



Richland County Council
Regular Session
May 21, 2019 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Chair; Dalhi Myers, Vice-Chair; Joyce Dickerson, Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Bill Malinowski, Jim Manning, Yvonne McBride, Chakisse Newton, Allison Terracio and Joe Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Beverly Harris, John Thompson, Stacey Hamm, Eden Logan, Larry Smith, Jennifer Wladischkin, Trenia Bowers, Ashiya Myers, Sandra Yudice, Shahid Khan, Nathaniel Miller, Michael Niermeier, James Hayes, Ashley Powell, Dwight Hanna, Ismail Ozbek, John Hopkins, Tiffany Harrison, Jeff Ruble, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Bryant Davis and Cathy Rawls

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The invocation was led by the Honorable Joe Walker
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Joe Walker
4. **PRESENTATION OF PROCLAMATIONS**
 - a. Resolution Honoring the Ridgeview High School Boys’ Basketball Team on their championship – Mr. Jackson and Mr. Manning presented a resolution to the Ridgeview High School Boys’ Basketball Team.
 - b. Resolution in conjunction with the National recognition that Richland County recognizes May as Lyme Disease Awareness Month – Mr. Manning presented a resolution to Ms. Arielle Riposta in honor of Lyme Disease Awareness Month.
 - c. A Proclamation Honoring the Magnet Schools of America 2019 National Principal of the Year Dr. Sabrina Suber – Ms. Kennedy and Mr. Manning presented a proclamation to Dr. Suber.
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. Regular Session: May 7, 2019 – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve the minutes as presented.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Regular Session
May 21, 2019

6. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to adopt the agenda as published.

Ms. Newton stated the Airport Commission vacancy needed to be added to the agenda under the Report of the Rules and Appointments Committee as Item 19(o).

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the agenda as amended.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning and McBride

The vote was in favor of adopting the agenda as amended.

7. **PRESENTATION**

- a. Experience Columbia SC – March Madness: Bill Ellen, President & CEO, Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center – Mr. Ellen thanked Council for their support of the “March Madness” event at the Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center.

- Over 47,000 visitors during the 5-day period
- All 6 games were on live TV
- Duke vs. University of Florida game drew the largest audience of the regional games
- Over 30 Community events were going on
- Produced and distributed 66,619 pieces of marketing materials
- 10 welcome tables throughout the hotels and airport
- Over 70 volunteers that donated 326 hours of their time
- The tournament garnered 600 media mentions of the region, which resulted in \$1.1 million worth of publicity value
- There were 647,493 impressions on social media
- All of the hotels in the region saw a significant increase in occupancy, which resulted in increased Accommodations and Hospitality Taxes.
- Next time Columbia will be eligible to host is 2023, but they have start preparing in August for them to be able to submit the bid by October. The bid will be for years 2023 – 2026.

8. **REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS** – Mr. Smith stated the following items are eligible for Executive Session.

- a. Adoption of Economic Development Policy
- b. Lower Richland Sewer Agreement with the City of Columbia (Purchase Option)
- c. Administrator Search Update

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Newton and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:30 PM and came out at approximately 7:06 PM

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

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Walker, Dickerson and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Newton, Kennedy, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor as unanimous.

- a. Adoption of Economic Development Policy – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the Economic Development Policy, as discussed in Executive Session.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning and Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: McBride

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy and Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

9. **CITIZENS' INPUT: For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing** – Mr. Willie Farmer spoke about improving the SLBE experience for businesses in the County.

10. **CITIZENS' INPUT: Must Pertain to Richland County Matters Not on the Agenda** – No one signed up to speak.

11. **REPORT OF THE ACTING COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. DHEC/Westinghouse Consent Agreement – Dr. Thompson stated the significant portion of the consent agreement serves to investigate and remediate the contamination at the Westinghouse site, and for Westinghouse to communicate and respond to future releases of pollutants on their premises.

Mr. Jackson stated that last year Ms. Myers, and others, were having discussions with regards to whether or not appropriate level of testing was being done. He is not sure we ever got any follow-up on this matter.

Mr. Khan stated, to the best of his knowledge, DHEC has gone in and done a thorough investigation. They provided the County a copy of the results in the last few weeks. In parallel, Council approved the proceeding to do individual well testing. Approximately 60 – 80 citizens signed up for the

testing and had their wells tested. The results were satisfactory, and there are no issues.

Dr. Thompson stated Council also approved for the County to a hydrology study, but because the consent agreement came forth, we are honoring what the State is doing, at this point.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, we have suspended the study.

Mr. Khan stated there was not a hydrology study approved. There was a study approved, which included the well testing. If needed, we would have taken it to the next level and conducted an additional investigation. Bear in mind, all of those actions were taken when we had limited information from DHEC, and we did not have any data. He stated DHEC has done a thorough underground geological investigation, which should serve all objectives we intended for the residents and customers.

Ms. Myers stated it would have been helpful to have had some memo, or something, so that when she met with the citizens on the Westinghouse Community Committee, she would not have told them we were continuing the County's work in parallel.

