



Richland County Council

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

July 14, 2020 – 6:00 PM

Zoom Meeting

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Dalhi Myers, Vice Chair; Joyce Dickerson, Calvin Jackson, Bill Malinowski, Jim Manning, Yvonne McBride, Chakisse Newton, Allison Terracio, and Joe Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Ashley Powell, Leonardo Brown, Brad Farrar, Dale Welch, Angela Weathersby, Ashiya Myers, Stacey Hamm, Michael Niermeier, John Thompson, Larry Smith, Tammy Addy, Clayton Voignier, Kyle Holsclaw, Quinton Epps, Synithia Williams, Jennifer Wladischkin, Judy Carter, Tariq Hussain, Dwight Hanna, John Hopkins, Jeff Ruble, Tyler Kirk, James Hayes, Allison Steele, Tommy DeLage and Brittney Hoyle-Terry

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The invocation was led by the Honorable Joyce Dickerson
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Joyce Dickerson.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **Regular Session: June 16, 2020** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

Mr. Livingston noted that “Tourism Development” needs to be changed to “Temporary Alcohol” throughout the minutes.

Mr. Walker noted the vote on Item 19 (p. 25 ~ Minutes) should be in favor, and not unanimous.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

- b. **Zoning Public Hearing: June 23, 2020** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- c. Special Called Meeting: June 23, 2020 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- d. Special Called Meeting: July 2, 2020 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the minutes as distributed.

Mr. Walker noted the vote for the Adoption of the Agenda should reflect it was in favor, and not unanimous.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

- 5. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Livingston stated the “Award of Records Management Storage Services”, which was unanimously approved at the June 23rd A&F Committee meeting, was inadvertently left off of the agenda. The item is time-sensitive and needs to be placed on tonight’s agenda for action. He requested the item be placed on agenda as Item (n) under Approval of Consent Items.

Mr. Manning noted tonight’s meeting is a Special Called Meeting due to the meeting not being held on the 1st Tuesday of the month, even though it was scheduled in Fall 2019.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the agenda as corrected.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **REPORT OF ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS**

Mr. Smith stated the following items are appropriate for Executive Session:

- a. Pending Litigation Update: Richland County vs. SC Dept. of Revenue
- b. Economic Development: Project Quattro
- c. Economic Development: Sale of Farrow Road Property
- d. Personnel Matter – Grievance Reviews and Recommendations
- e. Personnel Matter (Chair’s Report)

Special Called Meeting

July 14, 2020

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to divide the question.

In Favor: Malinowski, Terracio, Walker, Dickerson, Manning, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: McBride, Livingston and Myers

The vote was in favor.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to go into Executive Session to discuss "Pending Litigation Update: Richland County vs. SC Dept. of Revenue".

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Walker, Manning and Myers

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to go into Executive Session to discuss "Economic Development: Project Quattro" and "Economic Development: Sale of Farrow Road Property".

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Walker, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Terracio, Manning and Myers

The vote was in favor.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:23 PM and came out at approximately 8:13 PM

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- a. Pending Litigation Update: Richland County vs. SC Dept. of Revenue – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to instruct staff to continue negotiations on this matter.

Mr. Smith stated he is not quite sure what aspects Council would like for us to address, in the form of negotiations, with the other party. If it is all aspects, we understand that. If there are specific aspects, then he requested Council to articulate which aspects, for clarity.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, to not accept what the County was provided, but to move forward with all the aspects discussed, to include the start of discovery.

Mr. Lindemann responded those cannot be done at the same time, given the procedural posture.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the motion can be that we do not accept any offers made, and move forward, as discussed in Executive Session.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to not enter into any agreements provided to us, and to move forward with the other matters, as discussed in Executive Session.

Mr. Smith stated, based on the substitute motion, there was a proposal made by the other party, which was discussed with Council in Executive Session. Mr. Malinowski's motion was for the County to reject the offer and move forward with the pending matters, as discussed in Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Jackson and Myers

Opposed: Terracio, Walker and Newton

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Walker, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston and Jackson

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Economic Development: Project Quattro – [See Item 17(b)]
- c. Economic Development: Sale of Farrow Road Property – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to defer this item until the September 15th Council meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Walker

The vote was in favor.

7. **CITIZENS' INPUT**

- a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing – No comments were received for this item.

8. **CITIZENS' INPUT**

- a. Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda (Items for which a public hearing has been scheduled cannot be addressed at this time) – Mr. Franklin Buie provided comments regarding Spears Creek Erosion.

9. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. Coronavirus Update – Mr. Brown stated in a recent letter from the Governor it was noted there is evidence of high rates of infection in people who do not have symptoms, and do not realize they are infectious. They specifically pointed to the Center for Disease and Prevention that estimates that 40% of people infected with COVID-19 do not have any outward symptoms and may transmit the disease unknowingly. We had a report of a potential COVID-19 case, related to the Detention Center. Upon receipt of the report, we took immediate precautions. We instituted a process by which we

tested staff, as well as the detainee. It was discovered there were several individuals who were asymptomatic, but were positive for COVID-19. In addition, on July 6th, the mask ordinance went into effect. PIO and Community Government Services has been receiving communication opportunities and requests about the ordinance. We are developing a fact sheet to provide to the community, so the public can better understand the ordinance. We have received several questions that may require us to take a second look at our ordinance to provide additional clarity. The County has purchased masks to be passed out to the community. We are currently awaiting the shipment. Upon receipt, staff will work with Council to coordinate distribution. We will also be providing information, via the County's website, on how to create your own masks.

