

COUNCIL CHAMBER

Special Meeting

July 25, 2019

A Special Meeting of City Council of Charleston was held July 25, 2019 convening at 6:13 p.m. at City Hall.

A notice of this meeting and an agenda were mailed to the news media July 10, 2019 and appeared in The Post and Courier July 14, 2019 and are made available on the City's website.

PRESENT (13)

The Honorable John J. Tecklenburg, Mayor

Councilmember White	District 1	Councilmember Waring	District 7
Councilmember Shealy	District 2	Councilmember Seekings – <i>excused at 7:00 p.m.</i>	District 8
Councilmember Lewis	District 3	Councilmember Shahid	District 9
Councilmember Mitchell	District 4	Councilmember Griffin	District 10
Councilmember Wagner	District 5	Councilmember Moody	District 11
Councilmember Gregorie	District 6	Councilmember Jackson	District 12

Mayor Tecklenburg called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

The Clerk called the roll.

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Now, if you would like to join us, Councilmember Lewis is going to lead us in an invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

Councilmember Lewis opened the meeting with an invocation.

Councilmember Lewis then led City Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Thank you. First order of business is under Council Communications. It's a continuation of a conversation we had at our last Council meeting about a proposed referendum on this November's ballot requested by Councilmember Waring. So, I'm going to turn it over to Councilmember Waring."

Councilmember Waring said, "Thank you, Mr. Mayor. As a matter of fact, I want to really single out Ms. Halversen. She and her legal team have done such a wonderful job because this is a difficult question to try to frame, and the way she has communicated with us has been second to none. So, I want to seriously thank you very much for your professionalism in all of this. I've had a lot of conversations with different Councilmembers on this one, and the question came to me. Well, we had an amendment on the floor that would carve out some of the same things that we're asking.

Carving out the existing homes, we agree 100 percent, I believe, on new construction. We agree 100 percent if a house, a structure, sustains, or a commercial building sustains, substantial damage due to flooding. Where the difference is would be if buildings or houses are damaged due to something other than flooding substantially, a fire, wind, hail, tree damage. I even threw Formosan termites in there, and the reason I say that is I bought a house off foreclosure not too long ago, and I walked inside. When you buy something off foreclosure, you can't look inside. You get to look outside. I walked inside, and man, did I grab an alligator by the tail. It was damaged substantially, almost substantially, by termites. We got there just in time. So, I don't have to lift that house, I don't have to raise that house.

What I'd like to do, maybe to save a lot of effort. As a matter of fact, even I read the paper every now and then. Councilman White had actually said 'that we need leadership on City Council'. So, I'm going to throw out to my colleagues to put the third reading of the ordinance, if you remember I deferred it because, Mr. Mayor, we were going to get the information from the National Flood Insurance Program to see whether we can still carve out the existing houses, as well as get the discount on the Flood Insurance that we all sought. I know that hadn't been determined, but you know what, maybe we should go forward with the third reading which would not necessitate even putting the referendum on. Put the third reading in front of Council to pass Freeboard +2 excepting damages, substantial damage, due to anything other than flooding. Put that before Council, kick it around, and whether we can get on the agenda and get a vote. So, I throw that back to Mr. Mayor."

Councilmember Lewis said, "That's a motion?"

Councilmember Seekings said, "So moved."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "Second."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "As a point of order, it's not on my agenda."

Councilmember Waring said, "That's right. That's why I said to put it on the agenda."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Second."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "That means we need to put it on the agenda then, and I believe I just want to make it straight before we vote that to add something to the agenda, we need nine votes, a super majority, in order to do that."

Councilmember White said, "Just a two-thirds vote."

Councilmember Lewis said, "Well, then, if it was the third, we don't need to vote to put it back on."

Councilmember Waring said, "Yes. We're voting to put it back on the agenda."

Councilmember Lewis said, "You want to put it on this agenda?"

Councilmember Waring said, "Tonight."

Councilmember Lewis said, "Okay, add it to this agenda."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Do we need them to add the third reading?"

Councilmember White said, "It's as it was sitting on the agenda, right?"

Councilmember Waring said, "As it was sitting. It was deferred on the agenda."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Yes, I'd certainly like to see it before we discuss it."

Councilmember Waring said, "Well I'm sure we can get that. We've got a lot of talented people in the room."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "We probably could."

Councilmember White said, "So, if I could just make a comment before we vote to add it to the agenda, and clearly I am going to very much support this, I had an opportunity to have a conversation with Councilmember Waring about this issue particular to the referendum, and really what the discussion was about is the fact that it's a very complex and complicated issue and, quite candidly, if I wasn't on City Council, I'm not sure I would understand it. So, to be able to get the voters to the point where in a referendum, in a short period of time behind the curtain of a ballot box, to be able to understand it thoroughly enough that they make the right choice for themselves individually would be a monumental task. In that discussion, and I shared with Councilmember Waring, that this is, I think, an opportunity where Council is just going to have to simply take on the leadership role that we were placed in and do what we believe is the best thing and right for our community and move forward accordingly.

Given that, I'm 100 percent in support of that and, quite frankly, the way that we have established the amendments to the original ordinance so that it does in fact have some carve outs for some of the issues specific to existing structures and being substantial damage over and above just flooding, I think, in my mind, that addresses some, maybe not all. Because sometimes you have an unintended consequence here or there, but I'm guessing we solve about 95 percent of our problems, and in my opinion, if we get that close on legislation, we've got as good as we can get. So, I'm very supportive of this, and I'll certainly vote to add this to the agenda and certainly support in moving this project forward or this ordinance forward. Thank you."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "Mr. Mayor."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilwoman Jackson followed by Councilmember Moody.

Councilwoman Jackson said, "Please don't fall out of your seat Councilmember White, but I 100 percent agree with you. I will definitely vote for it to be on the agenda. I do think that we need to take this responsibility under our own advisement. I brought this ordinance draft around to my kids even with some of the 'whereas' to help them understand the background, and they were like 'Huh? What?' They're 30 and 40 somethings who have PhDs and Masters."

There was laughter in the church.