Mr. Khan stated the decision, by Administration, was to put the study on hold until we got additional information, which we got, including the consent order. Essentially, we are at a point to make a decision whether we want to continue and spend taxpayer dollars to repeat the same volume of work, or rely on a State agency, which we believe has done the job.

- b. Cherry Bekaert – PDT FY2017 Financial Audit – Mr. Alan Robinson stated Cherry Bekaert was engaged to conduct a financial statement audit of the Richland PDT. Ms. Bonne Cox who specializes in construction contractor auditing was tasked with conducting the June 2017 PDT audit.

Ms. Cox stated they have issued their audit of the Richland PDT for the year ending June 2017. The audit results are included in the agenda packet. She stated they were engaged to audit the financial statements of Richland PDT. The engagement came to them in January 2018 under the United States Generally Accepted Auditing Standards, which are for private companies. Included in that are accounting estimates. One of the required communications is to discuss with you what those significant estimates are. In the Richland PDT financial statements, there is an estimate for allowance for doubtful accounts. While there was a delay in the timing of us being able to conduct the audit, at the end of the day they were able to obtain evidence to finish the procedures. When they reviewed and did their procedures, they had conflicting evidence, so what they have issued is a disclaimer of an audit opinion on the financial statements of the Richland PDT due to material uncertainty. They did not have any uncorrected misstatements, which are known differences when we have audit evidence that says one thing and the financial statement says something else. There were some adjustments made to the year-end statements, but those adjustments were reflected in the financial statements. There were no disagreements with management, based on what they were providing. Management signed a representation letter that states they were truthful in their inquiries and did not withhold information that would have been relevant. If they were aware that PDT management was also consulting with other independent accountants, it would be brought to Council's attention. They did have difficulty involving a legal dispute regarding the contractual arrangement with its sole customer, the County. Due to the uncertainty surrounding this ongoing legal matter, they determined it to be both material and pervasive to the financial statements of the PDT. Because of the significance they did not deem it to have sufficient evidence in order to issue an opinion on the financial statements. Another letter that was issued, is in regards to the consideration of internal controls of the financial statements of PDT. They noted 2 matters they

deemed significant deficiencies in internal control. One of those relates to the preparation of the financial statements and year-end adjustments. The auditors did draft the financial statements, which includes some year-end adjustments and disclosures to financial statements. Richland PDT did not do that internally, but the auditors did that. Because they drafted the statements and posted the adjustments, it was a deficiency in the internal controls of PDT. A second matter they noted, related to the internal controls of the financial controls, was the lack of segregation of duties. The joint venture subcontracts with partners, in order to perform work as vendors. They noted that change orders, for those subcontracts, and vendor invoices, were approved by management of the partner of the joint venture. As a result, there is inherent conflict of interest, due to the lack of an outside parties' involvement in the approval process of the change orders between the vendors of PDT and the partners of PDT. It was noted in the opinion letter issued that they were engaged to audit the accompanying financial statements, but as discussed in Note 4 to the statements, the joint venture is involved in ongoing legal matters with its sole customers. Because multiple account balances in the statements of the joint venture are driven by the business conducted with its sole customer, the uncertainty is considered both material and pervasive in nature. Because of the significance of this matter, they have not been able to obtain sufficient evidence to issue an audit opinion on the financial statements.

Mr. Walker inquired, as it pertains to the findings, specifically the significant deficiencies, which jump off the page, in your experience is it normal for a program of this magnitude to not prepare its own financial statements.

Ms. Cox stated it is not that uncommon for people to not prepare statements internally. This is a fairly common finding in small businesses.

Mr. Walker inquired, as it pertains to publicly managed and audited funds...

Ms. Cox stated she has seen both.

Mr. Walker stated, in the findings, a conscious decision on the part of management to conduct internal financial reporting does not comply with GAAP was noted. He referenced p. 44 of the Program Management Agreement, subparagraph (3), "All financial records shall be maintained in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Procedures, consistently applied. Subcontractors shall do the same." He requested Mr. Smith to opine on his interpretation of the auditor's findings versus the PDT contract. Another point in the findings states, "...we noted that all change orders on subcontracts and vendor invoices were approved by management of a Partner of the Joint Venture. As a result, there is an inherent conflict of interest due to the lack of an outside party's involvement in the approval process." In this arrangement, the County would be the outside party that would typically be included in the approval process. Additionally, on p. 24 of the PDT contract, it states, "A Change Order is a written order to the Contractor signed by the County..." He inquired if that was the practice being followed.

Ms. Cox stated there was a lack of segregation of duties between the people approving changes to contracts and people receiving the benefit of those contracts.

Mr. Smith stated the audit concluded the generally accepted accounting procedures was not being followed. The specific portion of the contract, that Mr. Walker referred to, requires that all records be maintained in accordance with generally accepted account procedures. There is a specific provision in the agreement, which requires GAAP to be applied to all the financial records that are maintained. In reference to the provision regarding change orders, there is a requirement those

change orders be approved by the County, or County personnel. He does not know whether or not the change orders got any County approval.