Ms. Newton requested an update on the services the County is currently providing.

Mr. Brown stated the Register of Deeds Office is open in a limited capacity, via appointments. All other areas are closed to the public, but we are still performing services online and via telephone. In reference to reopening, some of those things have changed in light of the increase in cases. We are instituting a training program for staff, so as they interact in the workplace they will know how to handle themselves, how to handle situations if someone is experiencing signs or symptoms, as well as, if you are a supervisor and you are notified someone is potentially exposed or ill. If you recall there was some time when we talked about looking at a 14-day downward trend to lead the discussion about when we would reopen. Since then, we have not seen a downward trend, so we started looking at positivity rates, and having a positivity rate of 5%. Now we are looking at positivity rates in double digits, and even using that as a criteria, we would not qualify for opening.

Ms. Newton stated we do not know how long this environment is going to last, so preparations to continue to allow people to work from home, and perhaps expand that capacity so the employees can be working safely and meeting the constituents needs remotely.

Ms. McBride inquired about the funds Richland County provided for non-profits organizations, and if those funds are still available.

Mr. Brown stated this matter would be addressed later on in the agenda under "Other Items".

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Richland County Sheriff's Department asked about enforcement, or assistance, in the enforcement of the face mask ordinance.

Mr. Livingston responded that he spoke with the Sheriff and Major Cowan before the ordinance was passed. At that time, they indicated they would rather not be the primary one to enforce the ordinance.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to who is enforcing the ordinance, if a violation is reported.

Mr. Brown responded there are members of Richland County team that can address that, and have the ability, if necessary, to write citations, even though we are not focused on writing citations. There are 2 Code Enforcement Officers, the Fire Marshals, the Fire Service who can assist with addressing any questions/concerns and enforcement.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, when we established the policies it addressed staff's travel for work, as well as all the aspects of them coming in, or not coming in to the office.

Mr. Brown responded the plan is not supportive any employee traveling to any work conferences. The only exception would be if there was a license that had to be renewed through some sort of conference outside of the Richland County environment.

Ms. Dickerson stated some places are making you go into a 14-day quarantine, if you do travel.

Mr. Brown stated, for example, if an employee travels for personal reasons, the plan is for the employee to self-quarantine for 14-days.

- b. P-Card Process Report – Mr. Brown stated, as indicated in the documentation he provided, he was asked to look into concerns raised about P-Card usage and internal controls. In looking at some of the internal controls that exist in Richland County's policy, he wanted to bring some things to Council's attention. The P-Card policy, in its current form, has gaps in its internal control measures. Specifically, card users have the ability to spend an amount not supported by their budget. For example, if you have a P-Card limit, you can go out and spend your P-Card limit and not have that exact amount in my budget. Using the P-Card, the system will not stop you from using it. Then, when the reconciliation process happens, Procurement and/or Finance would note that the funds are not there, but because the County is obligated to pay those funds for the P-Card, the County would pay the statement, and money would have to transferred to cover for that expenditure. He noted that purchasing limits are directly linked to the Department's budget, so there is not a specific mechanism he was able to determine that explains why a particular department has a particular amount on their P-Card. Also, deference is given to Council members and Elected Officials. Council members are able to approve their own request for a P-Card, which is different from Department Heads. Department Heads have to get their request approved by the County Administrator. Receipts documenting purchases may be requested, but not required, which goes to the point of people feeling they do not want to step on the toes of their superiors. Elected and Appointed Officials are exempt from the two signature requirement. If an individual signs for a purchasing card use, there is at least two other people, the approving official and the Department Head, who have to sign off on the statement. He stated you want a policy that communicates to everyone that is a P-Card user what the requirements are, and let that lead how things are managed. Additionally, the P-Card policy does not clearly define and classify all of the various uses of the P-Card program. For example, if you look at the definitions, you will not see Council members, but then going to the policy you will see some wording about Council members, which could potentially add a layer of confusion, when you are looking at how this is managed, and who is responsible to answer to whom. Lastly, the P-Card policy does not cite the spending authority associated with different classes of P-Card users. For example, if there are opportunities for P-Card users to spend County funds, it should be clear where the authority comes from. The P-Card policy does not address what happens when you bring in discretionary funds, which are tied to the Council's individual expense accounts. The P-Card policy may address certain criteria that are prohibited in its P-Card policy, but because some of the discretionary abilities afforded to Council. They can use their expenditures different from the P-Card, but the P-Card may be used, which goes back to us needing a policy that clears all those things up, so everyone is on the same page. He is asking to work with County staff to create a policy that governs everybody that uses P-Cards, so that way individuals will not be in a position to where they do not feel it is appropriate to question is a superior position.

