

GREENWOOD CITY COUNCIL

June 21, 2004 - 5:32 p.m.

**MINUTES**

PRESENT

Mayor Pro Tempore Niki Hutto; Council Members: Linda Edwards, Betty Boles, Herbert Vaughn, Johnny Williams, and Barbara Turnburke; City Manager; Assistant City Manager; City Clerk; City Attorney; Mike Hatfield of WCRS, and Wallace McBride from the Index-Journal.

ABSENT

Mayor Floyd Nicholson

MINUTES

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the City Council Meeting, and Executive Session on May, 17, 2004, and a Special Public Hearing, Meeting, and Executive Session on June 1, 2004.

Motion was made by Barbara Turnburke, seconded by Johnny Williams, approving the minutes as presented.

The Mayor Pro Tempore asked, "All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved."

Motion was carried unanimously.

REPORTS

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto asked for a motion to accept as information the reports from the City Manager for May 2004, and the Commissioners of Public Works Consolidated Financial Report for the period ending April 30, 2004.

A motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Hebert Vaughn, to receive the reports as information.

The Mayor Pro Tempore asked, "All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved."

Motion carried unanimously.

CONSIDER

Ordinance  
Authorizing the City  
Manager to Deduct  
Workers'  
Compensation  
Premiums from  
Uninsured  
Contractors'  
Invoices.

(2<sup>nd</sup> reading)

Under old business, Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the first item and asked for a motion.

Motion was made by Barbara Turnburke, seconded by Betty Boles.

The Mayor Pro Tempore asked, "All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved."

Motion passed unanimously.

- attach -

CONSIDER

Ordinance  
Authorizing the City  
Manager and City  
Clerk to Execute a  
Deed Conveying to  
an Individual  
Participating in the  
Housing Authority  
of the City of  
Greenwood's  
Section 8 Voucher  
Home Ownership  
Program, the  
Property Located at  
113 Balsam Lane.

(2<sup>nd</sup> reading)

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the second item and asked for a motion.

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Barbara Turnburke.

The Mayor Pro Tempore asked, "All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved."

Motion passed unanimously.

- attach -

CONSIDER

Ordinance  
Amending  
Ordinance 03-016,  
the City of  
Greenwood 2004  
General Budget.

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the last item under old business and asked for a motion.

Motion was made by Herbert Vaughn, seconded by Barbara Turnburke.

(2<sup>nd</sup> reading)

The Mayor Pro Tempore asked, "All those in favor please raise your right hand. Is there anybody opposed? So moved."

Motion passed unanimously.

- attach -

CONSIDER

Under new business, Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the first item and recognized the City Manager.

Ordinance  
Annexing 1.309  
Acres, Owned by  
CVS 7388, L. L. C.,  
a Delaware Limited  
Liability Company,  
Located off  
Northside Drive and  
US Highway 25.

(1<sup>st</sup> reading)

STEVEN BROWN

"Ms. Hutto and members of City Council: At last month's meeting, I informed Council that we were anticipating a signed annexation petition from CVS. We have annexed all of the needed properties to make that contiguous to the City. The only addition that we might see in the next month or so is another annexation petition from Greenwood Development, which would annex all of their properties. At the present time, we only have a ten foot strip.

One other note that I would make to you is that in this ordinance, you will notice at the bottom that I have added a sentence which says, '...this annexation includes SCDOT right-of-ways for US 25 Montague Avenue Extension abutting the northwestern boundary of annexed property.' We often take in all of the right-of-ways around the property. Because of the location of this property, and the undue burden that it would place on our police department, I am asking that the road, which is directly in front of the proposed CVS, be annexed. We would work accidents in front of the store, but the State Patrol would continue to work accidents on Northside Drive."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Is there anything else? Any discussion or questions? Do I have a motion to approve?"

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Herbert Vaughn.

“All those in favor raise your right hand. All those opposed? So moved.”

Motion passed unanimously. - attach -

CONSIDER

Ordinance  
Amending City of  
Greenwood Code of  
Ordinances, Chapter  
3, Alcoholic  
Beverages, Section  
3-4, consumption or  
Possession in Open  
Container - Streets,  
Parks, Etc.

(1<sup>st</sup> reading)

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the second item and recognized the City Manager.