Ms. Cox stated the documentation they saw, on the actual approval of the change order, had the PDT partner and then the vendor of the PDT signing off on the change order. They also saw when the amounts were invoiced to the County, the change orders were listed on the supporting documentation provided to the County. Those amounts were approved by payment by County management, so the County did see the change orders, as listed on the supporting documentation when those were submitted for payment to the County. The execution of the change order was between the Richland PDT member, partnership represented and the vendor of the PDT. There was not County signoff on that.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the auditors had the change orders, and they were approved by the PDT and the partner receiving the benefit, but when it got to the County level was it a number on the invoice or was it a number with the change order attached.

Ms. Cox stated, when she says the change order that was approved by the partner of the PDT, and the vendor of the PDT, that is the subcontracts from the PDT to the actual contractors that were doing the work for the PDT.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the invoices that came to us later, bore the amount of the change order, but not an approved supporting piece of paper.

Ms. Cox stated it was a supporting piece of paper, in that it was a typical construction application for payment.

Mr. Walker stated he found it interesting that this contracted party (PDT) could not, would not or otherwise chose not to provide information that could have been substantive to the audit because of the ongoing litigation. He inquired if they felt like they got everything they needed to complete a full financial audit.

Ms. Cox stated one of the standard audit procedures, they perform, is they inquire of management if there is ongoing litigation. A summary of the litigation is provided to the auditors. Typically, a confirmation letter will be sent to the entity's lawyer to have them represent their opinion on potential liability related to any pending litigation. They were made aware of the pending litigation between the PDT and the County. Management represented to them that their opinion was that they were correct, and they stood behind the amounts they had billed to the County and those were appropriate revenue to the PDT, which was the nature of the litigation between the 2 entities. PDT's attorney gave them the letter that said, "Yes, we agree. We believe that we are in the right, and the amounts that have been billed to the County, under the contract, are appropriate with the contract. The information they received from the County said exactly the opposite. Those conflicting pieces, from outside parties, were why they had to disclaim the opinion because there is no reconciling that when it comes to audit evidence.

Mr. Walker stated he is trying to figure out what to do with moving forward. He inquired if he is misinterpreting this, and is it other than what he has stated it as.

Mr. Smith stated, in terms of the issue of whether or not they were required to utilize GAAP and they did not, he thinks the contract speaks clearly that this is a requirement. On the other issue related to the change orders, he would need to see the documents Ms. Cox is referring to. To the

extent that there was no approval of the change orders, which he believes is what the contract calls for, that could be a potential issue that we would have to look into.

Mr. Walker stated, under Note 3 - Related party transactions, it states, "At June 30, 2017, the Joint Venture has accounts payable due to an entity related through common ownership of one of the Partners in the amount of \$105,673. The Joint Venture pays expenses to this entity for consulting services. During the year ended June 30, 2017, the Company paid \$618,274 and the amount is included in costs of revenues earned in the accompanying statement of income." He inquired, if it was ever discovered, or can you tell me what entity was presumably getting paid twice for consulting. He stated he is not being accusatory, but the PDT was engaged to be a consultant; therefore, a related party charging for the same thing concerns him.

Ms. Cox stated she did not have all of the detailed records with her, so specific names or amounts she would need to follow-up with that information. She stated related party transactions, under financial statement, and in the accounting world, means that if you have any related companies, through common ownership, then it is required disclosure of that. So, when it reads, "The Joint Venture has accounts payable to the Partners in the amount of \$105,673." Those are the actual partners of the PDT. The next paragraph that describes some dollar transactions to an entity related through common ownership of one of the partners, then that is not the actual partners of the PDT, but there is some overlap in ownership with a separate entity.

Ms. Newton stated she has read many audits, but she has never received a disclaimer before. The first thing mentioned is conflicting evidence while the audit was being conducted. For clarification, when they are referring to conflicting evidence, they are referring to the PDT's representation of the merits of our lawsuit vs. the County's representation of the merits of our lawsuit.

Ms. Cox stated that is correct.

Ms. Newton stated during the presentation it was mentioned there were material and pervasive weakness. She stated she is trying to figure out if the information received had material and pervasive weaknesses the auditor wanted to be expounded upon, or if they are saying they did not receive all of the information they would have expected to receive and that missing information is the material and pervasive weakness.

Ms. Cox stated the phrase "material and pervasive" are what they are referring to as the ongoing legal matter. They are saying the ongoing legal matter, with the conflicting audit evidence, is material and pervasive to the financial statements of PDT. Meaning it affects multiple accounts, and it is so material to the statements that they have to issue the disclaimer of opinion. The "material and pervasive" language is what the professional standards guide them to use when we are in the position to determine what type of opinion they are going to issue. If it is determined to be material and pervasive to the financial statements, then they are guided to issue a disclaimer on the opinion.

Ms. Newton inquired, if despite the dispute, they received all of the financial information they would have expected to receive, so that you could evaluate the PDT financially.

