city staff. The normal protocol was going your through council representative who goes to City staff, who is obligated to investigate, inspect and come up with the right type of amendment to an ordinance or an ordinance change to address the specific issues that a certain individual, group to present.

This occurred during COVID but they (Ms. Southerland, Ms. Tilman, Ms. Scheer, Mr. Burbage and himself) still met regularly. They took these ordinances in consideration and went through the ordinance line by line for over six months. They felt that the preliminary draft by Ms. Scheer was legal and practical to enforce, which was the ordinance in front of the Commission today. In reference to transparency, his goal was to go into this process as the done before, try to get through heartaches and obstacles prior to coming to the subcommittees and try to get some compromise on both sides of the fence. Not at City's preference, that didn't happen in the manner that they felt it should be necessary.

They send the ordinance out February 19 to the carriage horse advocates' attorney, CARES and carriage industry. They invited them to the table to get through these items, talk about it and vet these items before going before the subcommittees to avoid where they ended up now.

March 4th, CARES and the carriage industry met with staff via Zoom. They were hesitant but agreed that this was the type of ordinance that was enforceable but they would have some recommendations to it. He never heard back from the carriage horse advocates. He sent emails to both sides and he never heard from the CARES group. He reached out to both until April 19 requesting their input and getting the ordinance vetted, and he still didn't heard from both. It came to the point they had to move forward and do something with the ordinance. The final straw was the carriage horse advocates who said they wanted their original ordinance to go forward with their proposal. So staff did that.

Mr. Riccio said several months in the hands of both sides, procrastinating, not giving good input until the last minute, and now here they were again, taking up everyone's time to try to do one common goal – to help the City manage the carriage industry in a manner that was safe and could be accomplished by enforcement. The waters had been muddied here in the last week of so with emails going to both sides giving information to both "all of you that is not totally the accurate information that should be given." So here they were again trying to come up with solutions, trying to come up with something that was enforceable. They were taking time from other issues that they could be focusing on

with the tourism in Charleston. It was the Commission's decision. They would honor anything the Commission agreed upon. They could go back to the table but his staff and legal were proud of and worked hard to try to get this accomplished before June 23 before the Commission to try to weed this information out. They would take the Commission's lead on where they wanted to go with these amendments and proposals.

Mr. Brown said he had a book on slavery called "Slave Ordinances" where they wrote so many ordinances on how to regulate slavery that people were breaking the law all over the place because the slave couldn't read the ordinance. They didn't know what they were doing wrong. He felt the Commission was almost in the same predicament. In his two years time or more on the Commission he had heard all of it. They voted on them and they took them before Council. The only new thing he heard this time was the driver's license, the background check, and the drug testing. He didn't believe the City had a say in drug testing and Mr. Domin could tell them that. Otherwise, nearly everything they talked about had already been addressed.

In reference to traffic lights, he said the reason the animals don't stop at most of the traffic lights was because it was hard for the animals to get back into the flow of moving. There were some places where animals don't really stop at a stop light. They knew where they were and it was usually a wide intersection.

He wasn't opposed to drug testing new or to the railings for safety reasons on the carriages. Everything else, as far as when an accident occurs and administering help, you would administer help if you could prevent a death situation. Otherwise you call yourself administering help and you don't know enough about it or if you had some training in it and you weren't sufficient enough and a death occurred, you could be sued. So much had been repeated and so much had been done, it was confusing. He understood why Mr. Riccio was confused because it had been presented to them over and over again. He wondered if they could pick up a few things that haven't been address light like drug testing, the higher railings on the carriages, driver's license and background checks. He didn't think that was too much to ask.

Mrs. Broaddus said she was new and had a lot of questions but she didn't want to bore those who had been on the Commission for a long time. With respect to the request for carriages to be on the streets after sundown if they gave 48 hour notice, she thought it was probably OK but she thought there were some issues with that because darkness was darkness, and if a horse out there after hours he was presumably worked much of the day, she was sure they regulated how long the work. She thought that was a problem that would always be in conflict and she didn't have a bone to pick with whatever side. She thought 48 hours didn't change the fact that it was still at night. There might be a way to reroute where that horse could go for just 48 hour tours.