Councilwoman Jackson continued, "It made me very concerned that we would be putting back something on our citizenry and expecting them to lead us in ways that I personally think, that's sort of a strategic mindset that we might need to get to as a Council if we keep thinking about having these non-binding resolutions, but I totally agree with you, Councilmember White. I

think this is the right thing to do. I personally, down the road, I'm going to be concerned about what our score will be, the CRS that really brought this forward in the first place. In my head, we wanted to do this +2 change for two good reasons to match the County, so we're not confusing the citizens, the builders, and the developer community who have set their plans in motion based on these things, also, to try and lower the premiums for every flood insurance paying homeowner or property owner. So, I'm still concerned with that. I think this is the place to start. If we get a ruling, and we really need to debate that, we can always amend this to make some changes that would allow us to have that point score, but thank you for agreeing to do this."

Councilmember White said, "Mr. Mayor, I meant to, if I could make--"

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Councilmember Moody is next."

Councilmember White said, "Excuse me. I apologize. Go ahead."

Councilmember Moody said, "Yes, I want to restate to be sure that I understood the original motion. The original motion was that we would adopt the Freeboard +2 for new construction. We would also adopt that for any property that was destroyed more than 50 percent due to flooding would also have to meet that requirement, that all other risks would just be where you are. In answering somewhat to what Ms. Jackson said about the five percent, and I think this is a deep subject and people don't understand it but, helping the confusion was, I read one article in our paper that said something about if we did this, we would get this twenty five percent discount. It kind of led you to believe that you would get a twenty five percent discount. It didn't tell you, you already had twenty percent, and you were only going to get five more, so it was a little bit misleading there. But, the other thing that I think we haven't considered, and I haven't heard it discussed around here, is the cost of insuring all of those other perils, all of those other risks; the tornado, the termites, the earthquake, all of those. If we're going to force all of those to go up to Freeboard +2, then somebody's got to pay for that insurance. Now, I don't think we're talking about that. So, that cost, if we keep it like it is, that cost shouldn't go up. So, maybe that will somewhat offset that five percent. I'm no insurance person, but I understand a little bit about risk, and if you're going to increase the cost of the risk, you're going to have to pay for it, so I think it works both ways. So, I think this is the right way to go, unless my understanding is different than somebody else's. That's what I would be voting on."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Shahid.

Councilmember Shahid said, "So, I was not going to vote for this Resolution to be passed, and I'm glad we're going to shift gears a little bit, but I want an answer. I think I heard a report, and we have been battling this around for several months, or maybe I'm just getting my wires crossed on this one. I thought somebody from Stormwater Department advised us that if we pass the amendment, we passed the +2 and we made an exclusion, that would deny us any benefit, and if I can get somebody from Stormwater to answer that question, that would deny us any of the benefit from a premium, not say discount, but a premium benefit being lowered. Can you answer that for us?"

Matt Fountain said, "Yes. Stirling's going to add a comment about the potential for first reading versus third reading on the agenda with a major change. One of the issues we had with DNR was the agency we had corresponded with. DNR's concern was that if you separate the substantial damage, substantial improvement definitions from the new construction definition, FEMA gives all three of those under the new construction definition. So, I think, we talked more in-depth with FEMA. We haven't gotten an official response yet but from, again, informal

responses, they think there's the ability for us to do that as long as we don't try to say that new construction and substantial improvement, substantial damage, are different things under the FEMA definition of new construction. I know that's getting incredibly complicated. Basically, FEMA says if you do substantial improvement, if you do substantial damage, that is new construction. So, if you say we have one requirement for new construction but a different requirement for substantial improvement, substantial damage, we just need to make sure the ordinance reads in a way that those are not changing the FEMA definition. I think we can do that, and FEMA says there's a good probability of doing that. It's just making sure we get that language in there properly."

Councilmember Shahid said, "I think that's what I remember the report coming back from, and it is always about the 50 percent rule. So if it's greater than 50 percent improvement or 50 percent damage repair from whatever occurrence, if you're making that distinction from either a new construction or if you're making that distinction from something other than flood, then you're not getting the benefit, and I think that is what you all reported or someone reported to us several months ago."

Matt Fountain said, "So, there are two separate questions there and one question is, yes, if you separate the two, you would not be eligible for the points from CRS. The second topic is, can you separate the definitions? Yes, FEMA will allow you to do different levels, we just have to make sure we phrase it in a way that doesn't look like it's in conflict with the way they define the terms, and it may be that that's not an issue. We haven't gotten an official response from FEMA yet. That was DNR's concern, was that FEMA would have an issue with that, and we've been corresponding with FEMA about it, but we haven't gotten a formal response back yet."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Well, from a procedural point of view, we're kind of discussing the question already. Can we just go ahead and vote on the motion to consider the third reading of the motion? Is there an issue there?"

Ms. Halversen said, "I'd say the only issue is that, obviously, we will have to work out the language a bit more, and we might need to get some advice from FEMA or at least DNR on the exact language of our ordinance change. So, at this time, I don't think it is appropriate to do third reading on the existing ordinance because it doesn't contemplate any of these changes, and these would be considered substantial changes and, so, that's not something that we would want to do on third reading anyways. So, I would suggest maybe having the discussion be on an ordinance including Councilmember Waring's suggestions and then asking the Legal Department to go ahead and work on that language for the next meeting at which we would bring it back as a first reading. It would be a totally separate ordinance than the one that is pending right now for third reading, and we can deal with them both at the same meeting at that time or something. We could withdraw or worse, start over, you know, again with the new one."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "I'm going to let Councilmember Waring respond."

Councilmember Waring said "I have a question, Counselor. We could have voted on third reading a month ago. I deferred it. So what is new? I don't understand what you're alluding to. What is new in the ordinance that we're going to be voting on?"

Ms. Halversen said, "The carve-out part that you're suggesting, has that already been incorporated in the existing ordinance?"

Councilmember Waring said, "That was part of the second reading. The first reading that the Mayor put forth was for Freeboard +2 across the board, for everything. My amendment carved

out existing structures that sustain substantial damage from any other peril except flooding, and we passed that.”

Ms. Halversen said, “Okay, I apologize. I didn’t work on the new revised version. I’ve only seen the original ordinance, so that’s why I think I have some confusion. I had only seen just the very first version.”

