



**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL  
COUNTY COUNCIL AGENDA  
Newberry Courthouse Annex  
1309 College Street, Newberry, SC 29108  
October 7, 2024  
6:00 P.M.**

Call to Order: Todd Johnson, Chairman  
Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance: Leon Fulmer, Council Member

1. Adoption of Consent Agenda:
  - a. Newberry County Council Work Session – September 18, 2024.
  - b. Newberry County Council Meeting – September 18, 2024.
  - c. Newberry County Council Emergency Meeting – September 27, 2024.
  
2. Additions, Deletions & Adoption of the Agenda.
  
3. Ordinance 09-01-2024. An Ordinance Approving the Terms of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Newberry County and the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority.
  - a. Public Hearing
  - b. Second Reading
  
4. County Council may take action on matters discussed during the 5 p.m. Work Session.
  
5. Further discussion of Newberry County’s storm recovery efforts, if desired by council.

6. Appointments.
7. Public Comments.
8. Comments/Requests from County Administrator.
9. Comments/Requests from Council.
10. Future meetings:
  - a. Newberry County Council Work Session – October 16 at 5 p.m.
  - b. Newberry County Council – October 16 at 6 p.m.
  - c. Newberry County Council Work Session – November 6 at 5 p.m.
  - d. Newberry County Council – November 6 at 6 p.m.
  - e. Veterans Day – November 11 – Newberry County Offices Closed.
  - f. Newberry County Council Executive Committee – November 12 at 6 p.m.
11. Adjournment.

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
MINUTES  
September 18, 2024**

Newberry County Council met on Wednesday, September 18, 2024, at 5:01 p.m. in Council Chambers at the Courthouse Annex, 1309 College Street, Newberry, SC, for a Work Session.

Notice of the meeting was duly advertised, as required by law.

PRESENT: Todd Johnson, Chairman  
Robert Shealy, Vice-Chairman  
Leon Fulmer, Council Member  
Les Hipp, Council Member  
Travis Reeder, Council Member  
Karl Sease, Council Member  
Johnny Mack Scurry, Council Member  
Jeff Shacker, County Administrator  
Joanie Winters, County Attorney  
Eric Nieto, I.T. Director  
Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council/PIO

MEDIA: Kelly Duncan, The Newberry Observer

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

1. Discussion of a proposal to allow the keeping of hens as a conditional use within residential zoning districts, subject to minimum standards.
  - Mr. Shacker discussed the previous ordinance that would allow, as a conditional use, keeping of hens in the residential districts, as they are currently not allowed.

This ordinance would not impact R2 (rural) as they already allow for chickens. Mr. Shacker said the way zoning works, you identify uses that are permitted on those properties and they are placed in a table, broken up into permitted, conditional, and special exceptions.

- Mr. Shacker showed a new tool developed by Mr. Brian Kelly, GIS, that shows how many districts within Newberry County are R2 (which can have chickens, and this ordinance does not modify in any way) and how the majority of the county is zoned this way. Mr. Shacker then showed the other zoning districts that this ordinance does impact.
- Mr. Shacker showed the size of the districts impacted just in case council decided to go into the direction of allowing hens based on the size of the property.
- Mr. Hipp said if you allow hens by size, no matter what, you are eventually going to get a border where someone with a smaller lot is allowed a smaller amount of hens and the owner at the adjoining property can have more, and it doesn't matter if the adjoining property is R2, you are always going to have a case if you do it by size where the neighbor can have as many as they want, or in some other cases the neighbor is going to have a larger number of hens, and you may have a limited number. He said if you do it by size, you are going to always have a case where your neighbor has the opportunity to have more hens than you. Mr. Hipp said if you keep reducing the number of hens by the size, that would be a burden to the Newberry County Zoning staff to administer.
- Mr. Reeder said a lot of the phone calls he has received were complaints about chickens running all over the place, into neighbors' yards, or the smell.
- Mr. Shacker said the details can change, but they tried to bring them an ordinance that struck a balance, giving an

owner the ability to have hens while also not impacting neighboring property owners.

