



GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes
Committee of the Whole Meeting
February 3, 2026
5:02 p.m.

Committee Meeting Room
301 University Ridge
Greenville, South Carolina

Council Members

Benton Blount, *Chairman, District 19*
Rick Bradley, *Vice-Chairman, District 26*
Liz Seman, *Chairwoman Pro Tem, District 24*
Joey Russo, *District 17*
Kelly Long, *District 18*
Stephen Shaw, *District 20*
Curt McGahhey, *District 21*
Frank Farmer, *District 22*
Alan Mitchell, *District 23*
Ennis Fant, Sr., *District 25*
Garey Collins, *District 27*
Dan Tripp, *District 28*

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place and agenda was posted online, at 301 University Ridge, Greenville, and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations and concerned citizens.

Council Members Absent

Joey Russo, *District 17*
Alan Mitchell, *District 23*
Liz Seman, *District 24*

Council Members Remote Participation

None

Staff Present

Joe Kernell, *County Administrator*
Chris Antley, *County Attorney*
Regina McCaskill, *Clerk to Council*
Bob Mihalic, *Governmental Affairs Officer*
Terrence Galloway, *Information Systems*

Others Present

None

Call to Order

Chairman Blount

Invocation

Councilor Long

Item (3)

Approval of Minutes

a. January 20, 2026 – Regular Committee Meeting

Action: Councilor Tripp moved to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2026, Regular Committee meeting.

Motion carried.

Item (4)

Executive Session

Councilor Shaw stated he had requested an executive session to discuss litigation and an employee matter. He stated he only wanted Council Members and possibly the Clerk to Council to attend.

Councilor Tripp stated it was his understanding Mr. Shaw had some allegations regarding the County Attorney he would like to discuss. He stated as Mr. Shaw was an attorney, he should understand that an individual had the right to be present during conversations regarding allegations or accusations against them. Mr. Tripp stated he opposed going into executive session unless the County Attorney was allowed to be present and hear the allegations. He stated it was his opinion an executive session was not necessary and Mr. Shaw should take up the matter with Mr. Antley.

Councilor Shaw stated the keyword was “assumption.” Mr. Tripp had no idea what the executive session was about and was making up something about a “personal beef” with Mr. Antley.

Councilor Tripp stated the County Attorney was present to advise.

Councilor Shaw stated Mr. Tripp could discuss the issue with the County Attorney later. He inquired as to why Council could not “talk on its own” and ask Mr. Tripp if he was afraid.

Chairman Blount stated it appeared there were two separate items Council needed to vote on; the first was to allow the removal of Mr. Antley from the executive session, and the second was a motion to go into executive session.

Councilor McGahhey stated, under Council rules, the body could enter into executive session with no other persons in attendance; it was also a state law. However, if allegations of a negative nature were made against an individual, that person must be brought in and given the opportunity to defend themselves. He stated it was unknown if Mr. Shaw intended to make such an allegation. If it became apparent during the executive session that it was his intent, Council could then “change gears.”

Chairman Blount stated it appeared some of the intent of the executive session was to seek legal counsel; however, if there was no legal counsel in the room, the items Council could discuss were very limited. He asked for clarification on what Mr. Shaw wanted to discuss to determine whether Mr. Antley needed to be present.

Councilor Shaw stated he had no problem asking Mr. Antley to bring up what they could discuss.

Mr. Antley stated he had no idea what Mr. Shaw wanted to discuss.

Chairman Blount asked how Council could ensure the conversation did not step outside the bounds of FOIA if no legal counsel was in attendance.

Mr. Antley stated the item was listed on the agenda as an employment matter. He could only assume the conversation was about his employment status. The agenda should have reflected Mr. Shaw's intent to discuss other matters, such as the budget lawsuit, and receive legal advice. He stated if the conversation veered outside the confines of FOIA and no legal counsel was present, a lawsuit could be filed against the County. Mr. Antley stated there was also the question of whether the issue(s) should be discussed in executive session or be subject to a public meeting. He stated it was difficult to make a prediction about the situation because no one had the courtesy to discuss it with him before the meeting.

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Shaw if the item(s) he wanted to discuss needed to be split up between a public meeting and an executive session.