STEVEN BROWN

“Ms. Hutto and members of City Council, you have been involved, or at least you have seen about three renditions of this ordinance. We have amended it several times as a result of input from the Police Department, members of City Council, Administrative Staff, and even some of the people who requested your consideration of such ordinance. I also understand that the City Attorney has some thoughts about this and he may want to share that with you in open session, or he may choose to ask you to go into executive session because it is of a legal nature.

Let me just tell you the revisions that have been made. The ordinance states, ‘...except as expressly provided in this section, it shall be unlawful for any person to consume, or to possess an opened container of any alcoholic beverage in and on any public street, road, alley, sidewalk, tree zone, parking garage, parking lot, or park within the City.’ Then we state the exceptions to that prohibition, ‘...or any public streets, sidewalks, or street zone or any portion thereof, that is located within the boundaries of the Great Greenwood Square, as defined in Ordinance 84-073.’ That means that this ordinance could only apply to the Uptown Tax District, which is a very restricted area. The Northern boundary is the railroad on Seaboard. The Southern boundary is Harvey Street, which is the road that goes between Old Discount Furniture and the Inn on the Square, and the old Winn-Dixie and First Citizens Bank. The Eastern boundary is Phoenix, and the Western boundary is Edgefield Street. It’s a small six block area. You notice that we also said, ‘and’, which means that Number 2 must also be present

in order for there to be an exception. This is new, ‘...designated in the resolution of the City Council as the site of a public festival or public event.’ The first requires it to be in the Uptown Tax District. Number 2 requires that it must be at an area within the district that is designated by City Council. Number 3 requires that a permit must be required under this ordinance. So if either one of those three conditions do not exist, or are not met, then there cannot be an exception. That’s a little bit different. Most of the other language in here is the same. In fact, I think most of it from that point is the same as you saw before. I heard City Council’s comments last time you reviewed this. I felt it was a consensus of Council that you would not consider an ordinance that allowed any alcoholic beverage in any type of park. All references to parks has been removed, and we restricted it to that Uptown Tax District.

As I told you at last month’s meeting, I am only an avenue, or channel, to present this to Council. I have my own personal opinions, but I don’t think they’re pertinent here in your discussions. There are a lot of people who feel this would make their events better. There are other people that feel we shouldn’t even venture into this area at all. I can tell you that I would rather, if City Council is inclined to allow this to happen, that you begin very small and very restricted. If you feel that this has come to you too quickly and Council would like to further discuss this with people in the community, agencies, groups, and those folks who have appeared before you, then certainly my recommendation would be to postpone it until you can gain the information needed. The only other suggestion, or amendment, that you might consider making is to possibly put a sentence that says, ‘...only the agency sponsoring the public event, or public festival may sell alcohol.’ In other words, you wouldn’t have an event where three or four people applies for a permit to serve alcohol.”

JOHN MCCRAVY

“I would like to say a couple of words, if that is okay. I wasn’t here at the last meeting, so I didn’t get a chance to really do a lot of research on this. I did have a chance to read over it, and I had a lot of reservations, legally. Like Steve, I may have personal opinions, but they’re irrelevant. That’s for you to consider, but I have some real liability questions with this. I think if a permit was issued negligently, I think an attorney could argue that. If somebody consequently gets drunk, rowdy, and hurts somebody else, there are a lot of laws in South Carolina that do allow for social host liability. I think that a creative attorney can bring the City into that litigation. I also think if that happens, a million dollars will not be enough coverage. I’ve seen cases where a drunk driver crosses the center line and kills two or three people. Well, \$1 million doesn’t start to begin to compensate the victims in a case like that. I think that would have to be increased a lot.

Second of all, the way this thing is written, puts a terrible burden on the City, in my opinion. When something goes wrong, everybody goes back and tries to resurrect the decision and nitpick it. If

somebody got hurt, they would go back and look at each one of these factors and try to say, 'Well, this was applied wrong and there shouldn't have been a permit in this case for this or that reason'.

Also, if a permit is disapproved, I think you're opening up a lot of legal controversy, maybe, in the avenue of people asking, 'Why was I disapproved and somebody else wasn't? I lost revenue because of it.' I think that ought to be considered. If it was restricted to just a government entity serving the alcohol, it might be a consideration. Looking at all these factors, we have an ABC Commission in the State that determines who should sell alcohol, under what conditions, and all these kind of things. They've been doing it for a long time and are good at it. They know how to apply these factors. This would be asking the City of Greenwood to start getting in the business of deciding, and I just think it has some serious legal problems.