Mr. Manning inquired as to what GFOA stand for, and the award they have given the County for the last 12 years.

Mr. Brown responded it stands for Government Finance Officer Association, and the award has the same title.

Ms. Hamm responded the award is for excellence in reporting.

Ms. Myers stated, as the person who asked Mr. Brown to undertake this review, she would like to thank him for doing so. She noted, during the process of this review, and while it is obvious from Mr. Brown's report there are members of staff who fear reprisal by asking questions about P-Card use, they do not fear reprisal from passing along information that in its raw form could be detrimental to people's reputation. She noted, for the record, there is nothing on her P-Card to indicate that Richland County ever paid for her to take an international trip. In fact, Richland County's record, from March 2019, reflects, while she took a personal trip, she met with local elected officials and took them dinner. The day she got back, she talked with Richland County staff and asked if that information would be weaponized, and misused. Dr. Yudice, who was in charge of the Finance Department, indicated she thought it could. She immediately repaid the charges, and is reflected in the County's records. The charge that scared her out of her wits, and was approved by staff, and never brought to me, was an absurd car charge, which was well over any limits that anyone in Richland County should be approving. No one ever asked her about. No one told her they were going to pay it. No one told her it had been brought to the County. Had anyone asked her anything, or even told her, rather than discussing it as internal gossip with other Council members, she would have said this needs to be challenged. She would have immediately said this does not look like a legitimate charge. As it stands, when she found out, she immediately had the charge reversed because it was not a legitimate charge. She stated we have come to a point where we weaponized everything, and we point them squarely at people's reputations. She suggests that is something we need to be a little more careful about. She stated what is on her P-Card is a lot of doughnuts, Sam's Club, flyers and running around, because we have a \$30Msewer project that nobody, but her, is providing public information for. She has held 25 meetings, which are reflected in her P-Card. If staff is serious about policing this, then maybe we should each learn to go to whomever it is that can actually answer the questions, rather than reporting on each other, and weaponizing information. When all of this happened, it was intentional, and it was clear there was an agenda. She noted this agenda is routinely used against people on this Council who look like her. She stated this is a tough job, and it is made tougher when we are in the circular firing squad against each other. Mr. Brown has done what she asked him to do. At no point, did she ask him to investigate her colleagues. He did not suggest that he was investigating me, but that is the narrative that was suggested. She stated we all have reputations to protect, and we have an opportunity to fix it. We do not have to run to the newspaper with things that are within our control to fix, and make other people look like criminals and thieves. She asked Council to take more seriously the reputations of themselves, and their colleagues. For the record, she has voluntarily met with law enforcement, and given them all this information because she wants it to be clear that she is not running around doing things that are illegal, and stealing from the County, which is the narrative that has fomented. She is happy to answer any questions about her P-Card spending, or the things she has to do for Richland County. She pointed out she does not represent a 10 mile district. It is 350 sq. miles, and it takes a lot more to do what she is doing, than what someone else has to do.

- c. Personnel Matter – Grievance Reviews and Recommendations – This was moved to Executive Session.

10. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL**

- a. Institute of Government and Annual SCAC Conference: August 1 – 3 – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Institute of Government and Annual SCAC Conference.

11. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

- a. Personnel Matter – This item was taken up in Executive Session.

12. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a Public Infrastructure Credit Agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to Washington & Assembly, LLC, a company previously identified as Project Novel; and other related matters – Mr. Barton Walrath, Mr. Andrew Savoy, Mr. Matt Kennell, Ms. Maureen O’Hare, and Mr. Robert Coble.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 20-001MA, Robert Giles, RM-HD to NC (2 Acres), Ohio Street & Olympia Avenue, TMS # R11203-01-01, 03, 04 & 05 [SECOND READING]
- b. 20-003MA, Chad Monteith, RU to GC (5 Acres), 6505 N. Main Street, TMS # R11716-01-04 [SECOND READING]
- c. 20-009MA, Bill Dixon, PDD to PDD (13.4 Acres), Greenhill Parish Parkway, TMS # R25800-03-44 [SECOND READING]
- d. 20-010MA, Yong M. Han & Kyu H. Han, RU to GC (.071 Acres), 10804 Two Notch Road. TMS # R259115-02-05 [SECOND READING]
- e. 20-014MA, Alex Serkes, GC to HI (6 Acres), 10501 Farrow Road, TMS # R17500-02-07 and 15 [SECOND READING]
- f. Columbia Area Mental Health Lease Agreement Renewal – 2000 Hampton St.
- g. Sweetwater Drive Culvert Repair Project
- h. Melody Garden Stream/Ditch Stabilization Construction Contract
- i. Replacement of Metal Storage Building at the Eastover Camp for the Department of Public Works, Road and Drainage Division
- j. Contract Award, RC-336-B-2020, Riverwalk and Stockland Drive Resurfacing
- k. Airport Construction Contract Award Recommendations
- l. Solid Waste –Host Community Agreement
- m. Request for Sewer Availability Approval Proposed Development on Koon Road Tract (Tax # R03400-02-56)
- n. Award of Records Management Storage Services

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the consent items.

