

REGULAR MEETING
DARLINGTON COUNTY COUNCIL
DARLINGTON, SC

July 6, 2010

A regular meeting of the County Council of Darlington County was held this 6th day of July 2010, at 6 p.m., at the Darlington County Courthouse Annex/EMS Building, 1625 Harry Byrd Highway, Darlington, South Carolina.

NOTICE OF MEETING

In compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda, giving the date, time, and place of the meeting was mailed in advance to the local newspapers (the News and Press, the Messenger, and the Morning News), persons requesting notification, and posted on the bulletin board at the entrance to the County Administrator's Office.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Billy Baldwin, Vice Chairman Anne C. Warr, Chaplain Dannie Douglas, Jr., Mr. Wesley Blackwell, Mr. Marvin Le Flowers, Mrs. Wilhelmina P. Johnson, Ms. Mozella "Pennie" Nicholson, and Mr. Alex "Buz" Shaw.

ALSO PRESENT

County Administrator Phyllis Griffitts, County Attorney James C. Cox, Jr., Clerk to Council J. JaNet Bishop, Codes Enforcement Director Randy Evans, Fire Chief David Williamson, Economic Development Director Robert Long, Planning Director Doug Reimold, Roads and Bridges Director Bobby Richardson, Environmental Services Director Mike Dorriety, Recreation Director Ken McRae, Human Resource Director Ginger Winburn, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Johnson, and others.

REPORTERS PRESENT

Mr. Jim Faile of the Messenger and Ms. Samantha Lyles of the News and Press.

Call To Order / Invocation / Pledge Of Allegiance

Chairman Baldwin called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. Mr. Douglas presented the invocation and Mr. Flowers led the pledge of allegiance.

Citizens' Comments

Mr. Clarence Johnson showed his no farm no food sign and stated that some of the Council members do not adhere to their duties and responsibilities. He said Council members should find out what they should and should not be doing and uphold their responsibilities. Council should be for the people and not for special interests.

Approval Of Minutes - Regular Meeting of June 7, 2010

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 7, 2010.

The motion carried unanimously.

Approval Of Minutes - Regular Meeting Of June 21, 2010

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Mr. Douglas to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 21, 2010.

The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinances

Ordinance No. 10-11, An Ordinance To Adopt A Transportation Element Of The Darlington County Comprehensive Plan, As Recommended By The Darlington County Planning Commission And Pursuant To The 1976 South Carolina Code Of Laws, Section 6-29-530 Et. Seq.; To Implement The Transportation Element Review Process To Determine Compatibility With Said Comprehensive Plan; And To Establish The Effective Date Of This Ordinance - **FIRST READING**

Chairman Baldwin read the title of Ordinance No. 10-11 for First Reading.

Resolutions

There were no resolutions.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Other Items

Remaining Appointments To Boards & Commissions

Mr. Blackwell appointed Mr. Brian Rudick to the Alcohol and Drug Citizen Advisory Committee to serve until he resigns or is replaced by County Council.

Mrs. Johnson appointed Mr. Jerry McCall to the Ambulance Commission for a term to commence July 6, 2010 and end June 30, 2013.

Mr. Baldwin appointed Mrs. Anne Baldwin to the Library Board since Mrs. Ronna Askins resigned effective June 30, 2010. Mrs. Baldwin will continue serving for a term to end June 30, 2012.

MOTION was made by Mr. Flowers and seconded by Mr. Shaw to carry over the appointment to Pee Dee Regional Transportation Authority Board.

At its meeting of June 7, 2010, Council reappointed Mr. Blake Bondy to the Pee Dee Regional Transportation Authority Board. However, he declined the reappointment.

The motion carried unanimously.

Memorandum Of Agreement For The Detention Of Juveniles

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Mr. Blackwell to approve the Memorandum of Agreement for the detention of juveniles.

Mrs. Warr pointed out that the Jail Removal Home Option would save the county \$56,650. This would also be a better plan than to house the juveniles in Columbia.

The motion carried unanimously.

Amendment To The Agenda

MOTION was made by Mr. Flowers and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to amend the agenda to go to the Administrative Update section of the agenda.

The motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Update - Mr. Doug Reimold, Planning Director - South Darlington Watershed Project, Suggested Plan Of Action

Planning Director Doug Reimold referred to the letters that were included in Council's agenda package. One letter dated June 22, 2010, from Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) State Conservationist Anne English, contained a report on the status of the funding for the South Darlington Watershed Project. The letter indicated that the amount of the stimulus package far exceeded the latest cost estimate for the construction of the South Darlington Watershed Project. The estimate for the project was \$2,167,000 with NRCS's portion being \$1.3 million and the stimulus package being \$830,000; leaving a balance of over \$500,000 that NRCS could not fund.

The second letter was dated June 23, 2010, from Planning Director Doug Reimold to NRCS State Conservationist Anne English clarifying some of the items that were stated in the June 22nd letter.

The third document was a memorandum dated June 28, 2010, from Planning Director Doug Reimold to County Council about the county not having sufficient funds to carry this project to construction. To date, \$214,000 had been spent to acquire easements and about \$330,000 for in-kind office support. Mr. Reimold did not have the amount that NRCS had contributed to the project to date. However, about \$115,000 in stimulus funds were used to hire an engineer to do the construction design plans for the project. Mr. Reimold stated that everyone was surprised at the considerable overage in the cost estimate when NRCS' original cost estimate for requesting stimulus funds was \$830,000. The current estimate for the project was now \$1.3 million. He also reported that the county had requested about \$200,000 for work in South Carolina Department of Transportation's rights-of-way and the estimate came back at \$750,000; leaving a balance of one half million dollars. Darlington County was estimated to have about \$100,000 and budgeted \$340,000, of which a portion would be used to cover the cost. This left a balance of over \$800,000, which Darlington County would have to provide in order to construct the project. Mr. Reimold also pointed out that the staff did not have cost estimates for the remaining easements (less than ten), wetlands mitigation and permits, relocating utilities, construction inspections, etc. Therefore, NRCS's letter indicated that they did not have sufficient funds to undertake the project at this time. The stimulus funds would be returned in August to the federal government to spend otherwise.

Mr. Reimold's memorandum also contained a suggested Plan of Action ~ several things that the county could do to continue at a much slower pace and on a much smaller scale to continue to move the project forward. The only cost would be the staff's time. There would be no budgeted items. The Plan of Action included the following: (1) Continue to work on obtaining all easements. (2) Clarify wetlands mitigation and permitting needs. (3) Develop a plan and determine an approximate cost for moving utilities. (4) Work with South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) to permit construction encroachment and to secure funding during the year needed (SCDOT had budgeted \$204,000 for this project for this fiscal year). (5) Receive the final project construction

design/plans from NRCS. (6) Begin to contact our Congressmen to earmark Watershed Operation funds for this project, possibly by the year 2012. (7) Continue to work with NRCS on this project, as well as seek solutions to drainage problems in the Sunrise Community.

Chairman Baldwin asked whether the ten-acre detention pond was in the plan.

Mr. Reimold explained that the original plan did not include a detention pond. This increased the cost of the project significantly. He explained that when the project outlined was given to the engineers, they knew the detention pond was a requirement of South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) and they designed it into the plan.

Ms. Nicholson asked whether the county could avoid the money begin returned.

Mr. Reimold explained that the funds could only be committed if the county commits to construction and to bearing all the additional costs. He said the stimulus money was designated for this specific project in its entirety. He also stated that the project was not shovel ready when the county received the commitment of funds. This was the county's basic problem.

Ms. Nicholson questioned the amount of funds the county would need to continue the project.

Mr. Reimold said \$1.3 million was a rough estimate, excluding the additional costs for the remaining easements, wetlands mitigation, moving utilities, inspection of the project, DHEC permits, etc.

Ms. Nicholson questioned why the detention pond was not included in the project, a wetland project.

Chairman Baldwin indicated that a lot had changed from the original plan. The current plan was now over \$1.5 million more than the original plan. He said they (NRCS) changed the plan and not the county.

Mr. Reimold said the watershed program had been around for about 50 years. Based upon past experience, detention ponds were not required. Such projects were done as restoring original ditch/drainage waters and bypassed normally required permitting. He said the cost for permitting had increased in restrictiveness year-by-year as federal and state requirements became stricter. Mr. Reimold explained that the state engineer had indicated that the county could not afford not to do detention ponds because of the dangers that may be exposed to Bethea Pond.