Another thing that was a problem in the 1 through 3 section was the felony misdemeanor and they said if you reviewed and they crossed it out. She hoped that could be solved because if you had a misdemeanor, at some point in time that person had issues. If they're interested in a job, they should be willing to find a way to expunge their record so they have a clean record if what they did was so minor that it didn't make a difference. But if anything ever happened, like an accident, and that person has a misdemeanor, that was something the law would zero in on, whether it was serious or not.

The driver and the tour guide, two people on the carriage. She remembered that was a big issue. The carriage companies thought they were trying to put them out of business. She said there should be a way to get them to give the Commission some accounting of what it would cost to adjust their accounting so that the people who were getting paid to do two jobs, you could get someone to do the driving and do the touring because it was difficult to do those two jobs even though they said they don't. If they're allowed to give an account on how they could work that system because not everyone was up to \$15 an hour. She thought that was the missing link.

Ms. Moore thanked everyone on the subcommittees who put in their time and gave thorough discussions. She respected everyone's opinion. She said their subcommittee came to a good decision to move forward with one piece of it and review another piece. She didn't know what the process was but were they able to move forward with the subcommittee recommendations or were they going through the whole thing.

Mr. Domin said it was ultimately up to the Commission. Somebody needed to make a motion. The Commission could chart their own course. They could take decide to take certain sections forward. They might want to take certain sections and give them back to City staff to work with suggestions. They might decide to report the whole thing out favorably. It was in their hands.

Chair Saboe commented he sat in on all of the subcommittee meetings and their discussions. Mr. Yonce spoke about the fact the timing was bad. He agreed with Mr. Yonce. He heard from many people knowing that they were going to have this discussion in the City, all of them tourism related, and many people thought this wasn't a good time and wanted to have a sense of more time. When he spoke with the City, he thought the City and the staff felt like these discussions have been round and round, and they wanted to move on.

His sense on it was there was a lot here and there's a lot that the Commission was dealing with. He still didn't have a good sense of what particular word they wanted to use, what particular phrasing they wanted. Some of the sections they put part of it through and part of it not. He moved they defer and table this, and have a clear proposal with no scratched out wording, a clear proposal brought back to the subcommittees as the original intent so that they bring something that was clear and not so ambiguous back to the Commission for review or pushing it back up. He didn't have a good sense hearing all of them talk about the fact that some words were here, and that word doesn't work and 48 hours would have put them out of business. He didn't think they were there yet. His motion was that they table this discussion, send back for further clear documentation of what they were actually putting before the Commission and they could either look at it favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. Kalinsky seconded the motion.

9 voted in favor, 3 were opposed and 2 abstained.

Mr. Wade asked for discussion.

Mr. Owen noted you could have discussion before a vote.

Dr. Weinstein said there was already a vote. You couldn't backwards to remove the vote.

Mr. Wade said he didn't vote. He didn't have enough time to say anything. The motion to vote and the vote happened faster than he could click the button.

Mr. Owen didn't think there was a call for discussion.

Mr. Domin concurred. He said there should have been a call for discussion on the motion. Procedurally speaking, he suggested they have the discussion. He didn't see any prejudices that could come from discussion. If anyone was inclined to, they could vote on it. Presumably those need to vote for it the same way would vote for it the same way.

Mrs. Evans asked if the motion could be restated.

Chair Saboe moved they table the discussion and ask that the document that they presented go back to the City and the subcommittee levels so they could actually present one version with all of the wording as they intended to come back to the Commission on the next meeting, which was in August. In essence, the motion was to table this until August with it going back to the subcommittees for further development and refinement. He opened it up for discussion.

Mr. Owen asked what was the intention to go to parties other than the City. There were three parties that asked for tabling: Charleston CARES, Convention and Visitor Bureau, who wanted more time for review, and Charleston Tour Association. He asked if it was their intention to go back to each of those parties for their additional markup or comments.

Chair Saboe said that wasn't his intention. His intention was to put it back in the subcommittee. They had two subcommittees ruled out unfavorable. One of the unfavorable varies some of the wording was good and some was bad. It was unclear which particular sections came in and out. His intent was to have one clear document that they could put in front of them so they could look at what actually the subcommittees approved and or didn't approve.

Ms. Moore asked if it would be possible get a list of all the things that were put out favorably and the things that were not put out favorably, and move forward on the things that were put out was favorably and work on those.