- Mr. Hipp said there is no way they can zone this where you make everyone happy. He said they do have, under R2, throughout the county that this does not apply, and this is impacting a very small population in the county. He said he would venture to say within that small population, there are a lot who do not even want hens. He said they are going to great lengths, like they should, to protect freedoms and liberties, but they cannot make everyone happy.
- Mr. Fulmer said he agrees with what Mr. Hipp said and added that they will not satisfy everyone. He said he does think they need to do this, to allow this to be a minimum conditional use for those folks that do want to have hens. He said he has gotten way more phone calls the past couple of weeks prior to their last meeting regarding chickens. He said of all the folks that have called, the major complaint they have had has been around whether they will smell it, see it or hear it. He said some were concerned by an environmental standpoint, but if you look at the numbers these six hens will produce way less of an environmental concern compared to bigger dogs. He said the concern of hens running loose, they did not want that, they were concerned by a look of a chicken coop, they did not want to see it and they were also worried about smell. He said most of the folks called him thinking they were trying to ban chickens, all together. He told them no, that is not what they were trying to do, they were trying to do the opposite. He said then he had calls from people who were on larger tracks who realized they were not zoned R2, including one gentleman who had 30 acres. Mr. Fulmer said he likes the idea of setting it by the size of the property because of the people who were captured in that zoned area, he likes the idea of

giving them more than six hens. He said he understands you have one property that is allowed to have more hens than a neighbor. However, he said if he has an acre worth of land, he should not have the expectation to have as many hens on his property as a neighbor who has 30 acres and that is not a reasonable expectation. He does not think an owner with thirty acres should not have the liberty taken from him to have more than six hens. He does understand they may be difficult to implement, but he does not want to take that liberty away from someone who has that many acres. Mr. Fulmer added that the sighting criteria about being screened, chickens maintained inside a structure, needing a plan in place to handle the manure; he thinks all of that is needed to eliminate the possibility of the concerns residents have had regarding, smell, eyesight, and the noise. He thinks the ordinance proposed does that, but he does not like the idea of what the use of an individual with a larger track of land is limited to and he thinks they need to come up with something different.

- Mr. Hipp said he does not disagree, but he is thinking about implementing the law and they currently have laws on the books that they are not implementing and that is a bad place to be. He said he likes what Mr. Fulmer is saying, and he thinks they should allow up to six hens on certain residential districts (R2 no limit), then they can have conditional approval, if you have larger property and you want more than six, you can go and apply for a conditional approval and the conditions can be set up by size of property not by districts. They can be approved by the district with requirements, but if you have a larger property and you want more chickens than that you can ask for conditional approval by the size of your property.
  - Mr. Fulmer asked if that would put more of a burden on staff to make that judgement call. Mr.

Hipp responded by saying but if you have someone with 4/10 of an acre and someone with 5/10 of an acre, one has a bigger house and the land size is almost the same and you've limited one with chickens and the other has more, to him, you go to the zoning staff and there will be a cut off with acreage.

- Mr. Hipp said you have limited one person who said they want six chickens and then they go out and buy more. He said they do not have zoning people to go out and count chickens.
  - Mr. Shealy said bottom line, they are trying to make it better than what they currently have on the books because right now, they are not supposed to have any.
- Mr. Sease said the majority of the calls he received were regarding permits and how much of a fee they will have just to have chickens on their property.
  - Mr. Shacker said he should clarify this point; the county does have a fee to go out and mark the location of a principal structure or accessory structure, that is what the chicken coop would be. He said there is a charge for that and the rational is to send a county employee to go out and take those measurements, so it really is not a permit fee but a fee to verify setbacks.
  - Mr. Fulmer said he had calls regarding that issue as well, and he told them it is a situation where you are requiring an employee to go out to someone's property to ensure you are not encroaching on another individuals' liberties and freedoms, you have to pay a fee for that and the individual who utilizes that program, pays for that program. He said that is not just county, but state and federal too.

