



Richland County Council
Regular Session
March 2, 2021 – 6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston Chair, Yvonne McBride Vice-Chair, Bill Malinowski, Derrek Pugh, Allison Terracio, Joe Walker, Gretchen Barron, Overture Walker, Jesica Mackey, Cheryl English, and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Ali Eliodorani, Ashiya Myers, Bill Davis, Clayton Voignier, Dale Welch, Erica Wade, Geo Price, Kyle Holsclaw, Angela Weathersby, James Hayes, Jani Hussian, Jennifer Wladishckin, Judy Cater, Lori Thomas, Leonardo Brown, Michael Byrd, Michael Niermeier, Michael Maloney, Randy Pruitt, Sandra Haynes, Stacey Hamm, Stephen Staley, Dwight Hanna, Tyler Kirk, Tamar Black, Jeff Ruble, Brittney Hoyle-Terry, Dante Roberts, Ronaldo Myers, Allison Steele, Elizabeth McLean, Lauren Hogan and Larry Smith,

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 Derrek Pugh.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Derrek Pugh.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **Regular Session: February 16, 2021** – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.
 - b. **Zoning Public Hearing: February 23, 2021** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the minutes as distributed.

Ms. Newton noted on Items 3 and 4 she is marked as “Present but Not Voting”. She requested to be marked as not present. She stated she had a conflict and briefly left the meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Regular Session
March 2, 2021

5. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved by Ms. Terracio, to approve the agenda as published.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The motion in favor was unanimous.

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

- a. Coggins v. Richland County and Seals (Gerald Seals Settlement) (Discussion of attorney-client privileged matters/Receipt of legal advice/settlement of claims; all pursuant to Sec. 30-4-70 (a)(2)) – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. English, to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, and English

Opposed: Malinowski, Terracio, J. Walker, and Newton

The vote was in favor.

***Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:10 PM
and came out at approximately 6:58 PM***

Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to direct Legal to move forward as discussed in Executive Session and bring back the necessary information at the next Council meeting.

Mr. Walker made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to acknowledge the motion made in November pertaining to this issue, extend an invitation to Mr. Seals for a public hearing that would provide him an unfettered opportunity to tell us the reasons he believes he was fired, and tell us the various actions he saw that he thinks the public need to see, so the taxpayers can see why almost a \$1M of their money was paid out as a settlement.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, and Newton

Opposed: McBride, Livingston, O. Walker, Mackey, and English

The vote was in favor.

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

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, and English

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, Terracio, J. Walker, and Newton

**Regular Session
March, 2, 2021**

The vote was in favor.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. English, to approve the original motion made by Ms. Barron.

Mr. J. Walker noted he wanted to go on the record, and clearly articulate, in November, Council put forward a path that was voted on, approved and clinched. This directive flies in the face of that action. He stated he would personally look into the legality of the actions of this evening, as opposed to what was passed and clinched in November.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this motion would void previous Council's previous motion. He also inquired if the previous motion was still available to Mr. Seals.

Ms. McLean responded in the affirmative. At this point, nothing is being voided or taken away. Mr. Seals' response, as discussed, was in response to that motion.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, Mr. Seals was not denied that motion.

Ms. McLean responded, in her opinion, he was not.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it seemed to him, when the initial motion was made, the language "as directed in Executive Session". He noted Council cannot be directed in Executive Session. He requested to have the language restated and/or clarified.

Mr. Livingston requested Legal to ensure the language is proper.

McLean suggested using the words "as discussed in Executive Session".

Ms. Barron restated her motion to direct Legal to bring back the necessary information by the next Council meeting, as discussed in Executive Session.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Barron, Mackey and English

Opposed: Malinowski, Terracio, J. Walker, O. Walker, and Newton.

The vote was in favor.

7. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

- a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public – No Comments were submitted.

8. **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

- a. Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda (Items for which a public hearing is required or a public hearing has been scheduled cannot be addressed at time.) – Mr. Slagsvol submitted a comment requesting Council to pause Countywide Re-Zoning process.

9. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. Coronavirus Update – Mr. Brown stated, on pp. 29 – 30, you will see the Richland County COVID-19 information. He noted we were roughly 9.8% positive. The goal has always been 5% or lower, so

based on this data we are still slightly above that mark. He included some myths and facts about COVID-19, as well as the frequently asked questions vaccine sheet. On p. 35, you will find the COVID-19 vaccine flowchart. Today Gov. McMaster, along with DHEC, announced they were moving to Phase 1B of the vaccine flow in South Carolina. This will impact some of the individuals in Richland County, as well as County Government. He noted they sent out an email to County employees, but there will be targeted employees (i.e. correctional and judicial staff and the Register of Deeds Office, etc.) contacted that Phase 1B may apply to. He noted he had a conversation with Mr. Byrd to discuss who would fall into 1B versus 1C. He stressed, while Richland County participates, we do not distribute vaccines, nor do we have jurisdiction over who gets vaccines and who does not.

Ms. Terracio stated she has constituents that are eager to access the County's buildings. She requested an update on how County staff ensures they receive emails, phone calls and responding to constituents.

Mr. Brown responded a majority of County staff is working in County offices during the week. Some staff is working staggered shifts to reduce the chances of a whole department being wiped out if we have any COVID-19 exposures. Currently the quarantine process is if individuals are exposed they have to remove themselves from the premises for a period of 10-14 days. The majority of the Ombudsman's Office staff are working remotely because the bulk of their work is done via email and phone calls. With the institution of Phase 1B, we believe it will allow employees to feel more comfortable about being in the office.

- b. Budget Calendar – Mr. Brown noted this was something that was discussed during the Council Retreat. On p. 41, you will see some proposed dates for budget workshops. This past month, we met with the departments within County Government to discuss the budget outlook and getting their budget requests. On p. 42, you will see some proposed workshop opportunities. This will be a time for Council and staff to have a good dialogue. It will be informal, but very question and answer driven, so we can make sure when we come to Council with the budget, we can have productive meetings. On p. 43, you have the recommended budget calendar, which we are asking Council to consider and approved in the near future.
- c. Sewer Rate Increase Update – Mr. Brown noted, in February 2019, Council voted on its water and sewer program. Council approved a rate increase for the next three (3) fiscal years. This past year, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, Council took action to delay the rate increase for six (6) months. Instead of being effective July 1, 2020, it was delayed into the first of the year. He stated we need to move forward with putting those rates in place. Without implementing the increase, we will not be able to meet our bond obligations. If we want to discuss the next rate increase that was to take effect in July 2021, we can certainly do so at a later date.

Ms. Newton inquired if this is separate from the rate structure that Council approved for District 11 transfer customers.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. That is included with the approved process, and no constituent within Richland County would receive more than a 15% rate increase the system, including the individuals Ms. Newton referenced.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the rate increase had to happen to meet our bond payment obligations.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton inquired if constituents would expect to have their rate increased twice in 2021.

Mr. Brown stated that will be his request to Council. He cannot say that because the vote Council took is different from this. We comes back with an item for action, the recommendation will likely be to implement the July 2021 increase in January 2022.

Ms. Newton inquired if there were any Federal dollars that could be applied.

Mr. Brown responded, during the Coronavirus Ad Hoc meeting, they discussed the Emergency Rental Assistance Program, Richland County, as a utility system does qualify. Those renters that are paying rent within our system, have the ability to qualify for that program, but beyond that we have not been able to get any other funding source we can use to pay for our utility system.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, when Ms. Newton inquired about more than one rate increase per year. We are talking about a January and a July increase. He does not know if she was referring to a calendar or fiscal year.

Mr. Brown responded we are going to do an increase now. In terms of the next increase, he would say in January 2022, we would come back to Council to implement the next rate increase.