Chair Saboe said yes if that was what the Commission wanted to do. Right now they were looking at the motion to table or not table.

Mr. Kalinsky agreed they had momentum to conclude this. He was anxious to conclude this in a competent and credible way. He asked if the motion could be amended to meet in July rather than kicking it down for two more months.

Chair Saboe thought that was fair. He asked if he was talking about the subcommittee level.

Mr. Kalinsky said he was talking about the subcommittees meeting again and the full Commission meet again to take up and conclude this issue.

Mrs. Evans asked how could they conclude this issue if they were discussing the same thing. Are they eliminating number two and number three? Or were they still only dealing with number one, the City proposal and making changes in that?

Chair Saboe said the subcommittees looked through the City's proposal because they had the presentation to the Commission. Even though they reviewed as a Commission, they were able to see the changes. They actually based all of their wording from the City's recommendations. With guidance, they actually reached out in a cooperative way to meet with the other two parties that presented.

Mrs. Evans assumed that the only thing being put back to the committees was the City's proposal to massage it and make changes.

Chair Saboe said yes, to get a final version. Using Mr. Kalinsky's subcommittee, he had two sections. He eliminated three parts of one section but recommended the first part of that section out. He (Chair Saboe) thought they was a lot of ambiguous aspects. He sat through all three subcommittee meetings and he still wasn't clear which particular phrasing and wording they accepted or which they ones didn't. He didn't feel like they have a collective, clear view of exactly what they were trying to accomplished. He personally thought they were there.

Mrs. Evans said there were other things that were objected to being left out as in the things that were in the advocates' proposal and CARES' proposals. She concluded they weren't dealing with those anymore. They were only dealing with number one, the City ordinance and massaging it,

Chair Saboe said yes. The City took into consideration all of the proposals and made a third proposal. They took some wording and ideas and included that. The Commission decided to only focused on the City's version.

Mr. Owen concurred with Mr. Kalinsky that the faster they could move this along the better. If they could set July as the next time they could get back he would be in favor of that. At the subcommittee level, they could call for input from whoever they wanted who expressed an interest in making more comment, including Charleston CARES and their 48-hour issue.

Mr. McLeod was trying to get his comments before the motion because he heard a few things from Mr. Riccio he thought were very relevant. He thought the ordinance was very onerous. He questioned why these things being put on the carriage companies. There were a lot of tourism issues in the community and they don't require this kind of background check of people who work in hotels or restaurants. It just seemed extremely onerous.

He noted the biggest thing Mr. Riccio said was the way this got to him. When they had the incident, they addressed it with the carriage industry. The fact that they were meeting now, the carriage industry and the Tourism and Livability Department, was probably where this should be. He liked what the City put together but now they needed to get those two parties in the room. They had a lot of outside influence. This was very onerous on one group.

Mr. McLeod said the City didn't have straight sidewalks, thousands of people jaywalk daily, there were poorly lit sections in the City, gun violence, incredible parking issues, cars don't follow the rules either, so why go after something that was so uniquely Charleston? The idea that CONA didn't share their

guidelines, Ms. Scheer had no problem getting them and they were was in the ordinance. They could be setting an example of how to regulate this if we let the City and this team work with CONA and the carriage industry to put together legislation that might preserve something that was very uniquely Charleston.

He encouraged them to not send this back to the subcommittee but to allow Mr. Riccio to get closer with the carriage industry and CONA to get this to be balanced. He thought going back through the subcommittee when they made the motion to move it, they thought they were getting somewhere. But now let those who do this for a living get in there and bring them a better ordinance.

Mrs. Evans concurred with Mr. McLeod's comment.

Mr. Wade said his one goal as to make a timeline and stick to it. It sounded like Mr. Riccio had already offered both sides chances and they weren't getting back to him. They're stonewalling, perhaps for their own reasons.

As far as the Commission was concerned, if they were going to amend this motion that was going to go back, which he thought they should see the permanent wording, why couldn't they say OK the City by this date was going to give us permanent wording, by this time we were going to have it in the subcommittee one last time so they can improve that, and if both of these factions would meet with the Commission instead of meeting behind closed doors, and the Commission decide in August what they were going to do with it. They aren't going to agree on every single line of this. Set a timeline and if they want to have the subcommittees look at it one more time when they have the proper wording and bring it to the Commission for a vote where they vote for the entire document and allow the two sides, if they want to have the opportunity, then it will be public that they have the opportunity so they could not say we weren't allow to speak. Can we set a timeline if they were going to defer this?