Special Called Meeting

July 14, 2020

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

14. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of a Public Infrastructure Credit Agreement to provide for public infrastructure credits to Washington & Assembly, LLC, a company previously identified as Project Novel; and other related matters – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve this item.

Ms. Terracio stated she has heard from both the Vista and Arsenal Hill neighborhoods, and they are not supportive of this. She noted, for the record, that she had previously expressed her concerns regarding student housing and these credits. Therefore, she will be supporting the neighborhoods and not supporting this item.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the dollar amount of the infrastructure credit that will be given out.

Mr. Ruble responded, the way the program is structured, the dollar amount of the incentives is limited to the eligible infrastructure, as they submit receipts. At the present time, we cannot give you a dollar amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, we will taking our money and giving someone a credit, when we could actually pay someone to do the same thing.

Mr. Ruble responded, the way the program is structured, you can receive a tax break of up to 50% for 10 years, and it is capped at your public infrastructure. We require the receipts on the backend to ensure they have spent the funds for public infrastructure.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if they will be reimbursed, up to a certain dollar amount, their total expense for public infrastructure.

Mr. Ruble responded the total dollar amount is based off their capital investment. It would be 50% of the taxes they pay.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the difference between us giving them the credit and the County hiring a construction company to do the same thing.

Mr. Ruble responded the company is making the investment, and we are abating some of their taxes. The County is not actually going out and borrowing money and giving it to anybody.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if he was a developer, he could say, "I'd like to put a sidewalk and some landscaping in in this area. Will you pay me back after I do it?" The County would say yes, because that is what we are doing with this group.

Mr. Ruble responded if you spend \$30M on a development, and it meets the approval of Council, you could because it would qualify as public infrastructure.

Ms. Dickerson stated she supports Ms. Terracio's opposition to this project. She noted there is another building going up on Huger Street.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Walker, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson Terracio and Myers

The vote was in favor.

15. **SECOND READING ITEMS**

- a. 20-016MA, RU to RS-LD, 2304, 2312, and 2314 Johnson Marina Road, TMS # R01315-01-17; R01315-01-14; and R01311-02-20 – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE REPORT**

- a. Midlands Business Leadership Group – Gateway Beautification – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated the reason he voted against this in committee is because the briefing document referred to critics, and we do not know who the critics are that has harshly judged the County's appearance. These critics recommended more trees and less surface parking. He took a trip out there, and he does not see how you are going to get more trees and less surface parking unless you get some of the businesses to agree to give up property. A lot of the area has already been landscaped by the businesses, and he was not able to locate the rebel flag referenced in the document. In the committee they were told the business community is in favor of this, and willing to support it. Yet, when he asked how much the businesses has pledged toward this, he was told they did not know because they were just starting to work on that. Also, it was indicated the cost would be between \$500,000 - \$1M; however, at the committee meeting it was stated the cost would be between \$1M - \$1.5M. In addition, it refers to gateways, yet the only thing the resolution addresses is one gateway, and no guarantee that any other gateways will be addressed in the future, or efforts will be made once this one is done.

Mr. Livingston stated the intent of the resolution is for us to get on one page, and try to come up with a regional design. The intent was not to deal with every detail, but to start a process.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

17. **REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

- a. Presentation of Knowledge Economy Jobs Study – Mr. Ruble stated there are a couple different philosophies that compete in Economic Development. They are embodied by two directors of the old State Development Board. Mac Holladay took an academic approach to Economic Development. He thought that if you build it they will come. He was replaced with Mr. Wayne Sterling, and he had a totally different philosophy. He believed in big game hunting, and to not fix anything because that

is somebody else's job. His job was sell, sell, sell.... A lot of us, in the State, follow that latter approach. We are transaction oriented, and he approached it with that same mindset. He started looking at the big white-collar operations we have (i.e. Blue Cross, Colonial), and how do we grow those companies. And, what other companies could benefit from being here. We started having conversations around the community, and we developed a partnership among a number of our allies (i.e. Midlands Tech, City of Columbia, Lexington County, USC, SC Research Authority, I-77 Economic Development Alliance, and the CentralSC Alliance). The University of South Carolina hired a consultant to do a study for us. We focused on insurance technology. After hiring the consultant, the scope expanded. What was decided was that had competitive advantages in approximately 6 areas: IT, Financial Services, Health Information Technology, Aerospace, Bio-Tech and Medical Device. The fields of Bio-Tech and Medical Device are growing so fast that our community cannot afford not to be in that arena. The consultant developed 67 recommendations, across 5 general topics, including Workforce Incentives and Marketing. This was truly a collaborative effort, which is a monumental step forward for the community. We have been criticized for not leveraging the University. He has been doing Economic Development on behalf of Richland County since the early '90s, and we understand today better than we ever have what assets the universities are, and how to leverage them. This is an action plan, and not an academic study to sit on a shelf. We are creating working group, and are planning on implementing this. The general idea is to get 30 – 40% of the 67 recommendations. This is going to have benefits down the year, and he commended Council for supporting this. He also thanked Gary Powers for coming out of retirement to assist on this endeavor.