Ms. Cox stated there was no financial information, or data, they asked for that they were not provided with. It was the revenue recognition, if you will, that was the difference of opinion. PDT held that they were allowed to bill these amounts; therefore, recorded them as revenue. But, then the County came back and said, "No, this is not revenue. We are not going to pay this." That difference of audit documentation is the problem. It was not that they did not give them the data.

Ms. Newton stated we are required to audit the PDT annually, and we also have some auditing requirements based on the Supreme Court ruling. If we conduct an audit, and the audit has a disclaimer, but not specific findings how does that relate to the obligations that we have from an audit perspective.

Mr. Smith stated your ordinance requires that anybody that is receiving these funds must provide the County with an annual audit to show how the funds were being expended. In this instance, he does not know that this occurred. The County, through Cherry Bekaert, engaged them to do an audit, so there was not an independent audit given to us, pursuant to the ordinance, by the PDT. That is an issue, in terms of compliance, with the ordinance that required that.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if every time management is mentioned, throughout the document, they are referring to the PDT, or at any time are they referring to the County.

Ms. Cox stated, in the conduct of their audit, they are referring to the management of the legal entity of Richland PDT.

Mr. Jackson stated, in some instances, they refer to the PDT as the vendor, and other times PDT is referred to as the management.

Ms. Cox stated the legal entity PDT is a joint venture with 3 partners. Each of those entities has a partnership represented that is governed by their operating agreement. Those 3 partners also have contracts with the PDT, so they are vendors and partners of the PDT. When they say management, they mean management of the PDT, but sometimes those are the same people.

Mr. Jackson stated, when they were talking about the change orders, were they talking about the change orders from the County or change orders that were done internally, among the 3 groups.

Ms. Cox stated the change orders PDT executed with its subcontractors.

Mr. Jackson stated the question now is whether or not the PDT were allowed, or not allowed, to do change orders among their entities once they had been given the funds from the County.

Ms. Cox stated that is correct. The change orders they looked out were not between the County and the PDT. It was the change orders between PDT and its subcontractors.

Mr. Jackson inquired, in the auditor's opinion, once the authorized payments have been given to the PDT, if a change order internally, among their group, is the same as a change order they would be making to the County entity.

Ms. Cox stated what they saw was there were change orders with PDT and its subcontractors. Some of those subcontractors were related entities, and some of those subcontractors were not related entities. The process PDT followed, for executing change orders with its subs, was the same whether or not it was with PDT itself, and its members, or with outside members.

Mr. Jackson stated, for clarification, this audit was done in 2017.

Ms. Cox stated it was done for the time period of the 12-month period ending June 30, 2017. The audit began in 2018 and was completed in February 2019. The PDT's internal financial statements are maintained on a calendar year basis, so management had to put together July 1 – December 31,

2016 and then January 1, 2017 – June 30, 2017 documentation.

Mr. Jackson inquired if they reviewed the organizational chart to determine the separation of duties, as defined in the chart presented to the County, and where the County's management and oversight was in place.

Ms. Cox stated she is not sure if it was the same organizational chart that was presented to the County. In the documentation they reviewed, they looked at names, and what that representative was for the PDT, and the name of the company, and what that representative was for that company. That is where they noted overlap. Both in title and, at times, in name.

Mr. Jackson inquired if they looked at that, in terms of those authorized signatures for approval of contracts.

Ms. Cox stated they did look at approval in the same way. They looked at the Project Manager approval, Construction Engineer approval, as well as, the approval from the County side of authorizing those disbursements. They reviewed that based on the position, and the title, corresponding to whatever entity it said it was, to ensure that the appropriate person was signing those documents.

Ms. Dickerson stated one of her concerns is the change orders. She thought if there was a request for a change order that County Council should have approved those changes. She inquired if the change orders took place between the PDT, their legal team, and whoever was paying from the County. Those 3 entities were the ones that approved those change orders, without Council members being engaged or involved in the request for change.

Ms. Cox stated she does not know what the Council was to be involved in on those change orders that were done within the PDT.

Mr. Smith stated, his understanding is, that any change orders would need to be approved by the County. His recollection is that it does not necessarily specify where in the chain that approval process may need to take place. That may be based on the dollar amount, but from what he heard them say, is that these change orders were being approved by the partners themselves of the PDT, without any 3rd party overseeing that approval.

Ms. Cox stated the documentation she saw, when they were doing the audit, was a change order between PDT and PDT's subcontractors, some of which were related to PDT, some of which were not related, in accounting terms. Those were approved by PDT directly. There was no direct sign off on that documentation by anyone from the County. The signoff from the County came when the invoice was submitted to the County for payment. The supporting documentation, which included the change orders on the pay apps was included, and they did see signoff by the County, at that point.

Ms. Myers stated she asked earlier, when the pay request came to the County, was the change order attached, and the response was, "No." It was stated that what was there was an amount. For clarification, the pay app included an amount, but not a change order.