Before the Council finally makes a decision on this, I would like the opportunity to pull cases in other jurisdictions that have this type of ordinance, and look at some samples of litigation that have come out it. I'm really concerned that there may be a lot, but maybe I'm wrong. I would like the opportunity to do that."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"My concern would be the brown-baggers that comes in, if you start allowing it. How many people are going to bring it in a brown bag? You might can govern how many you sell, somewhat, but you're not going to govern how much they got in the back of their car. My concern is, once you open it up, it'll be hard to restrict it to just one area. Once a person brings it in a bag, the next thing you know is it's all over town, and there's no way you're going to police it. Now, that would be my concern. If you're selling it downtown, and someone accidentally got hurt by one of these brown-baggers, there's no way anybody is ever going to know whether that beer was bought from one of our people, or they brown bagged it.

Why can't we have events around town without alcohol? Y'all already know that I'm gonna vote against it because it's downtown, and I like to see downtown prosperous. If they're having a sidewalk sale, I've got no problems with that, but when you sell it in the City parking lot and someone do get hurt, then you're in trouble. I mean, I'm sorry, but you're in serious trouble, if it happens. 'If' is a big word. That's how I feel about it. I don't know how y'all feel about it, but the brown-baggers is what would worry me more than anything in the world. You can't police it."

LINDA EDWARDS

"Ms. Hutto, I think at this moment, we ought to just postpone this because there are too many unanswered questions. Like Mr. Brown said, we don't have room for personal feelings, and I have quite a few about this issue. I would hate to think that we can't have events in the City, unless we got something to drink. I have a problem with that. You know we deal with moral issues. There are some things we want to sell moral, and some things immoral. If

you're going to bring your children to these events and you're walking around with this cup in your hand, I can't help if we do allow permits, I have a problem with that. Children do as they see adults do. You know we might not be here in a couple of years as Council Members, but if we pass something like this without examining it, it'll go down as this City Council passing this ordinance. If somewhere down the road somebody got hurt, we'll have to live with that for the rest of our lives.

My suggestion would be, to postpone this, get all we can get out of this in the work session, and think about this hard. Even if you have personal feelings, you think about it from that end, too. I just don't want to see where we can't have what we call, 'family events' and 'outings', unless I'm walking around with a cup in my hand. That's what I understood when they first said it, that people are saying we can attract more tourists. Well, maybe we don't need these tourists if they can't drink at our outing. They need to be somewhere else. I just think we need to postpone this because even among ourselves, we got questions."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"I'd like to hear from both sides of the issue from the public, quite frankly. We heard briefly from the people who would like to have this and more specifically, what parameters they like to have it, but we haven't heard from the general public in a sense of how they feel about it. There's going to be two sides of this issue, even in the public opinion. Not just here. I would be more comfortable hearing from the public on both sides of the issues, personally.

Now, culturally speaking, if we can get personal, I grew up with it. I'm speaking culturally, and personally, with me. I see how it has worked in our family, and extended family, in a different perspective. But again, we're dealing with everyone in Greenwood, and I'd rather have a consensus of the actual public that it's going to be serving."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"Well, I grew up with it too. I drank my fair share, and quit. I've been to places lately where they sell alcoholic beverages. I'd be sitting there, enjoying myself, and get it spilt all over me. I can remember one time we went to a restaurant, and there was a little kid that got beer spilt all over him. That's gonna happen downtown, too, when you start it. You're gonna have some people who drink socially."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Again, I don't think the public itself has been given ample opportunity to examine this issue. I don't think the public is aware of it because, if they were, we'd have a room full of people."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"I don't think this room will hold them."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"I don't think the public has been given an opportunity to actually consider the ordinance and really voice to their individual Council Members how they feel. The only people that have spoken to us

are the business owners in the Uptown area who are in favor.”

STEVEN BROWN

“My recommendation would be to Council to postpone this until the City Attorney can research the matter, and provide you with his opinion. Then City Council can look at his opinion and, if you choose to move forward, then at that time, require us to advertise a public hearing.”

LINDA EDWARDS

“You’re gonna have some people that’s gonna question about your drunk drivers.”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

“Well, I’ve already been asked about that.”

BETTY BOLES

“I would like to see us investigate. When you made the suggestion about the various events that we have per year, look into that to see how many actual events we do have where the merchants would request to serve alcohol during that time. Also find out how many business owners are interested in applying for this, because you may find there’s only one or two. I mean, you don’t know. I feel that if they’re interested in this ordinance, then they should be interested in also assuming some of the liability.”