Mr. Jackson stated he would like to see this whole effort expanded, so the composition of everyone involved is reflective of Richland County, the technical colleges, the CATE Program, and the HPCU college and universities are engaged. He believes this is a great first step, but a lot more diversity needs to occur to be more reflective of Richland County.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and Infrastructure Credit Agreement, and amendments of certain existing fee-in-lieu of ad valorem agreements, by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Quattro; to provide for payments of fees-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve this item.

Mr. Malinowski requested the name of the company by 2nd Reading.

Ms. Myers requested to be briefed on this matter since it is in her district.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Dickerson and Myers

The vote was in favor.

- c. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Project Quattro; identifying the Project; and other matters related thereto – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Dickerson and Myers

The vote was in favor.

- d. A Resolution approving certain sponsor affiliates to join in the fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement between Eastover Solar, LLC and Richland County, South Carolina; and other matters related thereto – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Ms. Myers inquired if anyone spoke with the Mayor of Eastover regarding this item.

Mr. Ruble responded he does not believe anyone spoke to the Mayor. He stated this is a technical legal issue related to transferring the property to a third-party. He stated he will follow-up with the Mayor to answer any questions.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Dickerson

The vote was in favor.

18. **REPORT OF THE RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

I. **NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS**

- a. Lexington Richland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council (LRADAC) – 1 – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee recommended re-appointing Mr. L. L. “Buddy” Wilson, Jr.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

19. **REPORT OF THE BLUE RIBBON AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Continuation of Recovery Consultancy Services – Change Order #8 for Task Order #7 – Mr. Voignier stated at the May 28th meeting the Blue Ribbon Ad Hoc Committee unanimously recommended Council approve the Tetra Tech Change Order to extend the period of performance to October 2, 2020, and increase the Task Order for disaster recovery planning and implementation services to \$214,176, due to delay related to COVID-19 and other construction-related delays. This item was deferred at the June 16th Council meeting. On July 9th staff provided Council an issues briefing, via email, to address outstanding questions, and document the progress of the County’s disaster recovery efforts through the Single Family Homeowner Rehabilitation Program, which is administered by Tetra Tech, as the implementing contractor. Since Tetra Tech began management of the program, the program has experienced a significant increase in the combined output of completed mobile home replacements, and home repairs and rebuilds, in comparison to the first 3 years of the program. Tetra Tech has done so while remaining within the funding allocation designated by HUD, and the County, as this program is funded by grant dollars, through CDBG-DR. Tetra Tech is vital to the continuation and completion of this program, not only due to their efficiency and effectiveness, but also because the County does not currently have staff with the experience or expertise to administer this program. Tetra Tech’s Task Order expires on July 17th.

Mr. Malinowski stated, Mr. Voignier indicated this increase will bring the task order to \$214,000. When he was reviewing the information, it appeared this task order is already approximately \$4M.

Mr. Voignier responded the change order for this task order is an increase of \$214,176. The task order itself is approximately \$4.4M.

Mr. Malinowski stated the County could have bought a vehicle and sold it at the conclusion of Tetra Tech's services instead of paying \$20,000 in rental car fees. In addition, the \$73,000 for hotel stays could have been used to assist the citizens. To take advantage of this system, whether it is legitimate or not, and have one person reap the benefit of over \$90,000, is atrocious and uncalled for.

Ms. McBride inquired if there a final report, in terms of the number of houses that were rebuilt, and where they were built.

Mr. Voignier responded that information is readily available. The information is submitted internally amongst staff on a weekly basis, and he could be shared with Council.

Ms. McBride requested a summary, by year, since the information is available.

Mr. Voignier responded that information was included in the June 16th Council agenda packet, and some of the information was also in the issues briefing.

Mr. Walker inquired, if this item were not to pass, what would be the impact on the CDBG-DR program, and our ability to move forward.

Mr. Voignier given the fact that we have approximately 22 additional homes, currently in progress, we would have to suspend operations for 3 – 6 months to ensure that we can maintain the temporary relocation and storage expenses for the homeowners, who are currently not in their homes. We would also have to find staff with the experience to administer this program effectively.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in the agenda packet, it said that Richland County was going to have to take over to finish this. If that is the case, why did the County have the expertise then, and not now?

Mr. Voignier responded we do not have the expertise. A CDBG-DR Program Manager was hired. Unfortunately, that person resigned about a month into the position, and we found it very difficult to recruit this type of expertise, which is why we approached Tetra Tech about serving as the implementing contractor.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Manning

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

20. **REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Mitigation Credit Sales – Kershaw County, Beechwood at Camden Project – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated all of the reviews, and dates of reviews, are blank in the briefing document, so he does not know what reviews or recommendations resulted in. He noted on p. 300 it says “gross proceeds” and it was indicated at the committee meeting it should have been “net”, but the briefing document still reflects “gross”; therefore, he cannot support this item.

