



GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Regular Meeting

January 9, 2018

6:07 p.m.

County Square – Council Chambers

Council Members

Mr. Butch Kirven, Chairman

Mr. Willis Meadows, Vice Chairman

Mrs. Xanthene Norris, Chairman Pro Tem

Mr. Joe Dill

Mr. Mike Barnes

Mr. Sid Cates

Mr. Rick Roberts

Mr. Bob Taylor

Mrs. Liz Seman

Mr. Ennis Fant, Sr.

Mr. Lynn Ballard

Mr. Fred Payne

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted on the bulletin board at the County Square and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned Citizens.

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT

Fred Payne, District 28

STAFF PRESENT

Joe Kernell, County Administrator

Mark Tollison, County Attorney

Dean Campbell, Deputy County Attorney

Jeffrey Wile, Assistant County Attorney

John Hansley, Deputy County Administrator

Regina McCaskill, Clerk to Council

Jessica Stone, Deputy Clerk to Council

Paula Gucker, Assistant County Administrator, Public Works

John Vandermosten, Assistant County Administrator, Public Safety

Bob Mihalic, Governmental Relations Officer

Shannon Herman, Assistant County Administrator

OTHERS PRESENT

None

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Butch Kirven

INVOCATION

Rabbi Matthew Marko
Congregation Beth Israel

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Item (4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved to amend the minutes of the December 5, 2017, County Council Meeting as outlined in the copies provided to Council.

Motion to amend carried unanimously by Council Members present.

Motion as amended carried unanimously by Council Members present.

Item (5) APPEARANCES – current agenda items

None

Item (6) ORDINANCES – THIRD READING

(a) Zoning Ordinances

1. **CZ-2017-59: Property of Donald Marvin Bragg, located at 810 W. Bramlett Road, requesting rezoning from R-7.5 to C-1.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

2. **CZ-2017-60: Property of V-Go Holdings, LLC, located at 1335 Cedar Lane Road, requesting rezoning from C-3 and R-10 to S-1.**

Councilor Ballard stated the Planning Commission and the Committee recommended denial and Council approved the request at second reading.

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Councilor Ballard stated eight votes were needed in order to pass the ordinance.

Motion was denied by a vote of four in favor, seven in opposition and one (Payne) absent.

3. **CZ-2017-62: Property of JB RV and Boat Storage, located at 2764 S. Old Highway 14, requesting rezoning from R-S to S-1.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

4. **CZ-2017-63: Property of Tamekia N. El, located at 4924 Old Augusta Road, requesting rezoning from C-2 to R-10.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

5. **CZ-2017-64: Property of Robert Gray Taylor, located at 3006 E. North Street, requesting rezoning from C-1 to C-3.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.
Councilor Taylor recommended affirmative support from his colleagues.
Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

6. **CZ-2017-65: Property of Charles H. Wyatt, located on Old Buncombe Road, requesting rezoning from I-1 to R-7.5.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.
Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

7. **CZ-2017-67: Property of Dorothy L. Butler-Austin, located on Draper Street, requesting rezoning from R-7.5 to FRD.**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved adoption of the ordinance at third reading.
Councilor Cates stated the ordinance was originally approved with conditions and then approved without conditions by the Planning Commission and the Committee. He inquired what the original conditions were.
Councilor Ballard stated the original conditions were in regards to an entrance which the architecture company and DOT would not approved.
Motion as presented carried unanimously by Council Members present.

(b) Southchase Wilson Bridge, LLC (formerly Project Spec) / Fee in Lieu of Tax Agreement

ACTION: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee in lieu of tax agreement by and between Greenville County, South Carolina and Southchase Wilson Bridge, LLC, with respect to certain economic development property in the County, where such property would be subject to certain payments in lieu of taxes; and other matters related thereto.
Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

(c) Greenville / Anderson Multi County Industrial Park Agreement Amendment (2010 Park) – Southchase Wilson Bridge, LLC (formerly Project Spec)

ACTION: Councilor Taylor moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance to amend an agreement for the development of a joint county industrial and business park (2010 Park) of Anderson and Greenville Counties so as to enlarge the park.
Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

(d) Ordinance Restricting Hours of Operation / On-Premise Consumption of Alcohol

ACTION: Councilor Roberts moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance restricting the hours of operation of establishments that allow the on-premises consumption of alcohol; to provide penalties for violations thereof; and related matter thereto.