Councilor Shaw stated he wanted to address the "courtesy thing." There had been some discourteous things done to him; therefore, he did not like anyone "crying victim" of "courteousness." He stated the intent of the executive session was not to discuss the employment of the County Attorney. It concerned the information Council members were entitled to have to help them make informed decisions about litigation.

Chairman Blount stated it appeared Mr. Shaw wanted to discuss something Mr. Antley had said, and it would not be proper to discuss the issue without him present, either in open or executive session.

Mr. Shaw stated he needed to determine what Council knew, or what information Council has had reasonable opportunities to acquire. He had no personal animosity toward anyone, and it was not about the employment of anyone at the County. The issue was about due diligence and the ability of the Council being provided the information it absolutely needed to serve the public.

Councilor Tripp stated Mr. Shaw's intended conversation was not enumerated on the agenda. The agenda indicated the following reason for the executive session:

"For discussion of employment, appointment, compensation, promotion, demotion, discipline or release of an employee regulated by County Council."

Councilor Shaw stated he agreed with Mr. Tripp the item was "mis calendared" and was willing to forgo the executive session until the next meeting. Mr. Shaw stated he had not seen a policy on calendaring; he did not know whether the Chairman made those decisions or whether Council Members had the authority to calendar an item. He stated the notice was not proper.

Councilor Tripp suggested granting Mr. Shaw a personal privilege to speak freely about his concerns. It was a matter of public record, and there were no attendees in the room.

Chairman Blount stated if Mr. Shaw's concerns pertained to anything specific about a lawsuit or a mediation, there were certain things they could not discuss, whether the conversation was public or private.

Councilor Shaw stated, as an attorney, he had obligations and duties with respect to other attorneys that were different from those of "non-attorney Council members," and he would "just leave it at that."

Chairman Blount stated he wanted to be clear he would not get into an argument about the agenda. He was more concerned about FOIA laws. Council was always getting pulled into them too easily; the last thing he wanted was to enter an executive session, discuss something they should not, and end up in a “bunch of nonsense.” Mr. Blount stated he did not mind discussing Mr. Shaw’s concerns in public.

Councilor Fant stated Mr. Tripp made a good point. No one from the public was present. Council could avoid the “FOIA executive session thing” and take 10 minutes to discuss Mr. Shaw’s concerns.

Ms. McCaskill stated the meeting was being livestreamed.

Councilor McGahhey inquired about the proper way for Councilor Shaw to privately inform the body about something pertaining to one of its three employees.

Councilor Shaw stated he thought the issue should be discussed in executive session because it was a “complicated interaction” and he wanted to do so respectfully. He was concerned about Council's ability to obtain vital information and to discuss similar issues. There appeared to be no way to do so, and everything was so “regulated.”

Chairman Blount stated the regulations were “by design” because certain things were not supposed to be public knowledge. He had no problem entering into executive session, but did not want to do anything that would be considered a breach of FOIA regulations. It did not appear as if Mr. Shaw’s concerns were covered according to the agenda.

Councilor Shaw stated his concerns were not properly conveyed on the agenda due to “scheduling.” He suggested waiting two weeks, or until the next “convenient COW” meeting, and noting the reason for the executive session as “litigation concerns.” Time was of the essence, as the events that prompted his concerns had occurred the previous fall.

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Shaw whether he had any objections to discussing his concerns in a public session and suggested it might be out of respect for the County Attorney.

Councilor Shaw stated, to a lesser extent, it was about courtesy, but to the greatest extent, it was about litigation and matters that could not be discussed in public. He stated the exact reason was because the litigation was exempt from FOIA.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw if he thought it was rational for Council to have a conversation about litigation without an attorney in attendance.

Councilor Shaw stated, “Absolutely,” and added, “You can put two and two together of where I'm going with this, but absolutely.”

Chairman Blount stated he disagreed. If Council was discussing litigation, legal counsel should be present, whether it be a county attorney or outside counsel.

Councilor Shaw stated he was not absolutely opposed to the County Attorney attending the executive session, but he thought they had “an agreement going in.” Mr. Shaw stated during the recent negotiations for Mr. Kernell’s employment contract, he believed Council would be given the opportunity to discuss the contract without his presence, so people who were intimidated or felt their questions were “not good” would have the opportunity to discuss the issue freely.

Chairman Blount stated Council could ask someone to leave the room without going into executive session if the purpose was to protect the comfort of the individual being discussed.