Councilmember Waring said, “Okay, but the second reading that passed was the amended version. We should be able to pull that out.”

Councilmember White said, “We had just amended the language that FEMA required.”

Councilmember Waring said, “That’s what we voted on, the second reading, and the Mayor and our Floodplain Manager suggested writing to NFIP and I said, ‘Okay, I’ll defer it until we hear back from them.’ We heard back from them and, quite frankly, it was nothing clear at all. So, then we needed to move forward. In other words, because the County has done this, that doesn’t mean the County is right. Can we get a copy of the second reading so our Council could be clear? You all should be able to pull that up.”

Councilmember Lewis said, “But, if we don’t have it, that’s why I made a motion that we could put it on the agenda for August.”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “That’s what I was asking a few minutes ago.”

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Griffin.

Councilmember Griffin said, “Mr. Mayor, it’s Councilmember Griffin. Can we call the question to put it on the agenda or not?”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “I’m going to ask to defer, if there is any more discussion about putting it on the agenda. Would you like to make a comment on that regard?”

Councilmember Griffin said, “My point’s more than that, so I’ll wait.”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “Alright. Would anyone else like to discuss the motion to add this to the agenda? That’s if we can get a copy of it.”

Councilwoman Jackson said, “Right, if we can get a copy of it. We don’t want to put it on the agenda if we don’t like it.”

Councilmember Seekings said, “Well, so far we’ve received advice of our Counsel that we shouldn’t be doing this so, I think, we probably need to defer.”

Councilmember Waring said, “Counsel is going to send the second reading attached.”

Councilmember Seekings said, “I’m not sure.”

Ms. Herdina said, “Can we get a five-minute adjournment, so we can get a copy of the second amendment, and then we’ll come back?”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “Okay.”

Councilmember Seekings said, “Well, if we’re going to wait for five minutes, can we at least ask Mr. Fountain just a few questions about substance while we’re waiting on the procedural part? Let’s use our time wisely.”

Councilmember Waring said, “We can vote to put it on the agenda.”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Let's call the question, and put it on the agenda, as amended, as was ready for third reading."

On a motion of Councilmember Seekings, seconded by Councilwoman Jackson, City Council voted unanimously to add the following bill the agenda:

*An ordinance amending Chapter 27 of **the Code of the City of Charleston**, by amending Flood Hazard Prevention and Control Requirements in Section 27-117 to increase the Freeboard Requirement from one foot to two feet, effective August 1, 2019 **(AS AMENDED)***

The Clerk said, "Well, who made the motion?"

Councilmember White said, "I'll make a motion to add it to the agenda."

The Clerk said, "Okay. So, Councilmember White and Councilmember Griffin?"

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "It was already on the floor."

The Clerk said, "I didn't hear it."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Okay."

Councilmember Seekings said, "That's right. I made it. I moved for it, but it doesn't matter."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "It was made some time ago."

The Clerk said, "You did, Councilmember Seekings?"

Councilmember Seekings said, "Yes."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "So, now, the motion which is not on our agenda, and we've got to have somebody go pull up a copy of it or go get a copy of it which we will do. In the meantime, we can continue to discuss it and ask Mr. Fountain or anybody else some questions."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Griffin.

Councilmember Griffin said, "I've got a question, and then I want to just make a couple of comments. My question is, did we ever find out when our visit was going to be? Originally, we wanted this done quickly because we thought the meeting was going to be this fall. Then, we were told it was probably postponed to next year. Do we have a date yet on that?"

Matt Fountain said, "So, they don't provide a date at this point. They just say that you won't be in this year's cycle. It will be in next year's cycle. It could be as early as January 1st, and it could be as late as-

Councilmember Griffin said, "But we've already heard that it's not going to be this year."

Mr. Fountain said, "Correct."

Councilmember Griffin said, "I'm just going to make the comment that no matter what this ordinance says, whether we take it as amended, whether it's what it was tonight, I'm not voting for it, and the reason is because we've had so much discussion about this. We beat our heads over it for so long. I don't think that the benefit outweighs the cost at this point. We have so many more questions than we have answers. This was not brought up by a Councilmember to be put on an agenda. This was to maybe get us to an extra five percent at the next meeting, the next visit. Well, we can get that five percent through other ways as well, and I still haven't seen all of

the information about that. I know we had a slideshow about potentially getting other points. There's plenty of other ways to get points other than this one way. Your point about the County and the City, just because the County did it, I completely agree with because look at the density in the City compared to the County. Look at how many homes are in the City. We are the largest municipality in the State. We're really the largest. You know, the City of Charleston is so much larger than the County, in terms of the number of houses. We can't be making decisions based on what other people are doing. That's just ridiculous. So, that point, to me, doesn't make sense. I think we stay at FEMA+1 for the time being. That's my perspective. I don't think I want people to think I voted no because it's as amended. It's because I think we should stay right where we are. We don't have all the information to make the decision, and at this point, I have not seen any proof that the benefit is going to outweigh the cost to the taxpayers of Charleston, the people every day that this would affect, especially the people that are built on slabs. It's going to be detrimental to them. That extra foot, I can't imagine somebody who goes out and has to live paycheck to paycheck, like every day Charlestonians, and then they're told that they've got to come up with an extra \$2,500. That's a lot of money to an everyday person. It might not be to some, but to an everyday person it is, so I'm voting no. Thank you."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Seekings.

Councilmember Seekings said, "I just want to ask Mr. Fountain. I think I heard him correctly when he said that under the current FEMA guidelines, and where we're headed, they view anything more than 50 percent the same as new construction. So, a carve-out is problematic. Is that basically what you just told us?"

Mr. Fountain said, "The concern DNR has raised, as the agency that oversees the FEMA program at the State level, is that there may be conflict between the language we have, not the intent. The intent, they think there may be a way to make that work. It's the differentiation of definition and language."

Councilmember Seekings said, "And we're not going to resolve that tonight? Right?"

Mr. Fountain said, "It would be challenging."

Councilmember Seekings said, "Right, and just one other quick follow up because we talked about this before, and it's just been a while since we did. The way we're going to set this up is, there are certain properties, particularly in the old historic district, that will not be exempt. They will be able to apply to the BZA for a variance, is that correct?"