Chair Saboe thought that was reasonable. He noted Mr. Riccio commented earlier that he felt that did reach out to both sides. He thought Mr. Riccio had their attention now based on the fact that this was before the Commission. Given the fact that there was a motion to defer, he Mr. Riccio how he felt about Mr. Wade's comment?

Mr. Riccio appreciated Mr. Wade's support. They tried to come to the table and tried to vet everything. Not everyone was going to be happy but as in any mediation you had to come up to some compromise in any issues that came up. He said if he could entertain anything tonight, the only positive he thought coming out of this was the approval of the emergency ordinance. He asked if they could get something done and show that they as a Commission, as a city staff had accomplished something? Could they move forward on the only proposal that was approved? They actually redacted most of it but kept the heart of the emergency ordinance. Could they at least proceed with that and that was something they don't have to worry about later, and go forward with what everybody suggests, relook at some things and come to a compromise.

Ms. Moore concurred with Mr. Riccio. She wanted to move forward with passing the extreme weather emergency ordinance or anything else that was turned out favorably. The things that turned out unfavorably they just take those off the table and that will save them some time when they go back to the subcommittee meeting and get the wording right. Go back and work on the things they want to change. The things that turned out unfavorable they need to get off the table and pass the extreme weather, which came out favorably.

Dr. Weinstein said there was a motion on the floor that's been seconded. That had to be voted on before they could start changing everything else again.

Councilmember Delcioppo added that unless the person who made the motion agreed. She added that while she appreciated the fact that this was more open casual conversation, she said she would appreciate it if people raised their hand and were called on to be recognized rather than just unmuting themselves and starting to speak because there were people who obeyed and waited to be called on and they weren't called on because other people were just jumping in and speaking.

Chair Saboe recognized Councilmember Delcioppo.

Councilmember Delcioppo said she wanted to say what Dr. Weinstein said, that there was a motion on the floor and a second. Unless the person who made the motion agreed to amend their motion, they needed to move on what was on the floor.

Councilmember Delcioppo agreed with everything Mr. McLeod and Mr. Wade said. She understood that there has been a lot of back and forth, and things hadn't been as timely as Mr. Riccio had set forth and expected. She knew that trying to send things piecemeal forward to City Council wasn't going to fly. They wanted one comprehensive thing to come before them. If the Commission was doing a little bit here and there, and this had to go back, she was going to wind with 11 people who were frustrated with her when the point was they wanted to try to get something that generates a consensus. Right now they didn't have that consensus. They weren't going to get a consensus amongst the minimum of 7 that they needed in City Council. She couldn't imagine going to the Councilmembers saying this was what was coming out of the Commission because she didn't know what was coming out of the Commission. It's been too piecemeal.

She felt very siloed like she had to be on the other two subcommittees in order to really understand everything that was going on. She wasn't really leaning towards sending this back to the subcommittees. She agreed with Mr. Brumby's idea that they set a time limit and it comes back to the Commission and then it goes to Council. She thought that was cleaner.

They didn't have a clean version of the ordinance. She understood that when legal did ordinances they had to redline but it was nice when you could just see what would be presented before the Commission so they get to some clear expectation.

Councilmember Delcioppo agreed with the deferral. She didn't agree with it going for two months or with it going back subcommittees as that invited too much back and forth. She thought they needed a month, if that was enough time, for Livability and Legal to help work through some of those changes that had been proposed. A new version could come before them and they would go from there. If there was something emergency wise they needed to do right now, that was a different story. Her preference was if it could hold out for month, hold it out for month, do it all at once and send it all to Council at one time.

The people who were the experts in this industry was the industry itself. These animals are very expensive. These are family businesses that had been in the families for generations. They were not trying to do themselves in. When the horse had to be put down, it was as if they lost a member of their family. These weren't things they took lightly, they didn't haphazardly run their businesses nor hire anyone who walked in. To treat them like that was disrespectful. They were running an honorable business, they've been in the city for generations and she thought they should afford them that opportunity and offer them the benefit of the doubt.