- Mr. Sease asked for clarification, if someone is going to have chickens on R2, do they need to have a permit and have someone come out and take a look.
  - Mr. Shacker said no, it is a permitted use and the only thing with R2, if there is construction for a building the county verifies setbacks and marks that. He added in R2, there is no requirement to have a chicken coop.
- Mr. Johnson said he thinks they had a little bit of bad media that said they were going to limit chickens and that was never the intent. The intent was to open the door and not close the door. He said he would remind everyone they are in this because of bad neighbors, he said they assume that one neighbor would go to another and say, "I don't like what you're doing." And the neighbor would go, "I'm sorry, I'll fix that." But the truth is those days are really nonexistent now. He said he thinks they need to do this. He added that something along the lines of the acreage versus the district and he likes Mr. Hipp's idea of conditional use (for those with many acres). He said he also feels they should be cognizant of the fee, and they do not want people to think they are trying to tax them to use their own land when it is the opposite. He said he thinks there needs to be a balance, and he said they started this because a resident called the county out for not enforcing the rule and the last thing, they want to get into is deliberate indifference which is a cause of action. He added that he thinks there is a compromise, but with compromise both sides end up mad at you.
- Mr. Hipp said they got a lot of concerns from residents that they were taking away freedoms and liberties. He said he heard someone comment about their ordinance



and he thought that cannot be right, and it was right. He said when the ordinance was accepted, and they were probably short on time and in a hurry and they adopted boiler plat language and some of that boiler plate language does not fit the county or their circumstances. So, the comment about shrubbery and distance to trees, that was originally used to restrict in a commercial development or housing development, that was not in any way to restrict people throughout the county how they put shrubbery in their yard. He said they do need to go back through the ordinance, and if they have a law they are not implementing, they need to eliminate it.

- Mr. Johnson said they have an interest in this, but they would like to see it worded different. He then requested staff go back to the drawing board.
- Mr. Fulmer said he thinks they need to have some language in there if the adjoining neighbors are okay with the chickens, maybe there is a waiver that needs to be obtained, if the neighbors are okay with that.
- Mr. Johnson added that he would like to see something added in about frivolous complaints and if you have so many frivolous complaints against your neighbor, you are fined for that because then you are using the county to wage war against a neighbor.
- Mr. Hipp said if you have a conditional use, using what Mr. Fulmer said, one of the conditions is you do not have objection from a neighbor, and if you do not have objection, you can have more. Mrs. Winters recommended going the other way and Mr. Johnson said he would like it better to have support rather than no objection.
- Mr. Reeder said if you are living in a residential area you have to have some restrictions. Mr. Johnson said he agrees and if you have someone on a half-acre lot next to someone with 300 chickens.

2. Legal Matter(s):

a. Discussion of matters related to Newberry County's local floodplain management program and participation in the National Flood Insurance Program pursuant to SC Code of Laws Section 30-4-70(a)(2).

- Mr. Hipp made a motion to go into Executive Session; Mr. Shealy provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.
- Newberry County Council went into Executive Session at 5:43 p.m.
- Mr. Reeder made a motion to come out of Executive Session; Mr. Fulmer provided the second and the motion carried 7-0 at 5:57 p.m.

3. Adjournment.

- Mr. Shealy made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Reeder provided the second and the motion carried 7-0 at 5:57 p.m.

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**Todd Johnson, Chairman**

---

**Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council**

**Minutes Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
September 18, 2024**

Newberry County Council met on Wednesday, September 18, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at the Courthouse Annex, 1309 College Street, Newberry, SC, for a regular scheduled meeting.

Notice of the meeting was duly advertised, as required by law.

PRESENT: Todd Johnson, Chairman  
Robert Shealy, Vice-Chairman  
Leon Fulmer Jr., Council Member  
Les Hipp, Council Member  
Travis Reeder, Council Member  
Karl Sease, Council Member  
Johnny Mack Scurry, Council Member  
Jeff Shacker, County Administrator  
Joanie Winters, County Attorney  
Karen Brehmer, Deputy County Administrator  
Captain Ben Chapman, NCSO  
Debbie Cromer, Finance Director  
Tommy Long, Emergency Services Director  
Eric Nieto, I.T. Director  
Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council/PIO

MEDIA: Kelly Duncan, The Newberry Observer

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Shealy led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance.

1. Adoption of Consent Agenda:

- a. Newberry County Council Work Session – September 4, 2024.
- b. Newberry County Council Meeting – September 4, 2024.