Mr. Fountain said, "So, there is not an exemption. It is a variance process. In terms of the exact process, if you don't mind Mr. Julka answering the exact process."

Councilmember Seekings said, "I just want to make sure. Is that a BZA matter, or who is that? Is that you?"

Stephen Julka said, "It's not me. The variance request would go to the Board of Appeals Under the Building Code, and there is documentation from our Board of Architectural Review staff and the State Historic Preservation Office. Once we get that documentation from those two groups, the variance is heard by the Board of Appeals."

Councilmember Seekings said, "Board of Appeals for?"

Mr. Julka said, "Building Code."

Councilmember Seekings said, "Who is that? We don't see it very often."

Mr. Julka said, "Mr. James Meadors is the Chair of that Board."

Councilmember Seekings said, "Didn't we just put him on the Planning Commission or BAR?"

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "He's on the BAR now."

Mr. Julka said, "Well then, I'm not sure if they've chosen a new Chair yet."

Councilmember Seekings said, "I don't want to usurp everybody's time, but one of the things I worried about, and I still worry about, is the conflict between people asking for a variance trying to get to a certain height to meet Freeboard +2 in an area that's super low where they may have to go up five feet to get Freeboard +2 because they're currently minus three. Then, they butt up against some pretty tough zoning ordinances. So, then you're going to have to get a second variance. That is a Board of Zoning Appeals issue. So, you may be before two boards. That gets complicated."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember White.

Councilmember White said, "One of the things I would suggest is recognizing that there may be some period of time that's going to pass before we actually know what that language needs to look like in order to not be in conflict with FEMA. As I heard correctly, the intent is fine. It's the language that requires some tweaking, and as it currently stands today, if we were to pass this now and we find out six, eight months from now that we need to tweak this language in order to maintain the appropriate credits and discounts that we currently enjoy, I don't think anybody in this room is going to deny that opportunity. But, what it does do for us today, and really this is for our citizens who may be on the lower end of the income spectrum, is that today they're not protected. They're not protected at all, and there are a lot of homes that would be impacted substantially, as it currently exists, if they have an issue that is non-flood related.

So, the one thing we do, by passing this right now, is we ensure that those people who are in the lower income spectrum who are at risk today and don't really even probably know how much risk they're in, we fix that. That opportunity and obligation is upon us, and that's what we really need to be focused on. The opportunity for us to fix a problem with the ordinance as it exists today can be done. We can do it right now. Councilmember Griffin, I certainly understand the issues that you raised, but I would say that by doing and making these carve-outs part of the ordinance as it moves forward we will, in fact, protect those folks on the low income spectrum who are at risk. I think it is certainly incumbent upon us to do that if we can do it, and certainly we can. Thank you."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Mr. Fountain.

Mr. Fountain said, "Just a very brief clarification, the concern DNR raised was not towards the discounts which is the CRS program. It was towards coverage under the NFIP, so they would potentially put you in a punitive state under the NFIP program."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "If I may ask a question of Mr. Fountain, the carve-outs we're discussing are not to change the definition of construction, but to exclude other perils; a fire, earthquake, or some other peril from basically forcing someone to go to +2 even if they're in the flood zone, special flood zone, if it's another peril. So, my question is this, if we were to do that, is there any jeopardy for our existing CRS points and our existing 20 percent discount that we currently enjoy?"

Mr. Fountain said, "As long as the ordinance retains the existing base freeboard elevation +1, those points stay in place with the existing CRS score to get us a 20 percent discount. It will

only be if we were to do anything that altered our existing ordinance with that one foot of freeboard above base flood elevation.”

Councilmember Seekings said, “So, if we subtract it.”

Mr. Fountain said, “Right. If you were to say that the carve-out took it all the way back to base flood elevation, that would remove the existing points. As long as you only do more protection for new construction, it wouldn’t impact the existing points. We just need to make sure the language is appropriate, but it’s the method of doing that FEMA has indicated, informally, is approvable.”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “Right. So, can I respectfully ask Council to consider that as we pass this, that maybe we have a little caveat, that based upon what Mr. Fountain just said, that we refine the language to ensure that we don’t risk what we already have. Is that a fair enough way of saying that?”

Councilmember White said, “You’re not contemplating that that ordinance change will still come back for additional approval, once we know, if language changes are required?”

Mayor Tecklenburg said, “I believe so.”

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Shealy.

Councilmember Shealy said, “Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I’m confused a little bit because if we change this ordinance to where the existing ordinance is now, if we take the other perils out of there, are we not changing the original ordinance? Does it put us in any jeopardy because we’re taking those perils away?”

Mr. Fountain said, “So, as long as you only remove the additional perils, for better use of a term, from the additional foot of elevation, then you’re okay on the existing. As long as those perils are still required to go to base flood elevation +1 as in the current ordinance. That current ordinance then, you still retain the points for that work. It would only be if you extended that carve-out and said, ‘We’re going to take those back to base flood elevation,’ that you would lose the points gained from that activity. So, this is basically the addition of more restriction for new construction or homes damaged by flooding and would just be more protective, so there wouldn’t be a reduction in points for that.”

Councilmember Shealy said, “Thank you. Got it.”

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Shahid.

Councilmember Shahid said, “So, if I understand what you’re mentioning or what you just stated to us, we’re creating two different classes. You’re creating a class of +1 and, regardless of the nature of the damage or the nature of the improvement, that’s going to stay the same. Then, we’re creating a second class that’s going to have +2, only applying to new construction and only applying to any damage from a flood. Any other type of damage based upon an improvement, or based upon damage from a hurricane or tornado or a tree falling through, is not going to apply. So, you’ve created a little more confusion with all of this by having two different classes.”

Councilwoman Jackson said, “And we don’t have an ordinance like that right now.”

Councilmember Shahid said, “Let me just rephrase this, so I make sure everyone is clear on this. To Councilmember Griffin’s point, if we do nothing and we don’t pass +2, we’re at +1, and that +1, regardless of the nature of the damage, or regardless of the improvement, you’ve got to build your house, fix, or move that house up to a standard, to FEMA standards, plus one foot.