Mr. Jackson responded that the reviews did take place by Legal, Finance and Budget, and should have been indicated.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Jackson and Newton

Opposed: Walker and Myers

Abstain: Manning

The vote was in favor.

- b. Staff Augmentation Additional Selection Approval – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of 4 additional groups to support the Transportation Department.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Manning

The vote was in favor.

21. **REPORT OF THE SEWER AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. Council Motion: I move that Richland County staff reevaluate the sewer project methodology to potentially allow for usage based rather than flat rate fees [MYERS] – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee recommendation was for new development, dependent on Richland County water or sewer services, or both, that the developer be required to meter the homes for usage, and that going forward Richland County develop a phased-in plan, so that a certain number of historic customers are annually brought into a metered system, until all customers are metered.

Ms. Newton made a substitute motion to approve staff’s rate recommendation (p. 317) and adopt Scenario 4 (p. 323), with a slight modification that whenever the County’s flat rate increased by more than 15% that the transfer customer rates be allowed to increase up to 20%, not to exceed the County’s flat rate. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if we do this, we are not addressing the situation, which has been around for years of how we get away from the flat rate. In Scenario 4, it says the transfer customers’ rate will increase at the same percentage year, as the other utility customers. He would like to know how anyone ends up getting near the flat rate, if the increase is the same.

Mr. Brown responded the County already had some rates approved for the next few fiscal years, so the assumption the information makes is that those rates will not be increasing annually.

Mr. Malinowski stated if the rate does not increase, then these other people's rates will not increase. It says, "it will increase at the same percentage each year, as other utility customers." Therefore, it does not address the "catch up" rate or "usage vs. flat rate".

Mr. Brown stated an individual, whose rates are not equivalent to the County's flat rate, their rate will continue to increase, until it meets the County's flat rate.

Mr. Malinowski made the following friendly amendment to the substitute motion: that addition to the proposed rate structure in Scenario 4 that we also move forward with requirements to meter new homes and develop a phased-in plan for existing homes.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, these are homes located in the Richland County service area.

Ms. Myers stated she understands Ms. Newton's concerns, but none of what she has put in her motion speaks to what we discussed in the committee regarding fair treatment of people, within the same class. We have still not spoken to the disparity within a class. She would like some analysis of that from Legal staff.

Ms. Newton stated, when Ms. Myers says disparity within the class, she is specifically referring to the transfer customers where, because Richland County has a flat rate, the objective is to get those customers to a flat rate.

Ms. Myers stated, at the committee meeting, when we discussed the transfer customers, as well as the Franklin Park, we discussed the issue that they could all be one class because they had the same experience with rates dramatically increasing, but some of the customers had a decrease in the rate. She understands what Ms. Newton is saying is that they hit the ceiling faster, but that means the class is not all being treated the same. It also introduces the possibility for someone outside of the class to say they want a different rate.

Ms. Newton stated, she cannot speak to the Franklin Park customers, but looking at the City of Columbia customers, she spoke to some sewer attorneys about the rate structure we are proposing, which is where she got her information. As everyone is moving toward the flat rate, within the transfer customers, they will all be treated the same.

Ms. Myers inquired, if someone's rates dramatically increased, but someone else's rate went down, are we saying they are being treated the same.

Mr. Smith stated he did not review this matter. He believes Ms. McLean did, but he knows we were talking about the importance of making sure we were consistent and the rates were the same. If we were going to create a class to make the rates the same in the class, unless we could come up with a rational basis to treat them differently. He is not sure what format this particular version is in. It sounds like, from what Ms. Newton has said, this version did not get our review, but she spoke to someone else about it. If that is the case, then he would say, in order for him to address the question, he would need to take a look at it.

Mr. Brown responded this information was shared, and he is not sure who did, or did not, review it. The criteria that went into some of this information clearly states, with the unified system, if it contends to charge different rates to different customers, they need to be group together, in classes, where each class member is treated equally. These classes we are talking about are grouped based on the service, and the services provided. Currently the services are provided by mechanisms. One service is provided by wastewater treated by Richland County, and the other service is provided by

wastewater treated by the City of Columbia. Therefore, those two classes are distinct, so each member in that class is being provided service the same way. Those classes are defined by the services they receive.

Ms. Myers stated, what she is saying is, they are not being treated the same within the class, and Franklin Park, which is getting less service than all of the classes, is being left out. The reason we did not bring forward this recommendation is, while the classes were established, within the transfer customer class, we are basically establishing two rate structures, and the Legal Department told us we could not do that.

Mr. Brown responded he is not sure he agrees on the two different rate structures, within the class, but he hears Ms. Myers' question.

Ms. Myers stated, if one person in the class was paying more than our flat rate, and one was paying substantially less than our flat rate, and we take one back to the old rate they were paying and raise them up until they get to the ceiling, but we take the other one, within the same class, and lower their rate to our ceiling, we do not have parody within the class. We have two separate rate categories within the class. We also discussed that Franklin Park is getting service from no one, but is paying for future service.