Mrs. Griffiths stated that this project began in 1997 and Council had signed off on two agreements. When the actual figures were obtained, they were more than what initially had been quoted to the county. The county would have to hire a full-time person to oversee the project. She explained that there was \$837,000 in stimulus money and the project estimate was now over \$1 million for NRCS. Because NRCS did not have the \$1 million, they said the county would have to come up with this amount, plus the cost of the other items (moving utilities, wetlands mitigation, etc.) and the project was not shovel ready. She stated that as of today, the county still did not have the final project design. Mrs. Griffiths said the staff was not saying not to do the project. However, the county would have to come up with another \$2 million as the county's match to do the project. She also stated that the county would have until September/October to be ready to get the \$800,000, but the county would not be ready because all the easements had not been obtained.

Mr. Blackwell summarized that the county needed to continue the project with the current staff and there may be some federal funds in 2012.

MOTION was made by Mr. Flowers and seconded by Mr. Shaw to accept Mr. Reimold's Plan of Action to continue forward in the absence of the stimulus funds.

Mrs. Johnson reported that she had attended the meeting wherein NRCS State Conservationist Ann English presented the new guidelines. Mrs. Johnson said the staff had completed the project and after 20 years, a new group came in with new guidelines. She said Part 1 of the project was what they said the county needed and was what the county had based its figures upon. Part 2 of the project included mitigation, etc. Therefore, it was not that the county was not doing what it was supposed to be doing. However, after 20 years, the entire project had changed.

Mr. Shaw said the county has to keep this project open or it would become bogged down again. Council could not do anything about what happened in the past.

Mrs. Johnson stated that she did not know whose fault it was regarding the permits that the county did not have.

Mr. Reimold explained that the county could not apply for the permits without the final plans.

Mrs. Johnson confirmed that the county did not have the completed plans in order to apply for the permits.

Mr. Reimold indicated that not having the remaining easements was not the primary reason for this. The county's initial obligation was to obtain the easements. In the meantime, NRCS had the obligation to have the construction plans prepared. Their focus was construction of the project and the county's focus was to obtain the land rights, as well as permits. He said that if the timing were right, the county would have been under the old letter regarding the mitigation. Once the letter expired, the county could no longer use that.

Mr. Cox said the county, in good faith, presented what the easements would look like, but this was subject to change in the final plan. Therefore, the county could not close out the easements without a final plan.

Chairman Baldwin said, initially, the easement was 60 feet, which increased to 80 feet, and then to a ten acre pond.

Mrs. Griffiths said the county had budgeted for more easements. However, the county would not be spending any more money on the project.

Ms. Nicholson wanted to know the determinative on the stimulus money.

Mr. Reimold said timing in terms of whether or not the county would have time to commit the funds. The funds (\$830,000) were allocated for the project based on NRCS's estimate. Also, NRCS could not obligate the funds because they could not get a contract ready for someone to bid on or have the plans ready to bid. Therefore, they (NRCS) wanted to enter into an agreement with the county where the funds could be obligated. This would secure the funds for a longer period. However, the county would still have to begin the project by the first of the year.

Ms. Nicholson presented her concerns about NRCS not asking for enough money for the project.

Mr. Reimold said the county did not have a final design to base the estimates upon.

Mr. Cox inquired about the number of man-hours the staff had spent on this project.

Mr. Reimold stated that a significant amount of man-hours was spent on this project over the years. He did not have the exact number of hours at the meeting.

Ms. Nicholson stated that in April, she attended a meeting with Congressman Clyburn when he made it clear that as majority whip, he had powers. Along with the

coordination and the coalition with Senator Graham, if the county had problems or once the county made a request for funding, etc., to let him know and more than likely he/they would be able to get it through. Ms. Nicholson asked the staff about contacting Congressman Clyburn and U.S. Senator Graham to find out whether additional funds exist, especially since NRCS was the problem. She said NRCS should have requested more money for the project.

Mr. Cox stated that without a final plan, NRCS did not know what to ask for.

Chairman Baldwin restated the motion to continue the South Darlington Watershed Project on a much smaller scale as outlined by Mr. Reimold in his Plan of Action.

The motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Update - Mr. Robert Long, Economic Development Director - Grant Awards/PolyQuest

Economic Development Director Robert Long reported that in May, County Council approved applying for a grant through the South Carolina Department of Commerce in support of PolyQuest expansion. He had received official notification that the grant was approved by the Coordinating Council for Economic Development.