Then, whatever benefits we get out of that, we keep. If we carve-out and say we're going to go to +2, and you're +2, except for some damage created by a hurricane or a tree falling through, whatever, then you've got to maintain the +1 of the damage no matter how it happened or the improvement no matter how it happened. So, you're creating two classes."

Councilmember Waring said, "Let me ask a question. If that's the new ordinance, why would the old ordinance still apply?"

Councilmember Shahid said, "That's what he's trying to explain to us. We've got to maintain the benefits. To maintain the benefits of what happens to your home, you've got to maintain that no matter what happened, what caused the damage, that you keep it at the current level that we're at right now. So, that's what I heard him say. If I'm wrong, correct me."

Councilmember Waring said, "Is that what he's saying?"

Mr. Fountain said, "Yes, correct. If you were to eliminate any component of the existing FEMA base flood elevation +1 component, it would remove the points from the CRS system for that existing ordinance."

Councilmember Shahid said, "We're better off doing nothing as opposed to creating a carve-out to go to +2."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "In the FEMA +1, regardless of the peril, we still have to go up. Am I correct?"

Mr. Fountain said, "So, under our existing ordinance, yes, any new construction, substantial improvement, substantial damage, base flood elevation +1 foot."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Now, if we go to +2, does that remove from the existing +1 and just include under +1 new construction? I think that's the question."

Mr. Fountain said, "Sorry, can you repeat that one more time just to make sure I'm clear?"

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Okay. I think that's what you're saying. If I'm hearing you, if we go to FEMA +2, we'll do the separation that is just new construction, which has to be FEMA +2. If there is a peril, if I'm understanding it correct, the +1 at 50 percent or more damage is still in effect."

Mr. Fountain said, "That's my understanding of how it's currently being proposed."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Right. But, that's different from what I'm hearing from Councilman Waring's recommendation. If I'm hearing it, even +1, it's gone. Regardless of, as long as it's not flood peril, they don't have to do it. It doesn't have to be done."

Mr. Fountain said, "So, those are certainly two different ways to consider an ordinance to be written and yes, they are separate styles of an ordinance."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "But, if I'm hearing the recommendation from Councilman Waring, if we go +2 then only if it's flood damage, am I correct so far? Only if it's flood damage do we have to go up to FEMA +2, based on new construction only. That means, just so I'm clear, if there is any peril other than flooding, you don't have to go up to 50 +2."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "But, you still have to go to +1."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "That's what I'm trying to make clear here."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Because otherwise, we'd lose our points, and everybody would lose their twenty percent discount."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "That's what I'm understanding, but that's not quite what I thought ---."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "That's not quite what you wanted."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "That's very different, yes."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "It's different. I would respectfully say that we need to keep the 20 percent insurance discount in place. I understand we're trying to protect those who might have another peril to protect them from having to raise their home. There are certain dollars' exposure there, but the immediate exposure, people will lose their discount on the existing, what we've got right now, would be immediate."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "I understand. I just want to make sure we all understand."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "So, maybe it's better, as Councilmember Griffin said, to do nothing, but before I finish my remarks, let me just say, the original purpose of all this is not just to get on the same boat with the County, who's already at +2 and doesn't have any of these exclusions. The real purpose is just to protect our property, long term, from flooding. The higher we build, the better off we're going to be with increased extreme weather, rain bombs, and sea level rise. So, if you're building something new today, and you expect your house to last 40 or 50 years, we're expecting a two to three foot level, two to three foot rise in sea level during that time frame. So, why not go ahead and put the spec in place to where the new home built next week will be protected 40 years from now? So, that's the real underlying reason that I had proposed that we consider doing the same as the County. Just a matter of flood protection. Councilmember Waring had his hand up."

Councilmember Waring said, "Mr. Mayor, the discussion, the difference really isn't on new construction. Everything you spoke about just now was new construction. I think 100 percent of us agree on new construction. Certainly, an overwhelming majority of us agree on new construction. We have a ton of homes, and I have certainly called out low to moderate income people because I have a lot of that in my district. Virtually everybody that has a house on a slab, that's been built since FEMA +1 went into being in the City of Charleston, almost everybody would fall into this risk."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Trap, as we've called it."

Councilmember Waring said, "It's really the existing homes that we're talking about. The part that, frankly, I find hard to grasp, Mr. Fountain, is that this proposal doesn't cost the National Flood Insurance Program one penny, not one penny. If you have damage from another peril, again, fire, wind, tree damage, earthquake, the National Flood Insurance doesn't pay a penny of that claim, not one penny of that claim. So, it doesn't expose them to any additional financial risk at all. That's why, Mr. Mayor, and I've brought it up, and I know you think it's a jab at you, but I agree with you. When we spoke about, and this is what Councilman Griffin was talking about, keeping it at FEMA +1, you said, 'They're already in that trap', and I agree. Listen, that's not a jab at the Mayor. These homeowners are already in the trap, in that risk, and we put them there, not FEMA, City Council. I voted for that, but we never had this discussion back in 2014 when we went to FEMA +1. We put them in that trap."

We only concentrated, believe me I will finish in a second Ms. Jackson, we only talked about flooding, and here we are five years later talking about flooding. I say this respectfully. I

thought about what Councilman Seekings said at the last meeting. He said, 'We make decisions all the time about people and their homes,' but we don't make decisions that could subsequently displace communities. It's not if we have another storm, it's when we have another major storm hit Charleston. Many of the people who were able to repair their homes in place after Hugo, under the FEMA +2, would not have been able to do that. When I asked Mr. Julka at the last Public Works meeting, 'What does the City use as a standard to determine 50 percent damage or more?' He said, 'The County assessed value'. Everybody in this room knows the County assessed value is a low value. I'd also asked them, 'Do they subtract up the land value?' He said 'Yes'. But by the time you subtract out, Mr. Mayor you told me that the land, that the house you lived in is worth more than your home, than the actual structure, the dwelling. So, if this subtracted out the value of the land, that means, frankly, it's economic discrimination. The claim will be able to hit that 50 percent threshold faster in the moderate income areas than certainly an area at the Battery, frankly.