- Mr. Hipp made a motion to accept the minutes as presented; Mr. Scurry provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.

2. Additions, Deletions & Adoption of the Agenda.

- Mr. Scurry made a motion to accept the agenda as published; Mr. Shealy provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.

3. Recognitions:

a. Employee Service:

Caleb Kierstead	5 years	NCSO
Joseph Kingsmore	5 years	NCSO
Jackie Greenwood	15 years	Public Works
Tammy Kinard	20 years	Corrections
Larry Graham	20 years	NCSO
Zenda McClurkin	25 years	Public Safety

- Mr. Shacker recognized the employees listed above for their service to Newberry County, highlighting their accomplishments and pivotal moments while working for Newberry County.

4. A Proclamation recognizing the Towns in Tune event in Newberry County and Bay Bulls, Newfoundland.

- Mr. Shealy made a motion to accept the Proclamation; Mr. Hipp provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.
- Ms. Michelle Long, Executive Director of the Newberry County Chamber of Commerce, accepted a copy of the Proclamation and members of the Bay Bulls Town Government were on Zoom for the presentation, as introduced by Ms. Long.

5. A Proclamation recognizing September 15-October 15, 2024, and Hispanic Heritage Month in Newberry County.

- Mr. Sease made a motion to accept the Proclamation; Mr. Reeder provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.
- Ms. Liz Rivera accepted a copy of the Proclamation along with Ms. Rubi Flores and Mr. Oswaldo Tapia. She also invited everyone to attend the Hispanic Heritage Month Festival at Newberry College on Monday, September 23, 2024.

6. Resolution 08-24. A Resolution to Recognize and Honor the Members of the South Carolina State Guard, to commend their all-volunteer force who embody the spirit of National Preparedness Month, and to declare September as “South Carolina State Guard Month” in Newberry County.

- Mr. Shealy made a motion to accept the Resolution; Mr. Fulmer provided the second and the motion carried 7-0.
- Local members of the South Carolina State Guard accepted a copy of the Resolution.

7. Ordinance 09-01-2024. An Ordinance Approving the Terms of an Intergovernmental Agreement Between Newberry County and the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority.

a. First Reading

- Mr. Shacker explained that this ordinance agrees to terms with the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority, who have acted by Resolution already, on the cost overruns for the wastewater treatment plant, one of the projects approved on the 2022 Capital Project Sales Tax referendum. He said due to impact of inflation of the cost of the projects, to a degree it began to bring in the question of the viability of the projects.
- He said a different approach is being taken, instead of funding cost overruns on the back end of the projects, they are proposing to cover the cost of the overruns on the front end and that would make the projects viable.
- He said they are looking at an estimated \$8.8 million overrun above the balloted amounts. They are now looking at close to \$46 million in projects. He said one of the things about inflation that is not necessarily negative, it has also increased collections which is allowing them to cover the costs on the front end.
- He said the reason they are recommending an ordinance for this project, and not the others, is because the increase to construct the wastewater treatment project is considerably more than the others. He said the balloted amount was a little over \$5.1 million and they are looking at a \$4.4 million increase. He said this will agree to fund that overrun now, and states if there are additional overruns the NCWSA will pay for those overruns.

- Mr. Sease said he was at the COG meeting the other week and he said they were supposed to be getting \$5.6 million from state and federal funds to build that project and if that was additional funds.
  - Mr. Shacker said he thinks they are using that to pursue what is outside of the scope of the CPST project.
- Mr. Hipp asked where this project ranked in the CPST project. Ms. Brehmer said it ranked fifth. Mr. Hipp said this is not an insignificant percentage wise increase over what was projected and if all of their projects were to be this kind of overrun, they would not have enough funding. He said if they did this, without bonding, they would have had to complete the first four projects first.
- Mr. Hipp said this is the first reading of an ordinance and he won't vote against it, and he is not happy that they have a project on CPST that is double what they predicted, and they have 12 projects.
- Mr. Reeder if anything changed from the original plans; Mr. Shacker said no it was the cost of inflation.
- Mr. Shacker said they have had increases with all of the projects, except for two that will be the museum and the IT/security upgrades at the courthouse.
- Mr. Hipp said once they approve this, it is the law and there is a difference between that and seeing their projects as they go. He says he feels uneasy about approving this ordinance.
- Mr. Reeder made a motion to accept first reading; Mr. Shealy provided the second.
- Mr. Johnson said he'd like to know, before they commit, if some of that is going to this project or other projects (NCWSA). He said if they lock in to fund this overage, what do they do about the other projects. He said without significant explanation and more details he would be hesitant to vote again.