Councilor Tripp stated if litigation was the issue, they should be in executive session. Mr. Antley should be part of any conversations regarding his handling of litigation. He stated Mr. Antley was a “savvy enough operator” and able to answer any charges Mr. Shaw brought against him.

Councilor Shaw stated attorneys had mandatory reporting and professional rules of conduct. Depending on the conversation, he may be forced to do or to not do something that he would not want to be made public.

Councilor Farmer asked Mr. Shaw whether he or other Council Members felt intimidated about discussing individuals with them present in the room.

Councilor Shaw stated in speaking informally with some of his colleagues, he thought there was a general agreement that, when dealing with situations like the one in question, they might not raise their hand and say they're intimidated. Someone could be intimidated by lengthy words, by arguments, by rules, by anything. Mr. Shaw stated he was not trying to get anyone in trouble or be defensive. There were things that needed to be cleared up that were not normal and not done the way he was used to. In the “eight-page memo”, someone referenced the fact they had been doing “this for a long time.” He stated he had been doing it for 30 years, was licensed in two states, and has had to sue counties on his own. Mr. Shaw stated he was not “fresh” at his job and was willing to put the item on hold.

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Shaw whether he was willing to put his credibility on the line there would be no FOIA violations if Council entered executive session and discussed his concerns.

Councilor Shaw stated he did not know and was willing to put the item on hold. He stated Mr. Blount had a valid concern.

Councilor Collins asked Mr. Shaw if the litigation he was concerned about was a pending case against the County, and if those concerns were a lack of proper representation or legal advice.

Councilor Shaw answered in the affirmative. He stated he wanted to use the executive session to gather information from his colleagues.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw why he would not want the County Attorney to be present to answer questions about a pending case against the County.

Councilor Shaw stated he had “all the writings” he needed from “that person” and referenced an “eight-page memo.”

Councilor Tripp stated Mr. Shaw had used the term “intimidation.” In his opinion, the intimidation was one-sided, and Mr. Shaw was attempting to use a public forum to pressure an individual hired by Council. He stated they would not do that to an employee; it would be considered intimidation. Mr. Tripp stated Council should be very careful about dragging “someone's name through the mud”, whether in a passive-aggressive manner or directly. He was opposed to going into an executive session to discuss an individual without giving that person the chance to be present and answer any charges levied against them or address any questions that came up. He inquired what would happen if Council Members had questions about Mr. Shaw’s concern, and Mr. Antley was the only one able to answer.

Councilor Shaw stated his intent was not to ask questions or to get his colleagues' opinions about his concerns; he wanted to gather facts.

Chairman Blount stated, to speed up the process, he would suggest either going into executive session with Mr. Antley present to ensure the conversation was within FOIA guidelines or holding the item.

Councilor Shaw stated he would be open to Council holding two sessions: one with himself present and another with Mr. Antley present.

Councilor McGahhey stated, under state law, there were four reasons Council could enter into executive session. He suggested Council determine which one was relevant to Mr. Shaw's concerns, and another executive session could be scheduled for the next Committee of the Whole meeting.

Councilor Blount stated he had no idea which Council Members Mr. Shaw referred to who did not want Mr. Antley present during the executive session. If that was how they felt, one of those individuals would need to make a motion to do so; it was not "a given thing."

Councilor McGahhey asked Mr. Antley if it was required to have a staff member present if Council voted to go into executive session.

Mr. Antley stated there was no requirement to have someone take Council into executive session and bring them out. Normally, Council would want someone monitoring to ensure they were within executive session; however, they could choose to take a risk. Mr. Antley stated he was not aware of any time Council had elected to go into executive session with an attorney present. He added he did not have to be the attorney present, as Council could bring in a third-party attorney.

Mr. Kernell stated if Mr. Shaw's concern was litigation, he would suggest Council bring in an outside attorney to provide legal advice if they chose not to allow Mr. Antley to be present. He stated when Mr. Shaw was sitting in the room as a Council Member, he was not wearing a "lawyer's hat" for the purpose of giving Council legal advice.

Chairman Blount stated it was his understanding the purpose of an executive session was to seek legal counsel on an issue. He asked why would they go into executive session for legal advice if there was no counsel to seek it from.