The grant, in the amount of \$100,000, would be used to assist Darlington County with a rail spur for PolyQuest, Inc.

Chairman Baldwin asked whether Mr. Long had spoken with PolyQuest about the stipulations and requirements in the grant.

Mr. Long said yes and indicated that PolyQuest had provided a letter stating that they were accepting the application.

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Ms. Johnson for acceptance of the grant award for PolyQuest.

The motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Update -Mrs. Phyllis Griffiths, County Administrator - Update

Mrs. Griffiths did not have an update.

Clarification On Conflict Of Interest Regarding Elected Officials, As Requested By Council Member Wilhelmina Johnson

Ms. Johnson stated that at Council's last meeting, her request for funds for Darlington County Cultural Realism Complex (CRC) was declared a conflict of interest. Therefore, she requested the County Administrator to provide an update on the conflict of interest. Mrs. Johnson then read a prepared statement. In the prepared statement, she said "*Wilhelmina P. Johnson is well educated and performs her duties as an elected official with mule sense.*" For the past 22 years, she submitted her annual report to the S.C. Ethic Commission indicating anything she felt was a conflict of interest. She stated that she had directed many federal projects and indicated whether there was a conflict of interest. Therefore, the only thing that she could say was that being accused was one thing and for something to be proven as factual was another. After referring to the information (Chapter 13, Article 1 Ethics, Government Accountability, and Campaign Reform and Article 7 Rules of Conduct, of the 1796 S.C. Code of Laws, as amended) that was included in Council's agenda package, Ms. Johnson talked about the 37-year legacy of the CRC in Darlington County. She said that if this was a conflict of interest now, then it was a conflict of interest

37 years ago when she was known all over the country during the bicentennial. Mrs. Johnson said the \$35,000 that she was requesting was nothing compared to what was needed and what would be received. She said *"hypocrisy in a democratic society could not be tolerated."* She also stated that in 22 years, not one penny had been given towards the collection of history in Darlington County for African Americans and the accusation should be proven.

Chairman Baldwin read Chapter 2, Section 2-84(e) Parliamentary Procedures from Darlington County Code of Ordinances which state, *"When members may not vote or do business with the county. (1) No member of council shall use the member's official position to obtain personal financial gain. (2) No member shall participate directly or indirectly in a procurement when the member has knowledge or notice that: (a) he or any business with which he is associated has a financial interest pertaining to the procurement; (b) Any other person, business or organization with whom he or a member of his household is negotiating or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment is involved in the procurement."*

Mrs. Johnson asked that Council and the County Administrator prove that this was a conflict of interest. She said it was one thing to have something in writing and another to ensure that it was being done.

Mr. Cox recalled that at Council's last meeting, Ms. Johnson requested \$35,000 for the CRC, and he was asked whether this was proper. He said it was not because it was a conflict of interest. Mr. Cox said he understood that Mrs. Johnson has emotional ties to CRC. However, the conflict was more than what had been outlined. He explained that the conflict would involve Mrs. Johnson individually, anybody in her immediate family, and any organization that she was closely tied to or associated with. He said she did not have to have a financial interest in the organization. However, if she was closely tied to it, or if she was on the board or had some governing powers over it, this would certainly be a conflict of interest. Mr. Cox explained that in this instance, Mrs. Johnson was the primary and moving force behind the CRC. Therefore, she was associated with it, the founder of it, and deeply involved with it. Thirdly, on her financial statement, Mrs. Johnson listed herself as her expertise and net worth of \$1.2 million. Therefore, in essence, Mrs. Johnson was the CRC and because of this, she could not even bring up the subject on county business. If she intended to do this, she would have to provide a statement in writing to the chairman indicating exactly what it was that she wanted to discuss, or what would be voted on, and what her position would be. The chairman would then rule on it. He said there was a procedure. However, because Ms. Johnson was the CRC, she could not have the discussion she just had because she has to excuse herself from all the deliberations, voting, and decision-making. Therefore, it was a conflict of interest.

Mr. Cox also stated that Council did not need the rules to know whether there was a conflict of interest. He said, *"if you get think there is a conflict, it probably is."* Mr. Cox stated that Mrs. Johnson provided a valuable service to the county through the CRC. Unfortunately, because of the conflict of interest, she would not be allowed to bring this before Council.