STEVEN BROWN

“Council may want to consider not moving with this ordinance, but move with one that allow an ‘encroachment permit’. A restaurant, such as Regan’s, would be able to have tables out in front of his business and sell alcohol. He can get the applicable permits from ABC, but it would be restricted to right in front of his store. That’s the same thing with the Sushi Bar.”

MAYOR PRO TEM  
HUTTO

“To me, that makes sense. You have an established business who already has their liability insurance, licenses, and they are the responsible party.”

BETTY BOLES

“But we would still need some type of ordinance as a guideline.”

STEVEN BROWN

“Oh, yes ma’am.”

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

“That would also help fill in with what they’re talking about, as far as if we wanted to proceed with a café type atmosphere. If we’re looking ahead to planning for Uptown Development, that kind of ordinance would be much more beneficial to business owners.”

STEVEN BROWN

“If there was a public event in the uptown area, and someone did choose to have an alcoholic beverage, then they can go to that establishment. I know that is done in other towns. We’ll look at that and get you some information on it.”

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

“Well, that would be an option. It would also be additional business they may need.”

BETTY BOLES

“It would be pro-choice.”

STEVEN BROWN

“Right.”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

“Then you wouldn’t have John Blow out there wanting to sell beer.”

BETTY BOLES

“That’s true, and that is dangerous.”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

“They’ll be selling out of their place of business and they’re responsible. Am I correct?”

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

“I believe that we have a recommendation to postpone this for further evaluation and discussion. Do I have a motion?”

Motion to postpone first reading for further discussion was made by Linda Edwards, seconded by Herbert Vaughn.

“All in favor of if this motion, please raise your right hand. All those opposed. So moved.” Motion passed unanimously

CONSIDER

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the third item and recognized the City Manager.

A Resolution to  
Adopt a Policy  
Governing the  
Installation of Speed  
Humps within the  
City of Greenwood.

STEVEN BROWN

“It’s probably been years instead of months, but we have had some citizen groups to come before you and talk about speed humps. The only place inside of the City that we have ever installed any of these structures has been at Northlake Subdivision. We did that after careful study. We did speed checks, direction of traffic, numbers of traffic, and speed of the vehicles. Council authorized us to put in what was known as, ‘speed bumps’. Now, most people are going back with what they call, ‘humps’, which is a less intrusive, and has a tendency not to damage vehicles.

The last time someone came before you, Council postponed any action until we could provide you with a recommended policy. What we have before you tonight states that the City may install, or remove, speed humps on City maintained streets. I emphasize that because, once we get into the business of trying to install these on DOT streets, then we certainly assume a lot of liability. I can tell you that if the DOT follows suit with their past actions, they will certainly shift that liability to the City.

We stated that the speed humps may be installed if the average traffic volume is 1500 vehicles; less than 1500 and more than 400 within a 24 hour period. Fifty percent of surveyed motorists must exceed 30 miles an hour or 30% must exceed 35. Fifty percent of the street's traffic is cut-through traffic that's determined by traffic counts and traffic forecasting. The road must be less, or equal to, 36 feet in width. The road must not have any more than two traffic lanes. The street must have a speed limit of no more than 30 miles an hour. The street must be a local access residential street in a developed area. The road must have an expected decrease in traffic volume, and that group decrease must not significantly increase traffic on adjacent residential streets. Areas of streets for installation of speed humps must have a grade of 5% or less. We don't want to be installing speed humps where there is an incline.

Then, we stated that speed humps shall not be used in the following situations: streets frequently used by emergency vehicles, streets which function as the immediate egress routes for emergency vehicles, bus routes, intended truck routes, areas which are curved streets that immediately abut school or park property, and any other situation where the uses of speed humps are shown to be inappropriate by an in-depth traffic study. Then I added this sentence for liability purposes, '...individuals or groups requesting speed humps on streets not maintained by the City, shall be referred to the SCDOT.'

Our procedures will require a group of citizens, an individual, or organization, wanting to request speed humps to be installed, to come to my office and designate the district in which they're requesting the installation of speed humps. We'll give them a petition that is on a form that we design. When they have 50% of the people living in these units to sign that petition, they'll bring it to us, and we'll verify the signatures. At that time, we'll send out a mail ballot to 100% of all property owners living in that area. Any unreturned ballots are considered to be in opposition to the speed humps. They must have 75% of the people living in that area to vote for it. At that time, the City Council will conduct a public hearing to make a final determination whether or not to implement the proposed work. Written notification of the City Council's final decision will be mailed to each property unit address.