10. **REPORT OF THE INTERIM CLERK OF COUNCIL** – No report was given.
11. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – No report was given.
12. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**
 - a. 20-031MA Jim Chapman M-1 to RM-MD (39.47 Acres) Rivkin Blvd. TMS # R22807-01-07
 - b. 20-033MA Yani G. Mouratev RR to HI (69.93 Acres) 115 Tims Road TMS # 06600-02-12
 - c. 20-039MA Will Unthank NC to GC (.86 Acres) 9366 and 9370 Two Notch Road TMS # R19908-03-23 & 07 U
 - d. 20-042MA Gita Teppara RS-MD to RM-MD (6.2 Acres) Sloan Road and Dorichlee Road TMS # R20101-05-01
 - e. 20-043MA Jeff Baker NC to GC (.8 Acres) 1630 and 1636 Leesburg Road TMS # R19203-11-05 & 06
 - f. 20-044MA Alexis Kisteneff, Jr. RS-HD to RM-HD (.20 Acres) 3921 Capers Avenue TMS # R13805-03-19
 - g. 21-003MA Walter L. McLaughlin, Jr. RU to GC (.33 Acres) 10400 Broad River Road TMS # R03300-06-08
 - h. Petition to Close Portion of Old Percival Road/Spears Creek Rd.
 - i. Mutual Easement Agreement between Washington & Assembly, LLC and Richland County, South Carolina impacting the Richland Library branch located on Assembly Street, Columbia, South Carolina [FIRST READING]

**Regular Session
March, 2, 2021**

- j. Southeast Water and Sewer Project – Hopkins Magistrate - Change Order 1 - TCO Construction
- k. Kneece Rd Sidewalk Award
- l. Wildewood Roads Repair/Resurfacing Award
- m. Spring Park Dr & Greenhill Parish Pkwy Sidewalk Design Award

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to approve the consent items.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

13. **SECOND READING ITEMS**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of an assignment by Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc. ("TPF") of a 2017 fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF to Project Charlie; the execution and delivery of an assignment by TPF to Project Charlie of a 1996 fee-in-lieu of taxes agreement in the form of a lease agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; the execution and delivery of an amendment to the 2017 fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and TPF; and other related matters. – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE

- a. Solid Waste - Richland Recycles Events – Mr. Malinowski noted, while he supports this, he noticed all the events throughout the next year are in one location, which is not centrally located to Richland County. He would like to see additional events scheduled in other areas of the County.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve this item.

Ms. Barron stated she and Mr. Pugh joined staff at the recycling event at the Riverbanks Zoo. The event was a collaborative event with Lexington and the City of Columbia. She commended staff for doing an excellent job.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Castelluccio stated other events are planned. She noted approximately 900 cars came to the event at the Riverbanks Zoo.

14. **REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE**

- a. Sewer Availability - Savannah Wood Phase II – Mr. Malinowski stated he would like to point out on Items 14(a), (b) and (c) the opening line states “A Sewer Availability Letter has been issued. Staff recommends County Council approve the proposed development.” For the record, Council is not approving a proposed development. We are only approving that sewer capacity is available based on the Utilities recommendation. He also noted, on p. 128, the letter states it is good for 12 months, but the number in parentheses is 24. The correct number is 12 months.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Barron, to approve Items 14(a), (b) and (c).

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Sewer Availability - Cabin Creek Place - This item was approve in Item 14(a).
- c. Sewer Availability - Congaree Project - This item was approved in Item 14(a).
- d. County Purchase Card Program – Mr. Malinowski noted today we received a redlined version of the document that is different from the one in the agenda. It was his understanding we are approving the redlined version.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the redlined version.

Ms. Mackey inquired if the redlined document would be updated/uploaded to the County website for constituents to review.

Ms. Thomas responded in the affirmative. The redlined and final approved document will be uploaded.

Ms. Newton inquired if Ms. Thomas could explain the key differences between the redlined document and the document in the agenda packet.

Ms. Thomas responded she addressed Mr. Malinowski’s requests and concerns. On p. 4 of the policy, we will require the training to be done before anyone receives a purchasing card. A typographical error was corrected under “Purchasing Guidelines”. Under “Purchasing Card Restrictions”, we have indicated this is not an all-inclusive list and indicates if there is are questions regarding the validity of a charge they should reach out to the PCPA. On p. 7 of the policy, it states, we will require individuals to retain the records for three (3) years for an audit. Any transaction that is found to be unsubstantiated, unapproved or any purpose that is not related to County business will be required to be reimbursed by the employee, and result in suspension or revocation of the purchasing card. Periodic audits will be performed and cardholders must maintain a copy of all the statements and receipts for three (3) years.