Chairman Kirven stated no prior provisions were made to allow for amendments at third reading for the item. He added that a motion to suspend Council rules for the purpose of making amendments at third reading and to allow for immediate consideration of the item was in order.

ACTION: Councilor Roberts moved to suspend Council rules to allow for amendments at third reading.

Motion unanimously by Council Members present.

Councilor Roberts stated the original ordinance was sent back to the Public Safety Committee towards the end of the summer in 2017. The Committee met and reviewed the ordinance and has now sent forward an amendment that was included in Council's packet. He stated the proposed amendment would serve three purposes: alcohol possession and service would be stopped at establishments at 2 a.m., businesses would not be required to close at 2 a.m. and it was designed to mirror the City of Greenville's ordinance regarding alcohol sales.

Councilor Seman inquired about enforcement of the proposed ordinance by the Sheriff's Office.

Councilor Roberts stated he had reached out to Sheriff Lewis earlier about enforcement and there was some concern about all patrons leaving at 2 a.m. He added that a later date of March 1, 2018 was included in the amendment for implementation of the ordinance, if it were to pass. Councilor Roberts stated there was a commitment on the part of the Sheriff's office to enforce the ordinance.

Councilor Ballard stated he spoke with a sergeant from the Sheriff's office who oversaw late-night establishments; with the passing of the proposed ordinance, deputies would continue visiting the establishments on a rotating basis. Information regarding the changes would be provided to the deputies in January and any violation after March 1 would be subject to enforcement by the Sheriff's office. He added that the Sheriff's office was in full agreement with the amendment.

Councilor Cates inquired about the penalties involved for any violation of the proposed ordinance.

Councilor Fant stated a violation would be a misdemeanor in a Magistrate's Court, which was currently capped at \$500.00.

Councilor Cates asked if multiple violations could result in more severe penalties or would that be determined by the Magistrate.

Councilor Ballard stated the goal of the ordinance was to eliminate alcohol in the establishments so there would be no violations or penalties.

Councilor Cates asked if there would be a deputy at every single establishment at 2 a.m.

Councilor Ballard stated law enforcement officers would visit each establishment once a month. There would not be a deputy at every establishment at 2 a.m. He stated there were 21 after-hours establishments currently in Greenville County.

Councilor Cates stated there was no way to actually know if an establishment violated the ordinance or not and asked if the owners would be on the "honor system".

Vice-Chairman Meadows asked if the establishments listed on Mr. Ballard's handout were the only ones that stayed open past 2 a.m. in Greenville County.

Councilor Ballard stated he obtained the information from the Sheriff's office and the Department of Revenue. He added that a certain type of license was required in order for an establishment allowing the on-premises consumption of alcohol to remain open after 2 a.m.

Vice-Chairman Meadows asked if the list was only the establishment that have been cited or was the list all inclusive. He added that there were 274 establishments in Greenville County with license to sell on-premises alcohol but the handout only listed 21, or 8%, which were after-hours establishments who caused 100% of the problem.

Councilor Ballard stated the list was all inclusive. He stated some of the establishments listed had no citations from 2 a.m. until 6 a.m. Councilor Ballard stated, to the best of his knowledge, the 21 establishments listed on the handout were the only ones which stayed open after hours.

Councilor Fant stated he only saw calls from six districts and asked if any establishments in the other six districts remained open after 2 a.m.

Councilors Barnes, Cates, Roberts and Seman all responded no bars in their districts remained open after 2 a.m. Councilor Dill stated there were some in his district but there had been no problems reported.

Councilor Fant stated there were only a handful of deputies working in the middle of the night and the Sheriff's office was not staffed to check ABC licenses or to see if there were beers on the tables after 2 a.m. He added that the job of law enforcement after midnight was to protect property not to police bars. Councilor Fant stated unless there was a deputy sitting at the front door of every after-hours establishment, there was no way to ensure the establishments were not in violation.