Councilor Shaw stated it was much broader than just receiving legal advice. He stated, in response to Mr. McGahhey's recommendation to determine which of the four allowable reasons Council may choose to go into executive session, he would suggest "for the discussion of settlement of legal claims or discussions of the public agency's position in adversary situations." Mr. Shaw stated his concerns clearly fell under that reason. His intent was not to "preach" to anyone; he wanted the opportunity to talk about his concerns and gather information.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw if there was any way he could put his concerns in writing so his colleagues would know what he was trying to achieve. Mr. Tripp stated it felt as if Mr. Shaw wanted to lead them into an "Alice in Wonderland situation" and they would "get sucked into holes" they knew nothing about. He stated there was no opportunity for Council to prepare to discuss an issue if they had no idea what the issue was.

Councilor Shaw stated he was not looking to vote on anything. His concerns pertained to Council's current understanding of the budget lawsuit litigation and the mechanism for obtaining information. He stated the County Attorney had mentioned "rumor mills," and it would be helpful to dispel those rumors and resolve the case, in a way that helped the public.

Chairman Blount stated it was difficult for Council to know what was rumor and what was not, because they had no idea what Mr. Shaw wanted to discuss. Mr. Blount stated he was unsure of Mr. Shaw's expectations.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw whether he had any professional relationship with the attorneys involved in the budget lawsuit against the County or had been involved in any conversations about the lawsuit.

Councilor Shaw replied, "Absolutely not," and stated he appreciated the question if Mr. Tripp wanted to ask it. He stated they were a very small group of people. Mr. Shaw stated in looking at some, or all, of the attorneys involved, he had "zero relationship professionally with them," but "some of them were very good friends." He stated the one who happened to take on the County, they did not "do stuff together", but "some of the ones that have been brought on by the County", they were friends. Mr. Shaw stated that happened all the time in a small bar "like this up here" and that was "part of the rumor mill."

Councilor Fant stated, between the emails and all the conjecture, he was "perfectly comfortable" affording Mr. Shaw 10 or 15 minutes to share his concerns, as long as the County Attorney was allowed to stay in the room.

Chairman Blount stated he agreed with Mr. Fant. Legal counsel was needed to ensure Council did not cross any lines. He stated it may be possible to discuss Mr. Shaw's concerns during the current meeting, but only if it could be done within the parameters of the agenda.

Councilor Collins stated he agreed Mr. Antley should be present, as he may be the only person able to answer some of Council's questions. Mr. Collins stated he and his colleagues may have the same concerns and questions as Mr. Shaw and needed Mr. Antley's guidance to determine why things were done in a certain way. While it may not be Mr. Shaw's preference, he believed Mr. Antley's presence would benefit the body and could help clarify some of the perceived rumors.

Councilor Long stated twelve people were represented on Council, and any time one of those members requested an executive session, their request should be honored as a sign of respect. That individual may have information they needed to share in order for Council to function properly. Ms. Long stated Council needed to vote on whether to enter into executive session, either at that time or later, because Mr. Shaw had requested it as a Council member.

Councilor McGahhey cited South Carolina Code of Laws (*Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 30-4-80*), which stated Council may enter into executive session by a two-thirds vote. He asked Mr. Antley whether Council could vote to enter into executive session under that rule regarding a matter not listed on the agenda, with no action taken after coming out of executive session.

Mr. Antley stated he was unable to answer that question and it would require some research on his part.

Councilor Blount stated they were just spinning their wheels. He suggested taking a vote on whether to allow Mr. Antley to stay in the room, then a vote on whether to enter the executive session.

Councilor Shaw stated he was not comfortable with Mr. Blount's suggestion. He stated if his colleagues did not want to hear his information, it was fine with him. He suggested they do what was necessary to "move it on."

Councilor Fant stated if the issue was moved to the next meeting, most Council members would still want Mr. Antley in the room.

Councilor Shaw stated the item was mis calendared under an "employee thing" and had nothing to do with hiring or firing an employee.

Chairman Blount stated Mr. McGahhey had pointed out a two-thirds vote would allow an executive session on an issue not listed on the agenda.

Councilor Shaw stated it sounded as if that would not be a true executive session because the attorney would be present.

Ms. McCaskill stated no motions could be made once the body was in executive session.

Action:

Councilor McGahhey moved to go into executive session based on the second reason allowed by state statute.