Sometimes really bad things were going to happen and they were never going to make something that's foolproof. If that was the bar, they were never, ever going to get it. They were going to be constantly disappointed and would constantly be coming back and layering on something else. She asked that they kept that in mind, keep this more holistic and think about the industry as a whole and what worked comprehensively and holistically rather than all kinds of pieces of the puzzle coming in. She felt that was where they were now and they would continue find themselves in this position.

Chair Saboe was willing to amend his motion. He asked Mr. Riccio if they pushed the Commission's recommendations back staff and his group, omit the subcommittees' review and moved it to July, would he agree to that timeline.

Mr. Riccio said that was very difficult. He questioned how much more could they do. Ms. Scheer drafted the ordinance with the input of five staff members. He said he couldn't answer that.

Chair Saboe said to Councilmember Delcioppo's point, if they were going to present something that was concise and direct, he didn't feel the Commission had the consensus of what that looked like. The point of going back to the industry was to refine exactly what they would recommend to Council so the Commission would feel they did what was in the best interest of the City in one document.

Mr. Riccio said he knew it would be overwhelming to everyone. No one wanted to be handed a bunch of pages of ordinances. While he preferred one piece at a time, that would take quite a bit of time. If that was what Chair Saboe wanted to do, they could take one portion at time, which he felt they did a

good job doing. The difficulty was where did they go from here? He would need the Commission's guidance of what their expectations were in one month.

Chair Saboe recommended Mr. Riccio look at the recommendations from the subcommittee, take the feedback of what was favorable and unfavorable, and put in all of the favorable as recommendations into that particular document. Mr. Riccio would have a chance to review it a second time and bring it back to the Commission for either a recommendation to move it to City Council or for further discussion.

Mr. Domin said for a point of order, he thought the Chairman's motion was exactly that. He asked for a straight copy without redline based on what the subcommittees decided and then that received a second. He was trying to keep them parliamentary proper and that was the motion that he understood was asked to vote upon. He didn't know if the motion included sending it back to the subcommittees. He thought they needed to address that if that was what they wanted to do. He thought they needed address the motion that was on the table and vote on it if there was no further discussion.

Mr. Burbage noted that Mr. McLeod and Mr. Wade had their hands raised.

Chair Saboe yielded to Mr. McLeod.

Mr. McLeod noted one of things from Mr. Riccio that was relevant was he admitted he wanted the emergency portion of that. He (Mr. McLeod) would be interested in providing that. He strongly agreed with the Chair requesting a clean copy of the ordinance. They all got pieces of it to discuss. His subcommittee didn't redact any pieces. They tried to look at it collectively. They didn't do that kind of editing.

Chair Saboe yielded to Mr. Wade.

Mr. Wade said the Chair said he was willing to amend his motion. He was just asking for more input on that. He asked Chair Saboe if he could consider some sort of time line in his motion.

Chair Saboe said yes. He amended his motion to defer it back to the City. He agreed with Councilmember Delcioppo that he didn't know they had to send it back to the subcommittees since they already had a chance to see it. He was concerned that Mr. Riccio didn't address his timeline question. Most of the Commission wanted to move it quickly and wanted to move it in the July timeframe. He asked Mr. Riccio if he would do a concise cleanup of the subcommittees' recommendations and his recommendations into one document. His recommendation or amendment would be that they defer or table the idea or intent of having one document come out of Mr. Riccio's area by July. He asked Mr. Riccio if he was prepared to meet that expectation.

Mr. Riccio commented he thought they could but he deferred to Ms. Scheer.

Ms. Scheer said they would do their best to make it in that one month. She asked for clarification on if they wanted a clean version from what came out of the subcommittee or did they want staff to receive further engagement and give them a new clean draft.

Chair Saboe said his intent wasn't further engagement. His intent was to provide a clean draft and if it was her will to give them one final view of it where she sent it back to the Commission, that was up to her.

His intent was to have one clean document where the Council or Commission knew exactly what their recommendations were as a package. He noted that Councilmember Delcioppo said Council didn't appreciate a fractional type of perspective to it. The intent would be to have it all done one time.

Chair Saboe said his motion was to table it with the idea that they would put together a concise recommendation to either pass forward or reject with the timeline in July to meet the Commissioners' desire.

Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Mr. Burbage said Mr. Brown had his hand raised.

Mr. Brown said before they vote, he notices on his computer he saw there were 37 participants and there were 21 in the meeting.