Councilor Roberts stated there were a small number of establishments which stayed open after-hours; the proposed ordinance would only affect the 21 that chose to do so. The proposed ordinance also addressed the issue of alcohol on the table after 2 a.m. as it would prohibit the sale of alcohol and any alcohol bought prior. He added that the ordinance also prohibited "brown bagging". With the amount of violence that was reported, Councilor Roberts stated there were already deputies stationed at many of the establishments. He added there were not a handful of deputies working the hours in question; there were 200+ deputies patrolling during that time.

Councilor Fant asked if that was the best use of the deputies' time.

Councilor Roberts stated he agreed it may not be the best use of their time but in a perfect world, there would be no need for deputies.

Councilor Dill thanked Councilor Ballard for the statistics he provided and stated the information was very eye-opening. He asked what was Council trying to accomplish; was it to prohibit establishments from selling alcohol after 2 a.m. or was it to stop people from killing each other and driving while intoxicated. Councilor Dill stated, according to the statistics provided, problems occurred at all hours of the day. He asked what problem was the ordinance designed to solve as it appeared to only address 38% of all the incidents reported.

Chairman Kirven stated he felt Council would not be discussing the issue if the bar owners took responsibility for the problem and policed themselves. He added the proposed ordinance had been offered up as a tool for behavior modification as the bar owners were not taking responsibility and patrons were still being shot and killed. The proposed ordinance was probably one of the only things that Council could do affirmatively and would more than likely not fix the problem; however, it would encourage business owners to be more responsible because they could get caught.

Councilor Dill stated he did not understand how some of the establishments listed on the handout could still be open given the number of calls law enforcement was receiving.

Councilor Fant stated the glaring problem was the violence and the deaths. He stated that Bible taught moderation in all things and alcohol at 5 a.m. was not moderation. Councilor Fant stated he had been trying to figure out a way to keep the establishments open when the ordinance was first introduced. With the push for economic growth and job creation, the western corridor of the County was the only area left with sites available and infrastructure in place. He stated that Council's job was to provide infrastructure and ensure public safety for the citizens of Greenville County. Councilor Fant stated with \$1.5 million being spent per year, Council needed to make the County as attractive and safe as possible for economic investment. Councilor Fant stated no parent should ever have to bury their child. One of the things that changed his mind about after-hours establishments was his conversation with three mothers who had lost a child as a result of bar violence. He said every time someone was killed at a bar, these women had to relive the death of their child. They begged him to do something about late night bar violence in Greenville County. Councilor Fant stated he wanted to present an amendment that would close all bars at 2 a.m.

Councilor Taylor stated he appreciated Councilor Fant's comments as well as Councilor Dill's comments. He stated Council may not get it perfect, but, if they could save one life that would be an accomplishment.

ACTION: Councilor Taylor called for the question.

Without objection, motion to call for the question carried.

Councilor Roberts restated the motion.

Motion as presented was denied by a roll call vote of four (Roberts, Taylor, Norris and Kirven) in favor, seven (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Cates, Seman, Fant and Ballard) in opposition and one (Payne) absent.

ACTION: Councilor Fant moved for adoption at third reading an ordinance to restrict the hours of operation of establishments that allow on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter, wine and/or alcoholic liquors, to provide penalties for violations thereof; and related matter thereto.

Councilor Fant stated his amendment was similar to Councilor Robert's amendment, but it would close all establishments that allow on-premises consumption of alcohol between the hours of 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. *(a copy of Mr. Fant's amended ordinance was passed out to Council members)*

Councilor Roberts inquired if Councilor Fant's amendment simply put the ordinance back to its original form.

Mark Tollison stated Councilor Fant's amendment included other changes but the intent put the ordinance back to its original form. The one that passed caused some confusion and Councilor Fant's amendment, as well as the previous amendment, would clarify the ordinance with the policy. He added there were other amendments included in Councilor Fant's amendment but functionally it would close the establishments at 2 a.m.