We have compared this recommended policy to other entities who are doing this. We feel that we have selected good criteria and good procedures. We're not necessarily asking you to adopt it tonight. If you want to study it further, fine. If you want to schedule a public hearing, that would be fine with us, also. This has been on our list of things to do for a long time, and we wanted to get it before you, because we certainly need a policy. I would not recommend to City Council that you postpone this or say 'no, we don't want a policy'. That's your prerogative, but I will tell you that we get requests frequently. We've been telling the public that City Council will be considering a policy. Your policy could very well be,

'We don't install them.', but we need something from you so that we can pass it on the citizens."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"You saying if we request it for Hunter Street, everybody in Greenwood Mill Village must vote on it, or just Hunter Street?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No sir. You set the limits. If it's one block of Hunter Street, then it's those properties within that one block of Hunter Street. It's the people who would be affected. It's every parcel of property which is adjacent, or abutting, that street, or block."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"It's City streets, only? It doesn't have anything to do with state highways?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Only City maintained. It is my understanding that DOT does install them in other locales. I don't think they've done it here in Greenwood, or in this region, but there are other places in the State where they do install them. All we're saying is, if it is a state maintained road, then we send them to the State, and let the State deal with that."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"So this needs to go to public hearing if we'd like to adopt this, or we could actually review this before we send it to public hearing?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Sure."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"It just takes two readings, right?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No sir. This is a resolution. We set it up as a resolution, and all you're doing is a policy. I'll be glad to set it up as an ordinance, if you prefer that."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Wouldn't it be more enforceable as an ordinance?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Probably so."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"I know that speed humps have helped on Northlake Drive."

STEVEN BROWN

"Yes, sir. We're about to go back and reinstall those. I would also tell Council that we are trying to use, as a test case on Northlake, a prefabricated speed hump, which is a hard plastic. Under the old situation, we would have to saw-cut the asphalt, remove it down to the base, and then build it back up. It's not only time consuming, but it's very expensive and a continuous maintenance problem. They do make prefab speed humps, which are a hard plastic that has reflective markings on it. It's much easier to install and, if you choose to modify that position, it's much more easy to revise and modify. We're going to put three of those in Northlake, and use them as a test case."

MAYOR PRO

"To see how they last?"

TEMPORE HUTTO

STEVEN BROWN

"To see how they last, and how effective they are. We feel that's the way to go."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Do you have an idea of a track record of how long?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Well, those out in Northgate have been in six to eight years prior to having to do maintenance."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Is there any warranty on how long those plastic ones are supposed to last?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No ma'am."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"There are a lot of cars that must go by a road in order to get speed bumps anyway."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Do I have a motion that we place this in ordinance form and a public hearing?"

LINDA EDWARDS

"Just a minute. Are you're calling for a question, because I got one?"

NIKI HUTTO

"Okay."

LINDA EDWARDS

"Do I understand you to say you need something now?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No ma'am, I don't need it right now."

LINDA EDWARDS

"Okay."

STEVEN BROWN

"You have already approved the speed humps in Northlake. That is the only one that you have approved and said, 'install it'. We removed them when we resurfaced, and now we're replacing them as the other Council has voted. We have other folks who keep asking us when we're going to be able to petition for speed humps."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"I wish we could pass what we have tonight, or put in a public hearing, because I know how the public feels already. How much difference would it be? It would be the same wouldn't it?"

STEVEN BROWN

"Well, ordinance form prevents a City Manager, administrator, or public works, from varying from that ordinance, one iota. It is a law and it takes discretion away."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"One more question. As many cars with aprons on them, what's gonna happen when they go over the speed bumps? Will the City be responsible for it?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No sir, not if you have it posted and constructed properly. We are

totally liable for negligence in anything we do, but if we do it right, post it right, and somebody ignores those signs, then I think that, as far as all the other roads, we're okay. The critical factor is that we manage this policy, and we do it to the best of our ability."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"In other words, by the time they enter the street, they'll see a sign that says, 'speed hump'."

STEVEN BROWN

"There's a state law that governs where you have to put the signs. Northlake is an ideal situation. It solved their problem. I am convinced that if City Council had not allowed the speed humps, we would have had somebody injured or possibly killed. It was a race track."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"People would come from Rock Creek through there."