- Mr. Shacker said there were commitments made with the other projects along these lines, and they used letters of understanding, but they went this route for this project due to the amount.
- Mr. Johnson said he doesn't think between the ballot and now they didn't think it would be over and \$8.8 million is shocking and he thinks they need to be wise to what they commit themselves to in the future.
- The motion carried 7-0.

8. County Council may take action(s) on matters discussed during the 5:00 pm meeting.

- There was no action taken.

9. Appointments.

- There were no appointments.

10. Public Comments.

- There were no public comments.

11. Comments/Requests from County Administrator.

- Mr. Shacker said they have a lot of projects in the air, and they are all moving forward.

12. Comments/Requests from Council.

- Mr. Fulmer thanked everyone for coming out and he thanked residents of Newberry County for the pleasure of representing them. He further said that he enjoys the



discussions with his fellow councilmembers over issues and it is a pleasure to work with them.

- Mr. Hipp said he appreciates everyone coming out and the thoughtful comments they get from residents, and he thinks it impacts their decisions and thought process.
- Mr. Johnson said the working relationship is really great and they can talk to each other, communicate and share opinions and not get upset.
- Mr. Sease thanked everyone for coming out and participating in their form of government and giving them insight and ideas when they are doing these ordinances.
- Mr. Reeder said it is a pleasure to see everyone's smiling faces. He said it was good to have all the proclamations and resolutions.
- Mr. Scurry said it was a pleasure to see everyone come out, especially the employees who were recognized.

#### 13. Future meetings:

- a. Newberry County Executive Committee – September 23 at 6 p.m.
- b. Newberry County Council Work Session – October 2 at 5 p.m.
- c. Newberry County Council Meeting – October 2 at 6 p.m.
- d. Newberry County Public Safety Committee – October 7 at 6 p.m.
- e. Newberry County Council Work Session – October 16 at 5 p.m.
- f. Newberry County Council – October 16 at 6 p.m.

#### 14. Adjournment.

- Mr. Shealy made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Hipp provided the second and the motion carried 7-0 at 6:37 p.m.

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**Todd Johnson, Chairman**

---

**Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council**

**Minutes Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL EMERGENCY MEETING  
MINUTES  
September 27, 2024**

Newberry County Council met on Friday, September 27, 2024, at 3:43 p.m. over the phone for the purposes of an emergency meeting with a 2/3 majority.

PRESENT: Todd Johnson, Chairman  
Robert Shealy, Vice-Chairman  
Leon Fulmer Jr., Council Member  
Les Hipp, Council Member  
Travis Reeder, Council Member  
Karl Sease, Council Member  
Jeff Shacker, County Administrator  
Joanie Winters, County Attorney  
Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council/PIO

ABSENT: Johnny Mack Scurry, Council Member

Mr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:43 p.m.

1. Ordinance 09-02-2024. An Ordinance to Provide Newberry County Chair the Authority to Declare a State of Emergency.
  - Ms. Winters said this emergency ordinance gives the chair the authority to declare a state of emergency. She further explained that the ordinance will expire after 60 days.
  - Mr. Hipp motioned to approve the emergency ordinance; Mr. Sease provided the second. Mr. Johnson then called for a roll call vote in no particular order: Mr. Shealy Yes, Mr. Hipp Yes, Mr. Fulmer Yes, Mr. Sease Yes, Mr. Reeder Yes, Mr. Johnson Yes. Mr. Scurry was not present. With the 2/3 majority, the emergency ordinance was approved.