Councilor Roberts stated the original ordinance closed the establishments at 2 a.m. and he questioned the difference.

Councilor Fant commended Mark Tollison and stated he had worked tirelessly cleaning up the language used in the amendment in order to avoid conflicts. He stated the proposed amendment mirrored what was used in Charleston, which had already been upheld in the Supreme Court.

Mark Tollison stated the most important change to any ordinance Council passed, whether it was the committee ordinance or Councilor Fant's amendment, was the second sentence which was problematic in regards to hours of operation as it referred to possession. He advised Council to make the change regardless of which direction they chose to go.

Councilor Taylor stated the issue was very simple; the establishments either close at 2 a.m. or they don't.

ACTION:

Councilor Taylor called for the question.

Chairman Kirven stated Councilor Dill had requested clarification regarding the issue.

Councilor Taylor stated he had no objection to Councilor Dill's request.

Councilor Dill stated in regards to penalties, the proposed amendment gave the County Attorney authorization to pursue any additional or alternative civil remedies as well pull an establishment's business license. He asked how this would stand up in court.

Mark Tollison stated both amendments contained the same language. Beyond just writing tickets to establishments, if there were recurring problems with a particular establishment that violated Council's legitimate policy, the County, in consultation with Council and Law Enforcement, could take additional action. He added that both ordinances were acceptable and had been tested under South Carolina law.

Chairman Kirven asked if the business registration and the nuisance ordinance would come into play in any of these circumstances.

Mark Tollison stated if an establishment's business registration entailed abiding by Council ordinances and they failed to do so, then there was a process in place to go after the registration. Obviously, that would be a last resort given the extra enforcements included in the amendment.

Councilor Dill stated if Council approved the amendment, there should be no requests for assistance from the Sheriff's office after 2 a.m. from establishments that allowed the on-premises consumption of alcohol. If so, the establishment would be in clear violation of the ordinance.

Mark Tollison stated Council was a law-making body and if there were entities in the community that violated the law, some form of enforcement would be precipitated on the codes side; it was a complaint-driven process.

Councilor Norris asked if the ordinance pertained only to District 19 or to the entire County.

Councilor Taylor stated the ordinance would apply to the entire County.

Councilor Norris stated she had visited some of the establishments in question late at night and early in the morning just to check them out. She added there were problems associated with those establishments and it was occurring throughout the County.

Councilor Dill asked how the amendment would affect establishments such as restaurants that served alcohol.

Chairman Kirven stated the ordinance would only affect establishments in the unincorporated areas of the County.

Councilor Cates asked if a restaurant or hotel that stayed open all night had a bar in it, would the establishment have to close at 2 a.m.

Chairman Kirven stated the original amendment that was defeated covered this, but the new amendment would shut the business down at 2 a.m.

Mark Tollison stated the amendment affected commercial establishments such as clubs, room service operations in hotels as well as bars, restaurants and nightclubs open to the public at-large.

Councilor Cates asked if he would be allowed to make a motion to send the item back to the committee for further review.

Councilor Fant asked if hotels would have to close at 2 a.m.

Mark Tollison stated only room service operations in hotels would have to cease at 2 a.m. in the unincorporated areas.

Chairman Kirven stated that all restaurants would have to close at 2 a.m.

Mark Tollison stated only restaurants that allowed on-premises consumption of alcohol located in the unincorporated areas would be affected.

Chairman Kirven asked if convenience stores that sold alcohol would be affected.

Councilor Ballard stated convenience stores would not be affected as they were covered by State law; the purchase of alcohol at these establishments was not considered on-premises consumption.

Without objection, Councilor Taylor's motion to call the question carried.