Mr. Malinowski responded he recalls that Ms. Myers requested some information to be brought back. He was supporting Ms. Newton's substitute motion because it will be a while before we meet again, and trying to get those customers from the City back where they should be, which may be possible in the overall motion. If the objective is to have customers, within the class, reach the flat rate the County is charging, then reducing the rate of those at the high end, will accomplish that.

Mr. Brown stated, if we have to place meters before we are able to make movement on this particular area that will not be resolved by next week, because we will not have the ability do that in the short-term.

Ms. Myers responded she does not think the questions coming out of committee did not turn on whether there were meters. We were trying to figure out how to put people in classes, and how to fairly find a rate for the Franklin Park people, who are not receiving service from either Richland County or the City of Columbia.

POINT OF ORDER – Mr. Walker stated there is an appropriately seconded motion on the floor. Therefore, the unilateral decision to not address it tonight is out of order.

Mr. Malinowski stated, according to his notes from the committee meeting, Ms. Myers referred to the rate study, and that the assumptions were flawed.

Ms. Myers made a second substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Terracio and Myers

Opposed: Dickerson, Walker, Manning, Jackson and Newton

The second substitute motion for failed.

Ms. Newton stated part of the question is based on a broad policy of metering, and part is based on creating a rate structure for the transfer customers. Therefore, she moved to adopt staff's rate

recommendations, and adopt Scenario 4, as presented on p. 323. Ms. Dickerson seconded the motion.

Mr. Malinowski requested a legal opinion on if Ms. Newton's motion is properly before Council because her motion has nothing to do with the committee's recommendation.

Mr. Smith responded, once a committee's recommendation comes before Council, Council can decide to either act on that recommendation or amend the recommendation.

Ms. Myers stated we now have the transfer customers, who are being treated in a class, but we have a class of customers who are getting service below all classes of our customers, and they will be charged considerably more than everybody if we take this action, without including those customers. Her issue at the committee meeting, and tonight, is if we are talking about fairness in the system, they are the ones who are being treated least fair because they are not getting treated wastewater. They are getting wastewater that runs into a hole. She does not know how we create this class, for the sake of fairness. She would like Franklin Park to be included, but the issue, at the committee, is that we did not have information on how they should be included. They are the ones whose rates doubled for literally nothing, so they are below the transfer customers. She thought we were trying to give staff some time to tell us what to do with them. She does not think you can create these new classes and leave them out.

Ms. Newton stated, when it comes to a class structure, what makes a class is there are a definable group by their characteristics. Franklin Park can certainly be a separate class because they do not meet the criteria for the City of Columbia, since they did not have their services transferred by the City of Columbia. Perhaps that is something the committee could take up and bring back next Tuesday, but for this particular group, this is something that was brought to Council in February, with a motion to have a solution by March, and it is now July. The motion before us is something that has been investigated by staff, and recommended on several occasions. It does not preclude us, or the Sewer Ad Hoc Committee, from going back and looking at Franklin Park. It does not preclude us from looking at how we do metering in the future, but it does allow us to address some customers who literally woke up not having their service changed, but having their rates double and triple, for the benefit of others, which is inherently unfair.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to call for the question.

In Favor: Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor of calling for the question.

Ms. Roberts restated the motion before Council is as follows: was to approve staff's recommendation, which is Scenario 4.

In Favor: Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Abstain: Manning

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Myers instructed staff to deal with some fix for the Franklin Park who are not getting any treatment, and are paying more in this new class.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Malinowski

Opposed: Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

22. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Letter of Support for McEntire JNGB – Mr. Brown stated we received a request for a letter of support, which was submitted to Council. In order for them to move forward with the procurement of the land they are trying to buy, they need to obtain letters of support from Council.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the request.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the amount of taxes received from this piece of property.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. COVID-19 Pandemic Relief Grant Update – Ms. A. Myers stated the grant closed to new applications at 11:59 PM on June 30th, with a total of 490 applicants. Staff reviewed all applications for eligibility. There was \$1.9M in funding requests from area non-profits, which would have impacted low-income families, healthcare workers, children and youth, and individuals experiencing homeless. There were \$5.2M in funding requests from area small businesses. We also noticed an overall decrease in staff across the County's small businesses. The next round of award recommendations begin on p. 350 of the agenda packet. In absence of a designated Council member, the grant committees met to review and score applications. The recommendations for both non-profit and small business recipients are included in the agenda packet. Ultimately, we are asking that Council consider these entities for award, and should these entities be approved for award, staff will begin to disburse funds following the receipt of all appropriate documentation from those entities.

Ms. McBride stated we have not provided any funds to the constituents that are need. For clarification, right now we are just dealing with the entities that will be managing the funds for us.

Ms. A. Myers inquired if Ms. McBride is asking if we have disburse funds to recipients from the first round.

Ms. McBride responded she is referring to the constituents that are in need of rental assistance and food from these grants.

Ms. A. Myers stated they have disbursed funds to the first round of non-profit grant recipients.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, the entities, we awarded the funds to, are doing this. She would like to know how the citizens know who to contact to get resources.

Ms. A. Myers responded they have a list of the entities that are recommended for award, as well as those that received an award. She will be glad to provide that list, and request that it be posted publicly.