Ms. Cox stated, what she meant by the change orders were included was, every pay app has an original contract amount, change orders to date, and then a revised contract amount. So, when she says the change orders were included, the dollar amounts of the change order were included on the

pay app.

Ms. Myers stated the reason she is being pedantic about this is that it would mean, by the time that came, the change had been made and all that is happening is paying money.

Ms. Cox stated it is correct that the change order had already been executed.

Ms. Dickerson stated monies were being paid, without the Council seeing the request. It was done without our approval, and that is funds that were not a part of the original contract. In her opinion, that is a breach.

Ms. Cox stated that the not to exceeds were not exceeded, so it may be that it was within the thresholds and dollar amounts. She does not know at point, and at what time, it should have reached the County's procurement policy to come before Council. They were not looking at it at the Council level, but the PDT level.

Mr. Malinowski stated, based on the contract, if it states where funds should be placed until they are used for payments. According to the audit report, it says, the dollars were kept in not fully insured accounts. Secondly, it indicated they purchased certificates of deposit. The way he read the report, it stated, if any penalties were incurred because they had to cash them in, prior to the maturation of them, those penalties were handed along as a cost to do business. He is assuming the County is paying the cost. He does not know why they are putting taxpayer money into CDs anyway, and it was not the County's job. Thirdly, why was the PDT allowed to earn interest on taxpayer dollars. He inquired if the interest has been credited to the County, as a payment to them, or did they take it and include it in their profits by putting it in their own accounts. Lastly, this audit is dated February 4, 2019, and he wondered why we are getting it 3 months later.

Dr. Thompson stated he just received the report last week, or the week before. It is his understanding Cherry Bekaert provided the report to Mr. Gomeau, so obviously, as he departed, it did not get to you.

Ms. Myers stated the auditors, essentially, saw a contract that said, for an amount not to exceed \$1,000. Let's assume that, at some point, some work was done and that work was a \$500 amount. Then, there were change orders that would have been approved internally, not externally, that got up to \$1,000. We could have conceivably said there is \$500 left. Mr. Livingston what can you do? Mr. Jackson what can you do? And, then she will sign it, and we will submit the total payment for \$500, plus two \$250 change orders. She inquired if that is the finding that they are saying is concerning in the books reviewed.

Ms. Cox stated that characterized what they saw.

Ms. Myers stated it could be because there was work left, or it could be because there was money left. You make no assertion, as to which one, but it got up to the top number.

Ms. Cox stated she would not say that it got up to the top number. She would say it never went above the not to exceed.

Ms. Myers stated, on p. 24 of the contract, which deals with change orders, it states, "A Change Order is a written order to the Contractor signed by the County, issued after execution of the Contract, authorizing a change in the Services or an adjustment to the Contract Price or the

schedule for a Project. The Contract Price and the schedule for a Project may be changed only by an executed Change Order. A Change Order signed by the Contractor indicates its agreement herewith, including that the adjustment in the Contract Price or the schedule contained in the Change Order is sufficient to compensate the Contractor for all Claims that Contractor may have outstanding at the time the Change Order is signed by the Contractor.” She inquired, on the strength of Section 10, which deals with change orders, would it be correct to say that a change order, not signed by the County, is improper.

Mr. Smith stated, even if we were talking about a situation where it was authorized by the Council, the language here seems to indicate that a change order is only appropriate after it has been signed by someone from the County.

Ms. Myers inquired if we conflict pay apps and change orders sometimes.

Dr. Thompson stated the team he assembled, when he became Director last year, does not conflict the two.

Ms. Myers stated, on p. 23 of the PDT contract, it states, “When any payment is withheld pursuant to this Section, the grounds for such withholding shall be provided to the Contractor. When the grounds for nonpayment are removed, payment shall be made for amounts withheld because of them, within 30 Days after the last ground for nonpayment is removed, provided all other conditions precedent to payment have been satisfied.” Then, on p. 45 of the contract, it states, “If any inspection by County, or its representatives, of Contractor’s records, books, correspondence, instructions, drawings, receipts, vouchers, memoranda and any other data relating to the Contract Documents reveals an overcharge, County may deduct said overcharge from any payments due Contractor, or, if no funds remain due to Contractor, Contractor shall, within seven (7) calendar Days of receipt of such written demand for repayment, tender the amount of such overpayment to County or otherwise resolve the demand for repayment to County’s satisfaction.” Under that section, it seems to her, that the materiality of the dispute is resolved under the contract because it is within the County’s sole discretion. The County has the ultimate right to say whether or not an amount is due and owing, and to set off that amount, or demand payment for that amount.

Mr. Smith stated, in terms of the overpayment issue, and as it relates to the current dispute, he is not certain the dispute is an overpayment issue. He thinks it is a contract interpretation matter. We paid it and said we should not have paid it, but the terms under which we said it should not have been paid, related to the interpretation of the contract vs. their interpretation of the contract, as it relates to a specific exhibit (Exhibit F) and whether it applied or not. That particular exhibit applies under certain circumstances, which had occurred at that point.