Motion by Mr. Fant to amend carried by a roll call vote of eleven (Dill, Barnes, Meadows, Cates, Roberts, Taylor, Norris, Seman, Fant, Ballard and Kirven) in favor, no one in opposition and one (Payne) absent.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated according to the statistics provided by Councilor Ballard, District 19 had the most calls with a total of 233 and District 25 was next with 188. He stated the amendment only solved a portion of the problem; there were also problems with calls for law enforcement during other operating hours. Vice-Chairman Meadows proposed penalties much the same as those imposed for alarm systems.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he would like to propose the implementation of a penalty for each call for law enforcement assistance for establishments that allowed the on-premises consumption of alcohol as follows:

| <u>Number of calls</u> | <u>Penalty</u> |
|------------------------|----------------|
| 0-2 | no penalty |
| 3-5 | \$50.00 |
| 6-7 | \$100.00 |
| 8-9 | \$250.00 |
| 10 and above | \$500.00 |

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he felt penalties would really get the attention of the business owners and the penalties would pertain to all operating hours. The penalty timeframe would be for one year.

Councilor Ballard asked who would administer the penalties and keep track of the number of calls for assistance.

Vice-Chairman Meadows asked who kept track of the alarm system calls.

Councilor Ballard stated there was a department, within the Sheriff's office, designated to keep track of alarm system calls.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the same department could keep track of these calls as well. He added the information was already being monitored by the Sheriff's office, as verified by the information provided by Councilor Ballard. Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the information could be provided to Council by the Sheriff's office on a monthly basis.

ACTION:

Vice-Chairman Meadows moved to institute fines for calls made to the Sheriff's office by establishments that allowed the on-premises consumption of alcohol.

Councilor Fant asked what would be the nature of the calls.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated he did not know what the nature of the calls would be and added that Council did not know the nature of the calls outlined in the statistics provided by Councilor Ballard.

Councilor Taylor asked if the County already had an ordinance regarding businesses that utilized the services of the Sheriff's office in excess.

Councilor Dill stated only on the burglar alarms.

Councilor Taylor stated a business registration could be pulled for businesses that excessively call the Sheriff's office.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated only if a business was a nuisance and it was a long process to do so. He added the process had been completed on some businesses on Cedar Lane Road and that area no longer had the same kinds of problems. Vice-Chairman Meadows pointed out that there were six different establishments located at one location according to the information provided by Councilor Ballard.

Chairman Kirven inquired if law enforcement should use statistics for intensive enforcement at certain locations.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the locations pinpointed by the statistics were being examined by Council. If an establishment had no calls, it was not included on the list.

Councilor Taylor stated the proposed amendment was not germane to the current issue. He suggested Vice-Chairman Meadows submit a proposal to the Public Safety Committee for review as a separate ordinance.

Councilor Cates inquired if the fines only pertained to businesses that were open after 2 a.m.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated the fines would pertain to any establishment that sold on-premises alcohol and had excessive calls for law enforcement assistance.

Chairman Kirven asked if the proposed penalties would deter businesses from calling law enforcement.

Councilor Roberts stated the Public Safety Committee tried to address the number of calls during the 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. time period; however, the big picture was the extreme violence that occurred during the same time period. He stated he did not feel that the calls were for things such as a blocked-in car or a minor car accident; the intent was to address the shootings and the extreme violence that occurred.

Vice-Chairman Meadows stated Council was not given information regarding the nature of the calls on the information provided, but had voted as if all the calls reported were related to violence.

Councilor Taylor asked if Vice-Chairman's Meadows amendment affected closing the bars at 2 a.m.

Councilor Dill stated the amendment only put a fee on the number of calls and the statistics prove the County had a problem at these establishments. If penalties solved the problem with burglar alarms they could solve the problem with violence at establishments that serve on-premises alcohol.

Motion by Vice-Chairman Meadows to amend the ordinance was denied by a roll call vote of four (Dill, Barnes, Meadows and Cates) in favor, seven (Roberts, Taylor, Norris, Seman, Fant, Ballard and Kirven) in opposition and one (Payne) absent.

ACTION: Councilor Seman called for the question.

Without objection, the motion to call for the question carried.

Motion as amended was carried by a roll call vote of nine (Meadows, Cates, Roberts, Taylor, Norris, Seman, Fant, Ballard and Kirven) in favor, two (Dill and Barnes) opposed and one (Payne) absent.