STEVEN BROWN

"It was kids coming from the high school and career center."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"And parents cutting through to get to the elementary school."

STEVEN BROWN

"There are some councils that require the group requesting speed humps to pay for them. I have not heard that from City Council. We did not require Northgate residents to do it, and I did not put it in this policy."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"Well, that would certainly cut down on the requests!"

STEVEN BROWN

"But it would be difficult to administer, and trying to get everybody to pay. I don't think we need to be there right now."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"No, I'm just kidding on that. Do you want to postpone it?"

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"We can either postpone it for further discussion or.."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"He said that it would be better if we went with the other ordinance instead of the original."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Right. Or we could actually make a motion that we'd like to see it in ordinance form and have it go to public hearing."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"So moved."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Linda, was your question answered, before we move on?"

LINDA EDWARDS

"No. We're going to discuss it. I'll save it for then."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Are you sure?"

LINDA EDWARDS

“Yes.”

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

“Do I have a motion that we draft it as an ordinance and forward it in a public hearing?”

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Herbert Vaughn.

“All in favor?”

LINDA EDWARDS

“I thought what he was saying is that we were going to discuss this before we went as far as putting it in an ordinance and bring up a public hearing?”

STEVEN BROWN

“We will have it for you at your work session.”

LINDA EDWARDS

“Okay. That’s fine.”

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

“All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved.”

Motion passed unanimously.

---

AUTHORIZE

Mayor Pro Tempore Hutto read the last item’s title and recognized the City Manager.

The City Manager to  
Request the CPW to  
Install a Water Meter  
on City Property off  
Fair Street.

STEVEN BROWN

“Ms. Hutto and members of Council, as you well know, the City and school district has leased a portion of it’s property off of Phoenix and Fair Streets. The local soccer club went to the CPW and asked them about installing a water meter. Naturally, the CPW cannot install it, so they sent them to us. I don’t have the authority to grant or deny that request, so I have it on the agenda. They’re wanting to use it for irrigation. If City Council wanted to do this, I would ask you to stipulate that it be put on our property.

Why should we do this? I think first of all, we have property there that has sat idle for years and has been nothing but an overgrown haven for rats and snakes. They cleaned it up, removed a bunch of dangerous metal, are renovating a lot of the buildings, and are going to install bathroom facilities.

It's my understanding that these soccer teams, who for years had to play out of town, will be playing in Greenwood. Once this facility is fixed, we will have soccer teams coming to Greenwood. They'll play people from Greenville, Columbia, Charleston, and all over the state. We'll have people eating in our restaurants, sleeping in our hotels, and will be buying goods here. I think it's a small token of assistance that we can provide, and I think the rewards could possibly be considerable."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"They would pay the water bill?"

STEVEN BROWN

"No ma'am. It would be a part of our agreement with the CPW; the same thing that was done at West Cambridge Park."

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Barbara Turnburke.

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"All those in favor? All those opposed? So moved."

Motion was passed unanimously.

STEVEN BROWN

"I have two other items. One is for information."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Okay."

STEVEN BROWN

"City Council authorized me to negotiate with the property owners behind what was known as, 'Old Rush' and Phoenix Streets. We have negotiated a price of \$75000 for that property, and there is a signed agreement. It is being surveyed at this time so we can lock in the meets and bounds of the property. We also negotiated an egress and ingress through the existing paved Greenwood Mills Parking lot, which means that we won't need to make anymore cuts on that street and can use some existing curb cuts. We will be bringing that back to you for final approval once we get the meets and bounds.

I believe the next work session is scheduled for the 5<sup>th</sup> of July, which is a holiday. I would ask City Council not to postpone your work session, but to move it to the 12<sup>th</sup>, which means you would be meeting two Mondays in a row. I think we have some issues that we need to move on and we can do it if we had the work session on the 12<sup>th</sup>. On the 19<sup>th</sup>, you will have your regular meeting."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"Is there any way we could do it that Tuesday evening?"

STEVEN BROWN

"You could. There's no problem."

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

"Let's do it on a Tuesday because you'll be interfering in my vacation then."

STEVEN BROWN

"That's fine. I have no problem."

MAYOR PRO  
TEMPORE HUTTO

"It would be Tuesday the 6<sup>th</sup>, if its amenable to all. Is there anything else? The meeting is adjourned."

Meeting adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

---

Floyd Nicholson, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk and Treasurer