Mr. Flowers asked whether volunteer non-paid positions, such as volunteer firemen, elected to County Council would have to give up being a volunteer fireman or whether they could not discuss or vote on anything involving the volunteer firemen.

Mr. Cox said that because of the nature of the county's volunteer fire department and the fact that the County Administrator hires the fire chief, it would be a conflict of

interest for a volunteer fireman to serve on County Council. However, this was subject to further review because of its unique nature.

Mr. Flowers pointed out that even a non-department that has a greater societal good would create a conflict of interest. Even a charitable organization that supports the county directly, Council members could not be involved in because of the conflict.

Mrs. Johnson said this was for interpretation and understanding. She stated that when CRC goes away, this would become the county's project and she will state what needs to be done for the people of Darlington County, South Carolina, and the Country as a whole. She said, "*if you want Wilhelmina Johnson to stay quiet, then you do it. Otherwise the conflict of interest would be brought back again.*"

Discussion Of The Phase-Out Of Non-Departmental Agencies That Occurred During The 1990's, As Requested By Council Member Wilhelmina Johnson

Mrs. Johnson said she had provided an analysis prior to the phase-out to show how much money the non-departmental agencies were bringing into Darlington County. This was not a duplication of services then and this was not a duplication of services now. She said this began when Council decided not to provide funding to certain agencies such as the Community Action Agency and Pee Dee Regional Council of Governments. She questioned the criteria Council was using to help people and this was when it began. Mrs. Johnson said Council needed to see what the county was doing and what could and could not be done.

Mrs. Warr explained that council members were elected to spend the taxpayers' money on county government services such as safety (police, EMS), garbage, roads and bridges, administration, etc. Taxpayers' money was generated to fund these aspects of county government. She also stated that county government, through the County Administrator, has control over the taxpayers' money and how it is spent. However, if Council gives money to non-departmental agencies, Council would have no control or audit over how the agencies spend the taxpayers' money. Mrs. Warr explained that if she wanted to contribute to any charitable organizations in the county, she would write her check. She did not feel that this was part of county government. Mrs. Warr questioned Council members saying one organization was better than another organization and deserves a certain amount of money. She said all the organizations were good and provided community services. However, they were not part of county government.

Mrs. Johnson said county government was responsible for the quality of life, which was more than public safety. She also said the county did not complete the phase-out because many groups were still receiving funds and others added. Therefore, she wanted this to be reviewed to be consistent and across the board for everyone.

Chairman Baldwin explained to Mrs. Johnson that she did not have to have an item on the agenda. If the items were not a conflict of interest, she could make a motion directly from the floor. If the motion received a second, Council could vote on it.

Mr. Flowers said he was not on Council when the phase-out was voted on. He questioned whether Mrs. Johnson had voted for or against the phase-out. If she had voted against the phase-out, her discussion was out of order. If she was on the losing side, she was not allowed to bring the matter back up as an item of business on Council. Only a winning member would be allowed to bring up a piece of business. The loser could not do this.

Mrs. Johnson said the fact that she was leading the discussion should let Council know how she voted. She said only four Council members were still on Council when this was voted on. She requested all the minutes regarding the phase-out.

Discussion Regarding Rules & Procedures Governing County Council Meetings, As Requested By Council Member Wilhelmina Johnson

Mrs. Johnson read Chapter 2, Section 2-83(i) from the Darlington County Code of Ordinances which states, *“Requests and comments by Councilmembers. Councilmembers shall make every effort to get items of discussion to the chairman or administrator on a timely basis for inclusion on the agenda. However, the agenda for all regular meetings of council shall include a provision for requests and comments by councilmembers. Matters raised during this time shall be items concerning the district represented by the member or a brief background on the topic the member was unable to get put on the agenda but which the member would like to introduce for further discussion and possible action at a later meeting.”* She pointed out that nothing states that when a member requests something to go on the agenda, that the chairman or attorney could scrutinize it, analyze it, and not add it to the agenda.

Mr. Cox pointed out that Mrs. Johnson would not be allowed to place CRC business on the agenda because it was a conflict of interest. She could bring up other business for her district, but not about CRC. Mr. Cox said that when there is a conflict, the council member has to recuse himself/herself.

Mrs. Johnson asked who would determine this.

Mr. Cox said the Chairman would normally turn to the attorney who acts as the parliamentarian. The Chairman’s rule would stand unless council votes to overrule the chairman.