Ms. Myers stated, let’s assume the term does not apply, who gets to resolve contractual disputes. In this contract there are 4 places where contract disputes are resolved by the County. Are we not invoking that anymore? If it is here, and the reason they are demanding payment is under the contract, but also under the contract it says, “once decided by the County, these disputes are final.” Why are we at the point where we cannot get an audit because we are going back and forth over whether or not \$1.5 million causes us not to be able to get a clean audit. There is some question in her mind about the magnitude of the dispute in the scheme of things, but also parties’ rights. She stated we have pretty clear rights here, so she does not understand how we get to where we are standing, 2 years behind the audit. She would like the Legal Department to further look into the contract to see if we should be spending taxpayer money defending a suit. It seems to her that we have the right not to. She inquired if this is the only audit Cherry Bekaert had conducted on the PDT

for the County.

Ms. Cox stated the audit for the 12-month period, ending June 30, 2018, is currently in process.

Ms. Myers stated, given that we are almost at the end of the contract period, it would make sense to her, pursuant to Section 5, that within the next 7 days we make a request to have a copy or originals of all books and records, so that we are at least protecting the County's ability going forward to have a record of pay apps.

Mr. Smith stated, in terms of us evaluating the audit, and the findings in the audit, and trying to marry that with the obligations under the contract. They are still in the process of doing that. They just got this information last week. He plans to bring to Council, at some point, my recommendations, as it relates to that, and how it impacts the ongoing litigation. In terms of the records, he forwarded a letter to the PDT's attorney approximately 2 weeks ago pointing out this specific section, as it relates to their obligation to maintain those records for that purpose. In addition, he sent a letter to Administration because they are in the process of determining what County assets will be brought back into the County, as it relates to the transition. In this particular letter, he pointed out this section and noted that one of the things we need to be looking at, is the books and records.

Ms. Myers inquired, in the auditor's experience, is this audit run of the mill or unusual.

Ms. Cox stated there are a couple of things that make it unusual. The audit engagement itself because we were engaged by the County, and not PDT. It is not the typical audit engagement. As far as issuing a disclaimer of opinion, she can think of one other time, in 23 years, that she has issued a disclaimer.

Ms. Newton stated there is a statement in the where it mentions the "inherent conflict of interest due to the lack of an outside party's involvement in the approval process". She stated she interpreted that to mean, if there is a partnership between "Acme Corporation", "Beta Corporation", and "Charlie Corporation" and they together form a business, and then they subcontract with a company that is owned by "Acme Corporation" and the partnership approved change orders that were essentially being provided by the partner subsidiaries.

Ms. Cox stated that is part of what was happening. Also what was happening, if Company "A", "B", and "C" came together for the joint venture, then some of those subcontractors were with Company "A", "B" and "C" directly. Then, one of the partnership representative would approve the change orders with the subcontractors.

Mr. Livingston stated normally management may get a chance to respond or give feedback on the audit. He inquired if an opportunity was afforded the PDT.

Ms. Cox stated they do not issue the audit report without management's approval of the audit report. They also provided drafts of the audit letters, which included the findings. The only response given was to issue the reports.

Mr. Walker inquired as to what led the auditors to use the language "conscious decision".

Ms. Cox stated that language is fairly common in many letters that she issues. Many times when you have relatively small organizations they will chose not to employ someone with sufficient financial

expertise in order to fully comply with GAAP and draft a full set of financial statements with disclosures because they have decided to spend their resources elsewhere. The conscious decision is typical in a cost benefit analysis.

Mr. Walker stated a lot of the questions that are being asked are not necessarily findings that is going to turn up in a financial audit. A lot of the contractual obligations (i.e. change orders, systems, operations and things that are going on within a program) are better explored by way of a compliance audit where you would send an auditor in to look at contractual terms, and understand if those contractual terms are being followed. Are we getting what we are paying for out there in the field? In the auditor's opinion, based on what we are looking at, and as we try to make determinations on how to be the best fiduciary for the taxpayers...He stated he sees issues, and he cannot un-see them. He wants to know how he runs these to ground and determine if this program is sustainable. What he does not want to do is get to the end of this program, and there is no more joint venture, what can we do to appropriately determine if we have a program on our hands that is in the best interest of the taxpayers.

Ms. Cox stated many of the questions that have been brought up are legal and contractual interpretation. She believes, at that particular juncture, a financial statement audit is not going to answer those questions. A compliance audit takes on a lot of different contexts. Generally, a compliance audit, in this particular circumstance, might look like a performance audit, which looks into the performance of the contractor, in conjunction with the terms of the contract.

Ms. Myers requested Ms. Cox elaborate on what a performance audit is.

Ms. Cox stated, when you say the words "compliance audit" you have to define what standards you are complying with. If you are talking about a particular contract, the more specific wording and language for compliance, with a particular contract, under professional standards, would be called a performance audit.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that would have been more appropriate, under these circumstances, to have asked for the performance audit.