Ms. Barron inquired if there would be a backup person in the office for purchases.

Ms. Thomas responded, in the event of a need for a backup person, they would work with the departments to make sure they have the coverage they need. The department head could always

be the person to make most transactions.

Ms. Barron inquired if the default person would always be the department head and would be trained to be a cardholder.

Ms. Thomas responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Barron inquired if Council would have one card or would there be individual cards for each Councilmember.

Ms. Thomas responded there would be clarity on who is incurring the charges. If the person in the department is given the appropriate instruction, they would be able to allocate those charges to the individual persons.

Ms. Barron inquired if that would be the standard for transparency. She believes it is important that we know where expenses are going and who is responsible for them. For example, the cardholder's records would indicate that she has spent "XX" amount of dollars on these items, so there is a cross-reference when the receipts are received.

Ms. Thomas responded in the affirmative. She noted some department's situations might be different because they may be ordering office supplies, equipment, etc. If it is attributed to an individual person we can accommodate that.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the way the document is written, individual Council members would not have cards, rather someone in the Clerk of Council's Office would have cards, and those charges we are reimbursed for would be allocated to the appropriate Council member.

Ms. Barron responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Terracio inquired who the cardholder would be for Council. She also inquired who the Purchase Card Policy Administrator would be.

Ms. Thomas answered she believed it would be the Clerk to Council and a possible backup as well.

Mr. Brown noted the Purchase Card Policy Administrator was already an existing position and they are in the Procurement Department.

Ms. McBride noted she appreciated the internal controls are being put into place.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Barron to reconsider Items 12(h) – (m), 13(a) and 14(a) – (d).

Mr. Malinowski noted that Item 12(i) was a First Reading item and should not be reconsidered.

Ms. Newton amended her motion to reconsider Items 12(h), 12(j) – (m), 13(a) and 14(a) – (d).

In favor: McBride

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English, and Newton.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- a. Sonoco Recycling Contract Extension – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee recommended approving the contract extension. Some of the committee members had questions that were not addressed due the time constraints.

Ms. Newton inquired if the budget office had concerns about the solvency of the department. What is being done to address these concerns?

Mr. Brown responded the question was about the landfill, and the associated program, being able to be an Enterprise Program. There were some rates that had not been addressed over a period of time, so those things are what is happening now. As we are addressing our rates, and trying to catch up, other agencies have continued to progress their rates. The services we are being provided have continued to increase, even though we have not gotten to a level where we are fully recouping the costs associated with the program.

Mr. Hayes responded the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund, as whole, and their revenue has not caught up with their expenditures.

Ms. Newton inquired about the timeframe for when Solid Waste will be coming back to Council. She noted she would like Council to address the overall Enterprise Funds to make sure they are operating as Enterprises Funds should.

Ms. Terracio noted the contract will be expiring at the end of the month. She inquired if Administration working toward a procedure in which Council are brought items in a more timely manner.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. He noted we have a meeting to address this concern. While there may be a few items coming up that need to be addressed, but they are working to bring items to Council in a more timely manner.

Mr. Maloney responded they received a letter on September 15, 2021. At that time, they had a different general manager. They looked at this initially as a rate increase, and potentially bidding the service out. After talking to customers, they found there were no alternatives. In December, they conducted a composition study of Richland County's contribution to the facility and found they have the cleanest recycling due to the efforts put in the collections. There is actually a 10% rate decrease compared to what calendar year 2020 provided. Because the amount of contamination in our recycling is so low we are able to garner a decrease. It would be two (2) years until we return with 5% rate increases each year to the level we are for 2020.

Ms. Terracio inquired if this also means we have less rejected recycling that goes into the landfill.