If you have a multi-million dollar home, say a four million dollar home, you're going to have to have damages in the millions to be able to hit substantial damage. But, if you have a \$150,000 house, and \$50,000 of that is land, that's not out of line. I actually had MLS do a search from the Ashley River bridges to Wappoo Bridge, to the North Bridge, all the way to Mark Clark Expressway, for vacant lots \$50,000 or less. One of them popped up, one lot for \$50,000 or less. If you subtract \$50,000 from a house that assessed at \$150,000, if you sustained damage of \$51,000 or \$50,001, you're at substantial damage. You're going to have to lift that home, and the numbers that have been put out to the public, the newspaper has done a better job recently, but they took your talking points, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Julka. They came up with that \$1,000-\$2,400 to lift a house one foot. Now, in subsequent articles, they've gone up to \$100,000, but it is a peril that we, on the 2014 Council, put thousands of homeowners in. To say that we're going to do nothing to help take them out for a five percent discount, maybe on the flood insurance, and nobody has calculated, if you increase the building cost, homeowners insurance will go up, and you know that. Homeowners insurance will go up. Yes, you may get a discount on the flood, but if you cover more perils, more risk, the insurer has to get the money from someplace, and you get that from premiums. So, I throw that out for extra considerations. As a matter of fact, you've got people around, virtually everybody on this Council is in that category. Maybe one, well you're in that category, too, because you're not at FEMA +2, but everybody around this Council would be subject to having to potentially raise their home if they had substantial damage from another peril. The easiest thing to do is not fix the problem because the people didn't understand what we did to them in 2014 because we didn't have the extended conversation about what if something happens other than flooding. Thank you."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilwoman Jackson.

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Councilwoman Jackson hadn't spoken yet on this matter. Then, I'll come back for seconds."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "I think we had such a good comprehensive presentation from Mr. Julka a few months ago, and I wish I could remember most of the details, but what we're not talking about are that the majority of the homes in our City are insured. We have property casualty coverage. So, if you have a peril that's not flood related, and you have to replace your house from a fire, the insurance company is going to require you to go to the flood zone height and they will cover it. It's a replacement cost. Now, maybe some people don't have replacement costs for their insurance. Maybe some people are not choosing to pay that premium, but what we're talking about now if we decided to change the +1 ordinance and separate out the other perils, everyone who buys flood insurance as responsible stewards in the whole City would lose their 20 percent. So, now, we're not talking about just not giving people the five percent. We're

talking about going backwards and putting more people at risk. I know that Mr. Julka had found us statistics about how many people that were eligible for flood insurance in a special flood hazard area zone were not covered, and it's a small percentage. So, we can't take away the people's opportunity to pay for their flood insurance and get the discount that our community has put the points together to give them today. I'm happy to just table this again and not do anything right now with the +2, but please don't talk about changing the +1 and taking out the other perils because people have homeowner coverage, and if they have another peril that takes out their house, their insurance company is going to make them build to the FEMA code that they're in. That's the way the building industry is right now. So, we're not giving them any benefit. If they're on a slab, they lose their house, they really should be four feet off the ground. Their new house is going to be four feet off the ground."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Griffin.

Councilmember Griffin said, "I believe it was the great poet Winnie the Pooh that once said, 'Every once in a while the best something is to do nothing.' I agree with you. To do nothing, in the sense of this entire topic, is the wrong thing to do. But, to make a decision tonight, I'm not saying we should defer it, I'm saying we should table it altogether for now. We've got four months at least until they come visit, and we need to see some numbers. I want to sit down and look at a value of a home and actually go through some math about how much we're saving at 20 percent, what we save if we took some things back from +1, we would still get a discount. It may not be 20 percent, but I believe there is a 15 percent discount instead of a 20. We need to look at that. We need to look at where we're at now. We need to look at what would happen if we went to +2 and actually see some hard core numbers based on the values of homes in Charleston. I would hate to make any decision that could, I keep saying cost to benefit. We talk about all of the people that aren't insured properly. We talk about all of the people that would have a substantial damage claim or would have to raise their home. I'd love to talk to somebody who actually does that for a living and what they charge. We don't have those kind of numbers, and we're not going to get them tonight, but we certainly can get them within the next month or two, and we can certainly start this dialogue over and maybe ask the right questions because I think we were asking a lot of the wrong questions when we started out. I think that we were doing it for the wrong reasons when we started out, but now I think everybody knows the risks involved in this.

Maybe we need to have a workshop with some people from the community that do this sort of thing to actually talk some numbers. I want to see whether or not we're actually saving people money by going up. You say that we're doing it, we're at sea level rise. I get that, but the whole premise of this when this whole thing started was, 'Hey, we've got a meeting here, and we want to get the 25 percent, and these are easy points.' It was not your ideas of, 'Hey, sea level rise, and we're going to do this and do that.' That was not what the reason was when we were approached in the beginning of this. So, I think we had the wrong idea when we first started out. We were looking for an easy way to get up 5 percent, but 5 percent compared to what the alternatives are and what insurances you could be lacking could be a detrimental thing to not only one person, but to an entire family, an entire lineage of people. They could lose their home forever. Somebody who has been in a home for 100 years, but doesn't live downtown, could lose their home forever because they're never going to get a variance. Their chances of that is zero. There has never been one in the City in West of the Ashley, and I don't see one coming. So, we've got to do a better job getting all of the facts and crunching some actual numbers. We had that insurance guy come one time, but I wasn't totally sold on that. I really wasn't. He said the right things, but why would I value his opinion over my comrade on Council who has been an insurance agent for years and years? He's got some things he's worried about, and I've got to trust him on that. We've got some serious issues here, and we don't need to be doing this for the points."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Wagner.