Chair Saboe said there were attendees who were viewing but they weren't panelists so only the panelist would be on his screen.

Mr. Brown concluded they could hear what they were doing. Chair Saboe said that was correct.

Chair Saboe said the motion was seconded by Ms. Moore. He called for the question.

The motion carried.

Chair Saboe commented to Mr. Riccio that he knew Mr. Riccio wanted a quick vote on the emergency ordinance but he felt better presenting it all in one package, especially after hearing Councilmember Delcioppo's views about how the City would look at it on a City Council level.

Mr. Riccio said he agreed and understood.

Mr. McLeod asked if that meant Mr. Riccio and his team could come back and say they decided they wanted the emergency element. It could be just two items at that point if they took in all of the feedback provided from the subcommittee. He asked if that was correct.

Chair Saboe thought in general that was correct. Mr. Riccio basically needed to clean up what they discussed and come back with a final presentation the Commission felt comfortable with. When they passed it to City Council, it was their decision to move it forward. It was the Commission's job to make recommendations as an advisory committee.

Old Business

Chair Saboe said he spoke to Ms. Koszela regarding something from the minutes where they addressed the Mayor's office perspective on flooding. He asked her if she could address that.

Ms. Koszela said she was prepared for when the Commission would like for either before the July or August meeting to have the chief resiliency officer from the Mayor's office to give a brief presentation on some of the flooding strategies and it was just for the City that the Commission seemed to be interested in. She could work with Mr. Burbage or Chair Saboe to get it on one of the next agendas.

Chair Saboe noted what they were addressing was a discussion in the February minutes where one of the Commission members asked about flooding and how flooding impacts tourism. Everything impacts tourism on some general level so he asked the Mayor's Office to update the Commission on what the Mayor's initiatives were and the timeline about what they have been working on.

Chair Saboe also noted Mr. Brown brought up the dollar tourism fee in Savannah in the minutes. He told Mr. Brown he didn't think they had time to discuss it and it would be carried over to the next agenda.

Mr. Burbage said he tried to research Mr. Brown's question regarding the Savannah and the tour tax. He wasn't able to find any information regarding that. He tried to reach out to Savannah's Tourism Office to get some clarification but he hadn't received any call back from them. He said he was happy to keep looking into it.

New Business

Chair Saboe said Mr. Kalinsky spoke about his committee recommending some other areas of focus to the subcommittees. In his discussions with Mr. Riccio and the staff they wanted to make sure the Commission knew what they were going to try to do was have more regularly scheduled subcommittee meetings, perhaps monthly or whatever schedule the chairs of the subcommittees would like to have. They would continue to try to have a different approach of how this Commission was addressing things related to tourism.

Mr. Riccio said in reference to meeting regularly, it would give them the opportunity to collaborate with other departments in the City that were responsible the issues that were brought up in the last subcommittee with homelessness and other quality of life issues. It would give them an opportunity to engage other City departments to work together and collaborate to give the Commission members the opportunity to do what they signed up to do, make a difference in the tourism quality of life in the City. They looked forward to doing that and facilitating that for everyone.

Mr. Yonce asked if the July meeting would be held on the 21st.

Mr. Burbage said he would email the Commission members tomorrow with some potential dates. He would have to check with the staff about the next meeting in July. He said the meeting would be held either the 21st or 28th of July.

Mr. Kalinsky asked if the meeting would be live or Zoom

Mr. Riccio said the update on commission meetings were all Zoom. They were meeting collective as a City group to try to do hybrid. Only City Council was meeting hybrid, in person and Zoom. To this date there was no other board or commission meeting in person. Until they got a directive to try to facilitate that, they would do so at the first opportunity.

In reference to trying to address the issues that the different Commission members want to address to the subcommittees, Mr. Burbage said if there was any issue the members of the subcommittees wished to discuss to email them their subcommittee chair and Chair Saboe. If the chairs wanted to contact him for what wanted on their agendas, he would be happy to put that together for their review.

Mr. Burbage added to make sure they avoided any group discussion that could be considered a quorum so they avoid any potential issues. Each subcommittee member speak directly to their chair and the chair communicate that to him or Chair Saboe so there wouldn't be any chance of an accidental quorum.

Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Marcia L. Grant
Administrative Assistant II