Ms. Cox stated you could have requested the performance audit in addition to the financial audit. She stated, it was mentioned, the County has a requirement, in the contract, to maintain books and records in accordance with GAAP. The only way you can get that assurance is with an audit opinion.

Ms. Myers inquired, if a performance audit would quantify the value of the change orders that were approved by, and performed by essentially the same party.

Ms. Cox stated there is another set of audits called agreed upon procedures. The agreed upon procedures engagement, which follow the same standards that the financial statement audit would follow, is where you could go in and specifically define what you want to know. An agreed upon procedure engagement is an assurance engagement that you could lay out exactly what you want to know. A performance audit is going to be for the entire contract, which will involve a lot of legal interpretation.

Ms. Myers inquired if it would subsume agreed upon procedures.

Ms. Cox stated agreed upon procedures would give you the most specific direction as to what you are looking for.

Ms. Myers inquired if the agreed upon procedures audit is what the auditors would recommend.

Ms. Cox stated, based on the questions she heard tonight, an agreed upon procedures audit would give you very specific information.

Ms. Dickerson inquired, if we retained the services of an attorney, to be housed in the County Attorney's office, to assist the County specifically with this.

Mr. Smith stated they hired an attorney to assist us with various things related to the PDT. A lot of it initially had to do with FOIA requests that we were getting. During that process, we determined some things related to the contract itself, which led us into the litigation that we are currently engaged in. At that point and time, we were also being sue by DOR and the attorney came from DOR, so we felt her knowledge would assist us in that regard.

Ms. Dickerson inquired if the Legal Department will be able to get answers to some of Council's questions, and how would the answers be provided to the Council members.

Mr. Smith stated he thinks that some of the questions that were raised have been addressed. As he said earlier, they are still in the process of looking at the audit, the contract, and the current pending matter to determine how we need to proceed. The information will be brought back to Council.

Mr. Jackson inquired about the period of the audit.

Ms. Cox stated the audit was for the period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

Mr. Jackson inquired, for clarification, that nothing was included in the audit prior to 2016.

Ms. Cox responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson stated, based upon a decision by Council members that pre-date him and several of his colleagues, that whatever procedures were agreed upon, and whatever contract was agreed upon when this was created, is now left up to new members to figure out what they all agreed upon. The logic behind trying to now recreate, without information in writing, that is not available now would make your job a little difficult without concrete evidence. How do you approach that?

Ms. Cox stated she would not expect a different result than where we are today.

Ms. McBride stated she was struck by one of the auditor's answers regarding nepotism with the partners. She stated that is a procedural issue, and she does not know if that would be wrong or not because it was according to how the contract was written, and the procedures within that contract. She does not want anyone to think that something illegal was done with these contracts, and how the hiring took place. There is so much background information that we do not have, and how this whole process started. Fortunately, we are in a position where the contract will be coming to an end soon, and we can start anew with what we have left to do.

Ms. Myers stated that all of her questions are based on the existing contract. There is a document that guides everything they are supposed to be doing, and how we are supposed to pay them. She believes looking at whether or not the procedures, in the guiding document, were followed is critical.

Ms. Dickerson noted that the contract with the PDT has never been amended since its inception.

Mr. Walker stated he thinks action needs to be taken, as a result of this, and he would like to understand from a timing perspective, when we can expect Mr. Smith's recommendation.

Mr. Smith stated the timeline he envisioned was to allow the auditor to provide their report, and allow Council to ask questions, so that he could get a better idea of Council's concerns. He spoke with the auditors earlier and told them that he would be coming back to them to address the questions raised. They have agreed to have a telephone conference with the interested parties. He wants to make sure that when we look at this we do not lose sight of some other things that are going on that this report may impact.

Ms. McBride stated she believes all Council members want to understand what happened and how to proceed so they will not make the same mistakes.

Mr. Malinowski stated he heard conflicting things from Mr. Smith. Initially, he stated he was hoping to get something done by next Wednesday, but then at the end he requested the time to get it done. The next Council meeting will be June 4th, so he hopes we can get a report by then.

Mr. Smith stated Council will get a report by June 4th.

12. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming budget meetings.

a. **Upcoming Budget Meetings:** -- Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming budget meetings.

1. May 23 – 2nd Reading of Biennium Budget (FY20 and FY21), 6:00 PM, Council Chambers
2. May 30 – Budget Public Hearing (FY20)
3. June 6 – 3rd Reading of Biennium Budget (FY20)

Mr. Malinowski stated, due to circumstances we were advised about previously, the public hearing had to be backed up. Therefore, we had to back up the 3rd Reading of the Biennium Budget for FY20. Normally, when we need to change meetings Council members are asked to provide dates, and we were not on this one. He stated he conveyed to the Chair that he had plans to be out of town at that particular time. He inquired why a date was just chosen, without input from Council members, and if 3rd Reading could be moved to the next week.

Ms. Roberts stated, if she is not mistaken, at the last budget meeting, these dates were discussed and Council agreed on these dates.

Mr. Manning stated that is his memory as well.