2. Adjournment.

- Mr. Shealy made a motion to adjourn the emergency meeting; Mr. Hipp provided the second. Mr. Johnson then called for a roll call vote in no particular order: Mr. Shealy Yes, Mr. Hipp Yes, Mr. Sease Yes, Mr. Reeder Yes, Mr. Fulmer Yes, Mr. Johnson Yes. Mr. Scurry was not present.
- With a 2/3 majority, the meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

**NEWBERRY COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**Todd Johnson, Chairman**

---

**Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council**

**Minutes Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA            )  
  )  
COUNTY OF NEWBERRY                        )

ORDINANCE NO. 09-01-2024

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE TERMS OF AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN NEWBERRY COUNTY AND NEWBERRY COUNTY WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY**

**WHEREAS**, Newberry County, South Carolina (the “County”), following a successful referendum held on November 3, 1998, imposed a Capital Project Sales Tax (“CPST”) within the County pursuant to the provisions of S.C. Code Ann. §4-10-300 *et seq.* (1976, as amended); and

**WHEREAS**, the CPST has been reimposed from time to time in the County following referendums successfully held in 2004, 2010, 2016, and 2022; and

**WHEREAS**, since its original imposition in the County, and continuing through the renewals thereof, the CPST has provided to both the County and the political subdivisions within the County funds to defray the cost of various capital improvements, thus avoiding the imposition of additional property taxes in the County and mitigating the need for increases in rates of public utilities in the County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority, a political subdivision and special purpose district of the State of South Carolina (the “Authority”) has been a beneficiary of the CPST in each iteration of its imposition; and

**WHEREAS**, in the most recent referendum for reimposition of the CPST, which was held on November 8, 2022 (the “2022 Referendum”), the capital projects approved therein (the “2022 Projects”) consist of 12 items with an aggregate cost, as shown on the 2022 Referendum ballot, of \$37,047,130; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council is advised that, as a consequence of inflation, the total estimated cost of all 2022 Projects has increased by \$8,881,687 since the 2022 Referendum, from \$37,047,130 to not less than \$45,928,817; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2022 Referendum ballot included the upgrade and expansion of the Authority’s Cannon’s Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (the “WWTP”) at a cost of \$5,154,560; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council is advised by the Authority that estimated cost of the WWTP has increased by \$4,462,231 since the 2022 Referendum to \$9,616,791; and

**WHEREAS**, the County intends to proceed with the issuance of not exceeding \$35,250,000 general obligation bonds, as approved in the 2022 Referendum (the “CPST Bonds”) to defray a portion of the costs of the 2022 Projects; and

**WHEREAS**, the projected cost overrun on the WWTP shown above amounts to more than 50% of total projected overruns on the 2022 Projects; and

**WHEREAS**, if the actual cost overrun on the WWTP exceeds the present estimate thereof, the WWTP and other 2022 Projects may face delays and funding shortfalls; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority desires to assist the County with its efforts to proceed with the issuance of the CPST Bonds and to facilitate the same such that construction of all 2022 Projects may be initiated, completed and their intended benefits made available to the citizens of the County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has, by resolution duly adopted (the “NCWSA Resolution”), determined that it will have no further need of cost overrun funding beyond that described above, and that it is committed to providing additional funding required for the WWTP, if any, from available funds of the Authority and from the proceeds of waterworks and sewer system revenue bonds of the Authority, which it may issue on its motion and which it has a capacity to undertake within the constraints of its existing loan documents, and provided the County Administrator of the County with a copy of such resolution, attached hereto as Exhibit A;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED** by the County Council of the County of Newberry, in Council duly assembled this 16th day of October 2024 that: Council hereby approves the terms of the NCWSA Resolution and agrees that such terms, hereby approved by this Ordinance, constitute an Intergovernmental Agreement between the County and the Authority.

**BY:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Todd Johnson, Chairman**

**(SEAL)**

**ATTEST:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Andrew Wigger, Clerk to Council**

**Approved as to form:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Joanie Winters, Interim County Attorney**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Jeff Shacker, County Administrator**

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Reading:</b>	<b>September 18, 2024</b>
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Reading:</b>	<b>October 2, 2024</b>
<b>Public Hearing:</b>	<b>October 2, 2024</b>
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Reading:</b>	<b>October 16, 2024</b>