Mr. Maloney responded in the affirmative. He noted it costs \$50/ton to dispose of the rejected recycling.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, if they were seeing a rate decrease, how would that affect the concerns of the overall Solid Waste expenditure remaining above revenue.

Mr. Maloney responded it is approximately 3% of the overall budget, so he does not see that remedying the whole budget. He sees it going in the right direction, but they will have to come back to Council to talk about small, regular rate increases.

Mr. Malinowski stated we are mandated by the State to have a recycling program. He noted other municipalities are not required to pick-up the recycling. He inquired as to what the County is mandated to do.

Mr. Maloney responded our mandate by DHEC is part of our Solid Waste 20-year plan. Some of its requirements are: designation of a Recycling Coordinator, description of the recycling program, outreach and education initiatives, an outline on how the County/Region plans to meet the South Carolina's waste reduction and recycling goals. It does not require us to have curbside pickup.

Mr. Malinowski noted, on p. 255, the word contract is struck through. To him, the word contract is stronger than agreement, so he was curious why the language was changed.

Ms. McLean responded the change was for consistency purposes because agreement was used later in the document. Both terms are interchangeable.

Mr. Malinowski stated noted we did not enter into an agreement on June 1, 2016, but a contract. He believes the language should be "services agreement, formerly a contract".

Ms. McLean responded she would look at the original document, and if the wording was contract, she will make the appropriate changes.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

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

- a. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Project A; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Ms. McBride noted this is an inducement resolution that does not obligate the County to anything. It only recognizes the project, from a legal standpoint, so that the company's 2020 investments can be included in any incentive the County negotiates. Staff will move forward to finalize negotiations and return to Council with full terms of a proposed agreement. While the company cannot be disclosed at this time, they desire to invest capital in Richland County to expand its aluminum processing facility. The committee recommended approval.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

- a. Resurfacing Package R – Mr. Livingston stated staff's recommendation was to award the Resurfacing Package R to Palmetto Corp. of Conway in the amount of \$3,390,951.94, to approve a 10% construction contingency of \$339,095.19, for a total budget of \$3,730,047.13. The committee's recommendation was for approval.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

Opposed: J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

Ms. Barron moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: J. Walker

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. Garners Ferry/Harmon Intersection – Mr. Livingston stated the Committee recommended moving the project forward with the original pre-scope design of Garner's Ferry/Harmon intersection project. The committee's recommendation was for approval.

Mr. Livingston inquired why the other projects were included in the briefing document for the agenda packet.

Mr. Niermeier responded he thought it was in the best interest of the new Councilmembers to see the total summary document, as well as the other projects. In the future, he will only include information for the specific project.

Mr. Livingston noted, to make it clear, Council is only voting on the Garners Ferry/Harmon Intersection.

In Favor: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

Opposed: Malinowski and J. Walker

The vote was in favor.

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

In Favor: Malinowski and J. Walker

Opposed: Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

17. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. Approving the declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions for the Blythewood Business Park; and other related matters – Mr. Malinowski noted he spoke with Mr. Ruble today, and because he was not able to get his questions answered until tomorrow, Mr. Ruble indicated he would be fine with deferring this item until the March 16th Council meeting.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Pugh, to defer this item until the March 6th meeting.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Resolution to appoint and commission Jordan Casey Abercrombie as a Code Enforcement Officer for the proper security, general welfare, and convenience of Richland County – Ms. Terracio moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. O. Walker, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Malinowski, Pugh, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, J. Walker, Barron, O. Walker, Mackey, English and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

18. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – There were no items for Executive Session.

19. **MOTIONS PERIOD** –

- a. I move that Richland County Council direct the County Administrator and his staff to conduct an equity and inclusive assessment of Richland County Administrative policies and services; and provide recommendations for a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for people of color, women and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent inequality. By advancing equity across Richland County Government, we can create opportunities for the improvement of businesses, communities and individuals that have been historically under-served, which will benefit all of Richland County. Appropriate assessments will better equip Richland County to develop policies and programs that deliver resources and benefits equitably to all – This item was referred to the A&F Committee.

20. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:26 PM.