Mrs. Johnson asked whether this was interpreted in the information that she read.

Mr. Cox said no. However, the overriding issue on the conduct of business was the conflict of interest. He referred to the Darlington County Code of Ordinances Section 2-84(e) about when members may not vote to do business with the county. Mr. Cox told Mrs. Johnson that in order to get before Council what she wanted to, someone else would have to come before Council to do it. Also, she could not join into the discussion. He emphasized that Mrs. Johnson could not advocate, stand up for, vote for, or applaud for any issue before council that was a conflict for her.

Mrs. Johnson said the statement in the ordinance needed to be revised to add what Mr. Cox said. Nowhere did it state that when a council member request something, that the chairman and the attorney could analyze it first.

Mr. Cox said the chairman has complete control over whether council members get to speak, how long they speak, and when they get to speak. He added that the Chairman also decides what meeting and what is best for the interest of county business.

Mrs. Johnson emphasized that this was not printed.

Mr. Cox pointed out that Mrs. Johnson could talk about anything that she did not have a conflict with.

Mrs. Johnson said that if she had a conflict, that would be her business and not to be analyzed.

Mr. Cox told Mrs. Johnson that she was *“super intelligent.”* When things go against her, she drops back that she does not understand. He said this was one reason that they

loved her and listened to her past the time when the chairman should have said it was time to stop.

Mr. Flowers added that Section 2-83 of the Code of Ordinances states that the chairman must approve all matters to be placed on the agenda. Therefore, if a council member wanted an item to be placed on the agenda and the Chairman does not place it on the agenda, the council member, during the Council Comment period, could move to place the matter on the agenda for the following council meeting. If the council member receives a second and a majority of the council members vote for it, then the item would have to go on the agenda. Therefore, the chairman's ability to place items on the agenda was limited to the fact that it has to be supported by the majority of council.

Mr. Cox confirmed that a majority of council could overrule the chairman.

Mr. Shaw commented that when Council members were elected, they must not have read this information because after 20 plus years, Council members seem to not know the rules and regulations. He said Council had been told several times tonight that it was a conflict of interest but was not paying any attention to it or to the county attorney. Council members were just deciding what they wanted to do. Mr. Shaw said he was given the information when he was elected and 20 years later, council was arguing about what Council was all about and what Council could do. He suggested that Council move to the next item.

Consent Agenda

There were no Consent Agenda items.

Personal Appearances

There were no personal appearances.

Requests / Comments – Members Of Council

Mrs. Johnson said she would not give in until the freedom of America was equally distributed. She said that until these things were done away with, Council would be hearing from her and \$1 million would be requested from the county at the next meeting.

Mr. Flowers commended the staff at the Smith Avenue recycling site.

County Council Meeting Scheduled For Monday, August 2nd, Cancelled

Chairman Baldwin announced that due to the fact that Council would attend the S.C. Association of Counties meeting the last of this month and the first of August, Council would not meet the first Monday in August (August 2nd). Council would meet on August 16th.

Vote For Executive Session

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Mr. Flowers to vote for executive session for the discussion of personnel matters.

The motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session

MOTION was made by Mrs. Warr and seconded by Mr. Flowers for Council members, Mr. Cox, and the County Administrator to go into executive session for the discussion of personnel matters after a break.

Council recessed at 7:15 p.m. prior to going into executive session. Upon reconvening at 7:54 p.m., Chairman Baldwin announced that no action was taken in executive session.

Retirement of County Administrator Phyllis Griffiths

Chairman Baldwin then read the following statement per County Administrator Phyllis Griffiths: *“Chairman and County Council Members, I am retiring as of July 30, 2010. I have thoroughly enjoyed my tenure with the county and will truly miss the employees of the county. I hope that Council will find an administrator that will truly work with the employees and be on their team. Darlington County has some of the best employees who are dedicated to their jobs and provide the best services to the citizens of our county.”*

MOTION was made by Mr. Blackwell and seconded by Ms. Nicholson to accept the County Administrator’s retirement.

The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

MOTION was made by Mr. Flowers and seconded by Mrs. Johnson to adjourn the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. J. JaNet Bishop, Clerk to Council

Mr. Billy Baldwin, Chairman
Darlington County Council

Approved at meeting of August 16, 2010.