(Discussion of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements, discussions of a proposed sale or purchase of property, receipt of legal advice, settlement of legal claims or discussions of the public agency's position in adversary situations, discussion about development of security personnel or devices)

Chairman Blount stated if Mr. McGahhey's motion passed, the County Attorney would be present during the executive session.

Councilor McGahhey asked whether he could add to his motion the only person other than Council present would be Madam Clerk.

Mr. Antley stated it appeared as if Mr. McGahhey was trying to invoke Council's ability to go into executive session for the discussion of an item not included on the agenda, given the fact that Mr. Shaw's proposed executive agenda item was mis-calendared. If so, Mr. McGahhey needed to state which vehicle he wanted to use to enter executive session. He stated the reason may be a combination of things and litigation had been mentioned several times. Mr. Antley stated the two-thirds vote was needed for that item.

Councilor McGahhey stated, based on the second reason cited in state law, the settlement of legal claims or discussion of the public agency's position in adversarial situations would be the correct reason, as he considered the issue an adversarial situation.

Mr. Antley stated Council needed to decide whether he should be present during the executive session. He stated it could be a separate motion or a combined motion.

Action:

Mr. McGahhey moved to go into executive session to discuss the settlement of legal claims or the discussion of the public agency's position in adversarial situations, with no one present except Madam Clerk.

Councilor Tripp urged his colleagues to vote against the motion. He stated the County Attorney should be present.

Chairman Blount stated he was concerned about excluding legal counsel from the executive session; however, he was comfortable discussing Mr. Shaw's concerns in public.

Councilor Shaw stated he would prefer everyone regroup and address the issue in two weeks. He stated he would not vote in favor of Mr. McGahhey's motion as his concerns were too convoluted.

Motion as presented was denied by a roll call vote of three (Shaw, McGahhey, and Collins) in favor, six (Long, Blount, Farmer, Fant, Bradley, and Tripp) in opposition, and three (Russo, Mitchell, and Seman) absent.

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Shaw whether he planned to revisit the issue at a later date and, if so, whether he wanted to set a definite date.

Councilor Shaw stated in an attempt to understand the "calendar rules", he had reviewed Council rules and could find no reference as to who controlled the calendar. He stated it appeared as if an item was submitted to the County Attorney in a timely fashion, it would be put on the calendar. Mr. Shaw stated he was not sure if that was how the rules were interpreted.

Chairman Blount stated it was his responsibility to approve items for the Committee of the Whole agendas, just as the chairpersons of the standing committees approved their respective agendas. He asked Mr. Shaw if he would like to reschedule the executive session for the next Committee of the Whole meeting.

Councilor Fant stated the Council Members who wanted the attorney present during the executive session would feel the same way at the next meeting. He asked what would be accomplished by holding the item until that time

Councilor Shaw stated he was "just getting the word out" about his concerns.

Vice-Chairman Bradley stated they did not know what those concerns were.

Councilor Shaw stated there were complications regarding his concerns, including litigation, an executive session, and possibly other issues. He told his colleagues if they wanted to approach him individually, he would share his concerns.

Chairman Blount asked Mr. Shaw if he would be agreeable to having an outside attorney present during the executive session if the Council chose to exclude Mr. Antley. He asked why Council would not want to have some form of legal counsel in the session to assist as needed. Mr. Blount stated certain actions could be a breach of FOIA.

Councilor Shaw stated the things he was talking about, he could “care less about FOIA”, but they all needed to protect the County; and that was what FOIA was there for. FOIA was in place to ensure justice was done in the litigation. Mr. Shaw stated he was not worried about anything he planned to say; he was not comfortable with Council’s understanding of some of the basic things. He wanted to get feedback from his colleagues on their understanding of some basic aspects of his concerns.

Chairman Blount stated he had no objection to Mr. Shaw obtaining that information in public, with an attorney present.

Councilor Shaw stated it would get “into the litigation.”

Vice-Chairman Bradley stated if that were the case, an attorney needed to be present.

Chairman Blount stated it did not appear Mr. Shaw would have enough votes to enter the executive session without an attorney present, just to give him an opportunity to inform his colleagues of his concerns.

Councilor Shaw stated he had provided a “very good solution,” 10 minutes to voice his concerns, followed by another hour with the attorney present.

Chairman Blount stated he could be wrong, but there were not enough Council members in favor of an executive session without the attorney present. He stated they had no idea what he wanted to present.