Councilmember Wagner said, "I about forgot what I was going to say. No, actually, Matt's trying to pull from his memory an awful lot of stuff and Harry, I think, is actually right. When this first hit Public Works and Utilities which Keith, Harry, and I are all on with you, sir, and Peter, but when it first hit, I probably was the most vocal the first day on saying, 'I don't want to go to +2 anyway.' Yes, I was afraid my neighbor was going to build up here, and I was going to get flooded. Let's go back to a very simple picture of what I'm trying to tell you by doing that. This thing definitely says unless substantial improvements or results of an event other than flooding and therefore are exempt from the increase of elevation from one foot to two feet. That's what we've got. That's on the second reading. My question is, are you 200 percent sure that your recitation of the points and all of this good stuff, who is the culprit here? Why are we doing this? If it's not FEMA, who is it? Is it somebody else? Who is requiring this other than FEMA? Who is going to take away our points? Who is going to cancel our insurance? What's going to happen out here, and what is the citation? How about that?"

Mr. Fountain said, "So, DNR is the State agency that is in charge of implementing the National Flood Insurance Program at the State level. It's a delegated authority from the Federal Government. DNR has sent a formal letter saying they have concerns that FEMA would potentially challenge the ordinance language. That is the only thing we have at this point. There is no certainty or guarantee. It is not a letter from FEMA. That's why we've been reaching out to FEMA trying to get confirmation. I believe, from what we've talked with FEMA about, there is an approach where you could do it. It's just that new construction definition."

Councilmember Wagner said, "How close are we to getting a response? When did we ask FEMA, and what kind of response are we looking for and when?"

Mr. Fountain said, "So, we asked FEMA a couple of months ago. FEMA tends to prefer that you send them recommended language, and that's when we've kind of come back at that point. Of course, we tabled this discussion for the referendum discussion, and we haven't advanced the other discussion because we've been working on the referendum discussion at this point. I wasn't aware we were going to bring this back up or else we would have continued that approach."

Councilmember Wagner said, "I'm going to send you my wife because she'll ride those guys like Sea Biscuit until she gets an answer."

Mr. Fountain said, "We have gotten a good informal response saying, 'Here is guidance, and here is how you may be able to do it.' It just hasn't been a formal approval letter at this point."

Councilmember Wagner said, "Yes, I'm quite sure she is watching, and I'm in a whole lot of trouble."

Councilmember Griffin said, "That's the truest statement you made tonight, sir."

There was laughter in the Chamber.

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Gregorie.

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Can I ask the attorney something real quick about this draft? Because as I read it, it eliminates the one foot."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "No, it keeps the one foot."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Not how I read it. Now, you may read it differently. It eliminates that one foot. One foot is not mentioned anywhere in here. So, the way I'm reading this, and correct me if I'm wrong, that distinction that we just kind of explained that's there for the one foot any peril will require x, y, z, those distinctions aren't in here, and I think Councilmember Waring is correct that if we were to pass this as is, there is no distinction. It's two feet. Am I correct?"

Ms. Halversen said, "There is a sentence that the increase from one foot to two feet applies only to structures damaged as a result of flooding, but I don't see where we actually preserved the one foot in the paragraph above it. So, I haven't had a chance to really look at this draft. This is the first time I'm really looking at it, too. So, we may need to do some more work on it."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Right. Because everywhere there is one foot, it's changed to two feet."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Well, in Section 4(i) it says in bold print underlined, 'Unless the substantial improvement to the existing manufactured home is the result of an event other than flooding and therefore is exempt from the increase of elevation from one to two feet.' So, it's preserving the one foot in that case."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "In a manufactured home."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "No, it's the same in Section 5."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Then, the next one in Section 5 does the same thing for other homes, doesn't it?"

Mr. Fountain said, "Yes."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Yes."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "So, that's how it maintains the one foot."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Okay. I don't know. I don't think so. I don't read it quite that way."

Councilmember White said, "Basically, this is a replacement to FEMA +1. "

Councilmember Gregorie said, "Right. Exactly."

Councilmember White said, "Everything is stricken from the record and goes to two feet, and it adds the exemptions."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "That's how I read it."

Councilmember White said, "This is the existing ordinance of FEMA +1 replaced 100 percent. This FEMA +2 with the carve outs. The +1 goes away."

Councilmember Seekings was excused from the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Councilmember Lewis said, "Can we defer this until the next meeting? Can we defer until the August 20th meeting? There was a motion on the floor to defer."

Councilmember Waring said, "You know what, I don't have any trouble doing that, but the thing about it is we need to do something for the Legal staff because they did so much work on this to get it here for today. Beyond that, I don't have any problem deferring it because hopefully we're going to come back and finish it. I deferred it to get letters from the DNR and the National

Flood Insurance Program, but that has not really materialized. This should be decided on prior to the next election. In all due deference, we're talking about insurance discounts. We're in the middle of hurricane season right now. We're coming up on the 30th anniversary of Hugo on September 22nd, thirty years since we had a direct hit, and that wasn't quite a direct hit. If a hurricane were to hit right now, these people that are in jeopardy that we talked about could not repair their houses in place as they did 30 years ago. They could not do it, and what you're going to see, I brought up the example about Ansonborough. Ansonborough was flooded during Hugo. Supposedly, there was contamination."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "There was."

Councilmember Lewis said, "Let's not go there. Let's leave that one alone. I don't want to dwell on that."

Councilmember Waring said, "Well, my point is--"

Councilmember Lewis said, "I agree with your word supposedly."

Councilmember Waring said, "My point is that can happen to a larger sector of the community now. That community was displaced and a different plan put in place. We can go out and enjoy the plan right now. We can walk around Gadsdenboro Park, the condos, etcetera. That can happen to South Pine Point, Ardmore. That could happen to Byrnes Down, the Moreland area, and that could happen to South Windermere."

Councilmember Gregorie said, "It could happen to Gadsden Green."

Councilmember Waring said, "It could happen to Gadsden Green, and we're going to do nothing about it. So, if we're going to go back, and we're going to put it on the agenda, and we're going to finish it, and if this is so detrimental, and FEMA were to come back and say, 'No way. We're going to take this insurance program from Charleston entirely', you know what? We would act. We would act. Right now, kicking the can down the road is not acting. So, I'll defer it until the August meeting. I thank staff for putting all of this together because I think we could have put that on the referendum and the whole purpose was to elevate the level of conversation for more people in the City of Charleston. They need to know what's happening to their homes.