Ms. McBride stated citizens do not know where to go for funding because she does not know where to tell them. She stated the outreach is not reaching the people we need to reach.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the award of the funds to the recommended entities.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

23. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- a. Personnel Matter: Grievance Reviews and Recommendations – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to defer this item until the July 21st Council meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Walker

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Terracio, Walker and Manning

The vote was in favor.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 10:45 PM and came out at approximately 11:13 PM

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to come out of Executive Session

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- a. Personnel Matter: Interim Clerk to Council – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to proceed as discussed in Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: McBride

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: McBride, Jackson, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Personnel Matter: Health Insurance Coverage – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, as allowable that we cover 3 months of health insurance as the Clerk to Council leaves the position.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Jackson, Myers and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

24. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. A Resolution Recognizing June as LGBTQ+ Pride Month in Richland County [MANNING and TERRACIO] – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to unanimously adopt the resolution recognizing June as LGBTQ+ Pride Month in Richland County.

Mr. Malinowski stated, while it is his belief that individuals referenced in this resolution must be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity, and any, and ever, sign of discrimination in their regard must be avoided, and should be investigated, and he supports the intent of the resolution, he does not want to be misinterpreted as supporting the lifestyle choices of those individuals. Therefore, he cannot support the resolution.

Mr. Walker stated, in a similar lens, he acknowledges that all people should be treated equally, and acknowledgment by month could get overwhelming for every different sect of life. Therefore, he agrees with Mr. Malinowski, and bringing this forward as a motion, instead of a unanimous consent item would be a better alternative.

Ms. Terracio expressed her disappointment that the resolution could not be unanimously adopted.

Ms. Terracio made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to suspend the rules.

Mr. Walker reiterated his point that you do not need to take months out of the year to recognize certain sects of the population. He feels like inclusion and opportunity should be available to all 12 months out of the year.

Ms. Terracio responded to Mr. Walker's comments by stating that South Carolina is one of the only states that does not have a hate crime bill. While we do not effect that at the local level, we can certainly support those in the LGBTQ community in this one month that is historically recognized as

Pride Month. Until it is absolutely true that all groups of people have exactly the same opportunities that this is an appropriate thing to do.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Manning, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski, Walker, Jackson

Mr. Livingston stated the vote to suspend the rules requires a super majority; therefore, the motion to suspend the rules failed.

Mr. Walker inquired as to what is required to suspend the rules, in terms of votes.

Mr. Livingston responded, it is his recollection, it is 2/3 of the members present.

Mr. Walker requested to have the Clerk state the vote for the record.

Ms. Roberts responded there were 3 negative votes, 6 positive votes, and no vote from Ms. Dickerson.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to challenge the Chairs' ruling.

Mr. Walker inquired if we are going to address the technical aspect of Zoom, at this point, or is this something that would be appropriate to defer until we have an appropriate quorum, and there are no questions about technical difficulties.

Mr. Livingston requested clarification on what Mr. Walker means by technical difficulties.

Mr. Walker responded Ms. Dickerson was present, and now she is not. Therefore, he would challenge if that is a technical difficulty. Council is facing a lot of different challenges due to COVID-19, and with the meeting platform. He would suggest in fairness of all that we defer this to the next Council meeting to make sure this is not a technical difficulty.

Mr. Walker made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item until the July 21st Council meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Walker and Jackson

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Manning, Myers and Newton

The motion for deferral failed.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to adopt the resolution, as published on the agenda.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for the record, hate crimes are against federal law, so even if we do not have a law, the federal government would come in and investigate them.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Manning and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Walker

The vote was in favor of adopting the resolution.

Mr. Walker stated, for the record, his no vote is indicative of his continued pursuance of not isolating particular groups of people to create freedoms for month by month. Everyone should enjoy the liberties of this country, the liberties that has been fought for every day, and that is what he will continue to pursue.

- b. We move to immediately terminate the individual issuance of and usage of Government Procurement Cards by elected and appointed officials in Richland County [WALKER and MALINOWSKI] – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.
 - c. We move to reduce the amount of discretionary funds available to individuals council members; be it funds for training, travel and entertainment, printing materials, or otherwise, by one half of the currently authorized amount. This is to include funds reimbursed to council members as well, be it from a discretionary account or otherwise. [WALKER and MALINOWSKI] – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.
 - d. Repeal and change a portion of Richland County Ordinance Article XI, INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, Sec. 2-652. Conduct of investigations. (a)(1), that starts with, “Commence any official investigation...”. In addition, have the Richland County Legal Department in conjunction with the Richland County lobbyist contact SC State Legislators and the South Carolina Association of Counties to request Section 4-9-660 of the South Carolina Code of Laws be repealed/changed. – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.
 - e. Richland County amend the retirement insurance benefit for employees to be granted full insurance benefit to employees who serve a total of accumulated years instead of total consecutive years for their perspective terms for full retirement. Example: Employees who qualify for full retirement at 25, 28, and 30 years be granted full retirement based on a total accumulated years served instead of consecutive years. The total years must be with Richland County Government [KENNEDY] – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.
25. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:50 PM.