Councilor Shaw stated that was the way trials worked. Everyone in the courtroom was quiet while the prosecutor presented the case. The defense was then given “all the time in the world” to defend their client; the two do not talk at the same time.

Councilor Tripp stated an attorney would not approach the judge without opposing counsel present, unless it was an *ex parte* matter.

Councilor Shaw stated he was not asking for any decisions; he just wanted to give his view of what had happened.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw if he had discussed his concerns with Mr. Antley, as he appeared to be “in the dark” about the situation.

Councilor Shaw stated Chairman Blount had suggested he speak with Mr. Antley about his concerns. The problem was “loaded”, as there was somewhat of a “personality issue.” He stated this was not a personality issue. He appreciated Mr. Antley, even before he became County Attorney, and tried to help him in the process. His concerns were not personal. They were about justice and how the budget lawsuit was ultimately resolved. He stated it was a problem if his colleagues were not concerned about the mechanisms being used to get information to them; however, it was fine with him if they were “okay with that.” Mr. Shaw stated he was not trying to get anyone in trouble.

Chairman Blount stated no one has indicated they were okay with it. For the record, his problem was the fact Mr. Shaw had no intention of discussing the issue with Mr. Antley present. He asked Mr. Shaw if he was amenable to another attorney being present.

Councilor Shaw stated they could all bring their own lawyers.

Chairman Blount stated an attorney needed to be present during the executive session, even if it was an outside attorney.

Councilor Shaw stated it would cost extra time and money to retain an outside attorney. He asked if one of the other attorneys in the legal office could sit in.

Chairman Blount stated that was exactly what he meant.

Councilor Shaw stated if the Chairman felt it was necessary, he had no problem with it.

Councilor Tripp stated, at the end of the day, Mr. Shaw was saying there was a personality conflict.

Councilor Shaw stated he did not say it was a personality conflict.

Councilor Tripp asked how allowing Mr. Campbell to be in the room during the executive session was different from having Mr. Antley present, if there was no personality conflict. Mr. Tripp stated he was "befuddled."

Councilor Shaw asked his colleagues whether they had read the "eight-page memo" provided by Mr. Antley; some parts of it addressed the issue. The problem was not about personalities but about events that affected Council.

Councilor Tripp stated Mr. Campbell could have helped draft the memo.

Councilor Shaw stated it did not matter who drafted the memo; it was sent on by Mr. Antley.

Chairman Blount stated it was "very strange" to request the County Attorney not attend an executive session. It was almost as if Mr. Shaw was trying to indicate it would be a danger to have legal representation in the room when he voiced his concerns. He stated that was the reason he was "not okay" with Mr. Shaw's request.

Councilor Shaw stated to Mr. Blount that he had voiced his concerns "about four times" and he had provided solutions, such as the presence of an outside attorney or another attorney from the County Attorney's office. He stated he did not understand why Chairman Blount kept repeating himself.

Chairman Blount stated he was attempting to clarify.

Councilor Shaw asked his colleagues if they understood the Chairman's concerns. He stated it sounded as if Mr. Blount was imputing something to him.

Chairman Blount stated he was reclaiming his time. He stated that less than five minutes earlier, he had questioned Mr. Shaw, and he did not say he wanted representation in the room. It was part of the public record.

Councilor Shaw stated the Chairman was "lawyering" and insisted he had informed Mr. Blount four times that he was agreeable for an outside attorney to be present in the executive session. Mr. Shaw stated it was therefore clarified he was agreeable to another attorney's presence. He stated there may not have been a "meeting of the minds", but he was absolutely not trying to stop anyone from having counsel in attendance. Mr. Shaw stated he felt it was not needed, but if it made them feel more comfortable, he understood.

Councilor Tripp asked Mr. Shaw if he would be willing to clearly state why he did not want Mr. Antley to be present, given the fact he had indicated it was not because of a personality conflict.

Councilor Shaw stated he had answered that question “a half hour” earlier. He could not keep answering the same questions over and over.

Councilor Farmer stated it appeared they were “talking in circles.” As it was obvious they were not accomplishing anything, he suggested they revisit the issue at “the next go around.”

Item (5)

Adjournment

Action: Councilor Farmer moved to adjourn.

Motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Regina McCaskill
Clerk to Council