I'll tell you there is one other thing I need to bring up, and I spoke to Counsel about it yesterday briefly. Tuesday, we had a meeting at CPW and believe it or not, they brought this up. Do you realize if we have a major hurricane and CPW gets swamped, then they're going to have to come in under the new building requirements? So, that means while we're trying to get our essential services back, our building permit department is not going to give them a permit to get the water and sewer back online, and that's a highly capitalized business. You all may remember, we just approved, I think, \$129 million in refinancing. I think it was Mr. Julka, Councilwoman Jackson, that we spoke to, or was it a Floodplain Manager that said we're going to hold them to a higher standard? Well, if you're trying to get essential services back up, we've been here during Hugo. What happens? The fleet of utility trucks come in from other neighbors and states trying to help us. The military came in, and we were glad to see them. Can you imagine if our water and sewer services had to go through and apply for building permits and approvals through OCRM and DHEC before we get sewer services online? What was told to me is that things will begin to back up. Our system wouldn't be equipped to handle it. Sewage would begin to back up in homes, restaurants, hotels, and bars. We have not thought this through. So, there is more to think about and, you're right, more people would be in that vice, in that peril, that we all now know more about than we did when it was first brought to us. So, let's defer it to the August meeting, but we've got homework to do."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Is that a motion?"

Councilmember Waring said, "Yes, a motion."

Councilmember Shahid said, "Second."

The Clerk said, "I have Councilmember Waring and Councilmember Shahid."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Shahid.

Councilmember Shahid said, "Well, what I would like to do is if we can put this off, we've got, I believe, the 15th is another meeting, but it would help us all if we could put together, between now and the 20th, a workshop, and bring in the insurance people and bring in the FEMA folks to talk about these things. We've batted these things around. We may not get the answer back that we're looking for between now and the 20th, and we'll be back in the same boat. So, if we can put together a workshop, I would certainly appreciate that opportunity."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "We have a motion on the floor to defer."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "I agree with deferral, but I think that if we're really going to make this the quality session that we need to have and get to the bottom of everyone's questions and answers, why don't we put it off until September? We know that the CRS people are not coming until the spring. Isn't that--"

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Next year sometime, but we don't know when."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "So, I think we just need to stop piecemealing this and, Councilmember Waring, I know I'm a thorn in your side about all of this. What bothers me in our discussion is that we have the base elevation no matter what. If any houses, if Ansonborough was washed over and needed to be reclaimed again, they would start at the base elevation. So, we can't get rid of that. That's a Federal zoning requirement."

Councilmember Waring said, "With all due respect, you referred that to me. Nobody is asking to do that. I'm not asking to do that and get rid of base elevation."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "But, at this point then we're just talking about two extra feet. That's what I can't get my mind around. So, that's where I need to really understand how one is totally devastating that we're putting people in a vice and the other one is something we just have to live with anyway."

Councilmember Shahid said, "Call the question."

Mayor Tecklenburg recognized Councilmember Griffin.

Councilmember Griffin said, "Just to make it abundantly clear and obvious, every extra foot costs thousands of dollars, thousands, and people don't have that kind of money sitting around."

Councilwoman Jackson said, "Insurance will pay."

Councilmember Griffin said, "No, they won't always pay."

On a motion of Councilmember Waring, seconded by Councilmember Shahid, City Council voted to defer the following bill:

*An ordinance amending Chapter 27 of **the Code of the City of Charleston**, by amending Flood Hazard Prevention and Control Requirements in Section 27-117 to increase the*

Freeboard Requirement from one foot to two feet, effective August 1, 2019 (AS AMENDED)(DEFERRED)

The vote was not unanimous. Councilmember Griffin voted nay.

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "So, that's the added item to our agenda. We now have the Resolution regarding the referendum. Can I entertain a motion to withdraw?"

Councilmember Waring said, "I so move."

Councilmember Griffin said, "Second."

On a motion of Councilmember Waring, seconded by Councilmember Griffin, City Council voted unanimously to withdraw the following Resolution:

Resolution providing for an advisory referendum at the next general election on the question of whether the electors of the City of Charleston approve of City Council adopting an ordinance to increase the freeboard requirement from one (1) foot to two (2) feet for new construction or substantial improvement of any residential or non-residential structure in the Special Flood Hazard areas of the City. (WITHDRAWN)

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Our Committee Chairman of the Audit Committee has left, but I would suggest that the same report that he gave at Ways and Means Committee stands. Is that acceptable?"

Councilmember White said, "Move for adoption of the report."

Councilmember Griffin said, "Second."

On a motion of Councilmember White, seconded by Councilmember Griffin, City Council voted unanimously to adopt the Audit Committee Report as presented:

---INSERT AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT---

- a. Discussion of Internal Audit Report
 - Councilmember Questions
 - Mayor's Time
- b. Discussion of Internal Auditor Reporting Structure (*Requested by Councilmember Harry Griffin*)

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Next, Committee on Ways and Means."

Councilmember White said, "Move for adoption of the report."

Councilmember Mitchell said, "Second."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Is there any discussion?"

No one asked to speak.

On a motion of Councilmember White, seconded by Councilmember Mitchell, City Council voted unanimously to adopt the Ways and Means Committee Report as presented:

---INSERT WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE REPORT---

- (Discussion of Internal Audit Report
- Councilmember Questions

- Mayor's Time
(Discussion of Internal Auditor Reporting Structure *(Requested by Councilmember Harry Griffin)*
(Consider the following annexation:
 - 1707 McLeod Avenue (TMS#424-09-00-155) 0.46 acre, James Island (District 11).
The property is owned by MSA Holdings LLC
(Annexation toolkit presentation - Tracy McKee, Chief Innovation Officer

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "Would we entertain having a workshop meeting on this issue?"

Councilmember Shahid said, "I would."

Councilmember Mitchell said, "Mr. Mayor, I've been looking at this month, even next month, but I'm not sure we can cram any more meetings into what we're doing now. I've got meetings throughout August already."

Mayor Tecklenburg said, "We'll poll you for a time that will work for everybody. How about that? Okay. The next Regular Meeting of City Council will be Tuesday, August 20. If there is no further business, we hereby stand adjourned. Thank you."

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Vanessa Turner Maybank
Clerk of Council