Item (7) **ORDINANCES – SECOND READING**

(a) **Greenville County Land Development Regulations Amendment**

ACTION: Councilor Ballard moved for approval at second reading an ordinance to approve amendments to the Greenville County Land Development Regulations for the County of Greenville, South Carolina, as last amended by Ordinance No. 4852, in accordance with the provisions of the South Carolina Planning Enabling Act of 1994, S.C. Code Ann. Title 6, Chapter 29.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present.

Item (8) **ORDINANCES – FIRST READING**

(a) **Zoning Ordinances**

Councilor Ballard presented for first reading Zoning Dockets **CZ-2018-01 through CZ-2018-08.**

Chairman Kirven referred the items to the Planning and Development Committee.

Item (9) **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None

Item (10) **APPEARANCES BY CITIZENS**

- **Robert G. Taylor, 1 Millbrooke Ct., Greenville** – appeared regarding Council’s attention to a zoning issue
- **Efia Nwangaza, 202 Lavinia Ave., Greenville** – appeared regarding right of citizens not to stand for the Flag or the National Anthem; disrespect for the dignity of women and the necessity of citizens/police review board’s subpoena power
- **David McCraw, 9 Baronne Ct., Greer** – appeared regarding truth in lawsuits
- **Bruce Wilson, 14 Freestone St., Greenville** – appeared regarding violence in District 25 / Fleetwood Manor

Item (11) **ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT**

No report

Item (12) **REQUESTS AND MOTIONS BY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

- Councilor Seman thanked everyone who attended the SCTAC Board of Director’s Annual Meeting. She stated great highlights were heard from Lockheed Martin regarding plans for the F-16, which would add 170 high-paying jobs to Greenville County. Councilor Seman stated she looked forward to more announcements planned for 2018.

- Councilor Fant stated the passage of the ordinance regarding the operating hours of establishments that allowed the on-premises consumption of alcohol was a first step and opened the door for additional actions in the future. He recognized the members of Vision 25 who were in attendance.
- Councilor Ballard stated the Zoning Public Hearing meeting that was held the previous evening was very positive and uplifting. He stated the turnout was tremendous and it was a great showing of local interest and involvement.
- Chairman Kirven stated Councilor Norris was scheduled to speak at an upcoming event for the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday and asked her to give details about the event.
- Councilor Dill stated he felt Council had accomplished a great deal during the meeting and had come a long way. He stated they had not done everything they could have and still had future issues to deal with. Councilor Dill added that contrary to what one of the speakers had said, he felt it was an honor for the gentleman to come to the meeting as he was a bar owner. He stated he enjoyed the future prospect of working with Councilor Roberts, as well as the rest of Council, and felt they could accomplish a great deal in the coming year if they would not get sidetracked with personal issues.
- Councilor Barnes stated everyone must learn to crawl before they walked and added he wanted to see Council work together, get along and solve problems instead of choosing sides.
- Councilor Roberts stated he was very excited to see that Greenville had been featured in *Architectural Digest* regarding the Carolina Music Museum. The article featured museums from around the world. Councilor Roberts recognized his parents who were in attendance as well as his wife. He stated he was unaware that one of the speakers had planned to discuss his relationship with other Council members and he looked forward to working with all of Council in the coming year. Even though the needs of his district may differ from other districts' needs, he felt Council could always find common ground and he was very pleased with the outcome of the evening's meeting.
- Councilor Norris stated about three weeks ago she went to New Washington Heights and met the family of a young man from Claflin University who was killed in November. She added the parents had always sacrificed for their child, but, sometimes in spite of all the things done to ensure everything will be alright, we fail. Councilor Norris stated she had made arrangements for her colleagues to join her at an event honoring Martin Luther King, Jr. She added she and former Councilor Lottie Gibson had fought very hard for the MLK holiday. Councilor Norris stated she planned to talk with the County Attorney regarding the requirement that women must state their name and address prior to speaking at Council meetings.

Item (13)

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION:

Councilor Norris moved to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously by Council Members present and the meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Regina G. McCaskill, Clerk to Council