Mr. Manning inquired as to when the meeting invite was forwarded to Council.

Ms. Roberts stated she believes the invite was sent on May 10th.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to reschedule 3rd Reading of Biennium Budget (FY20) to June 10th at 6:00 PM.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Jackson, Myers, Kennedy and Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: Myers,

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

- b. Public Works Week BBQ, May 22, 12:00 Noon, Public Works Complex, 400 Powell Road – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Public Works Week BBQ on May 22nd at Noon.
- c. Richland Soil and Water Conservation District’s “Conservation Cookout”, May 22, 6:00 PM, American Legion, 200 Pickens Street – Ms. Roberts reminded Council of the upcoming Richland Soil and Water Conservation District’s cookout on May 22nd at 6:00 PM.
- d. Committee Meetings – May 23 – Ms. Roberts reminded Council that the May committee meetings will be held on May 23rd due to the Memorial Day holiday.
 1. Development and Services Committee – 5:00 PM
 2. Administration and Finance Committee – 6:00 PM
- e. Community Relations Council’s 55th Anniversary Luncheon and Awards, June 12, 12:00 Noon, Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center, 1101 Lincoln Street – Ms. Roberts informed Council of the upcoming Community Relations Council’s Luncheon and Awards on June 12th at Noon.

13. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

- a. COMET Operating/Capital Budget – Mr. Andoh stated, under the SC Code of Laws, Chapter 25 for Regional Transportation Authority Law, the COMET is supposed to get approval of their operating and capital budget before the Board of Directors can adopt the budget. He presented a brief PowerPoint with an overall of the organization and the operating and capital budget.

Ms. Newton inquired, for clarification, that the current route lines have been in place for 127 years, and there is an opportunity to reevaluate the bus system to make sure that we are going the right places and structuring the route service the proper way. What does that process look like, in terms of making that determination, and when, if at all, might it have budget implications?

Mr. Andoh stated the project will be revenue neutral. They are going to engage the stakeholders, member agencies, passengers and people that have never ridden the COMET to give feedback. There will be extensive community workshops, so that people can assist design and reimagine the new system. They are also going to gather data on what people are doing with the transit system.

Mr. Malinowski requested that the Board member listing include the municipality they represent and whether or not they are voting members. He also inquired about the makeup of the \$15 million reflected in the budget.

Mr. Andoh stated it is a summary of the contractor fixed route, the contractor DART, the reserve for service enhancements, and the Federal expense transit operations. It is difficult to break it out

because of the way the contract is structured. They pay the contractor on a revenue vehicle service hour basis, and they break out how much goes to their administration, drivers, maintenance, and parts.

Mr. Andoh noted that he believes the system is going to be getting to a plateau with our present ridership, based on the current system design. The system is not attracting “choice” riders because it takes 3 hours to get from one point of the service area to another point of the service area, and that is not attractive. In order for us to change that trend, they need to either invest in other technology (i.e. Uber, Lyft, van pool program) or redesign it to make a system for all, and not just those that are transit dependent.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if there is not a new Penny, what will happen?

Mr. Andoh stated the short range transit plan is going to have a special chapter that talks about what the COMET system looks like without a sales tax, which would require significant service reductions. In addition, they plan to go back to the jurisdictions to see if the County and City would be willing to make a limited General Fund commitment. A lot of the systems, especially the systems he has managed in the past, generally go to the member agencies annually.

Mr. Jackson stated he would encourage Mr. Andoh to begin that. He stated he would support the efforts in trying to find an alternative way to subsidize and fund this effort.

Mr. Manning stated, stated for clarification, the Penny has been in existence for 7 years, and you are looking at the portion of that for Mass Transit to run out in 2028.

Mr. Andoh stated that is correct, and with the reserves they should be able to make it to 2029.

Mr. Manning stated, if he recalls, the Penny was going to be for 22 years or until the \$1.1 billion came in. Tracking those years is going to be important because it is easy to talk about having another vote for the Penny, but if this one has not run out that could put us in an interesting position because it would not be extending the Penny. It would be, for some period of time, adding another Penny until the other Penny quit.

Mr. Andoh stated that is why they are starting the education process early and making sure the community sees value in the transit system now. If we do not start now, we could have a situation like when the SCANA money ran out.

Mr. Malinowski stated, he thought, the COMET got the same amount each year, so they were guaranteed that amount for the 22 years.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if a survey had been done on the percentage of Richland residents that ride the transit system.

Mr. Andoh stated the last time a survey was done was 2009, at the request of County Council. He does not have those numbers, but can provide them to Council. He stated the study they are getting ready to undertake will do that.

Mr. Malinowski requested a copy of the proposed new routes.

Mr. Andoh stated they 9 months to a year away from doing that. His intent would be to have the consultants go to every member agency and seek feedback.

Ms. Dickerson stated this was a City bus. It was very different, and the routes were different. Since the Penny, the routes have had to be redesigned. Now we look at it as a regional transportation system, so the dynamics has changed significantly.

Mr. Andoh stated out of 41 routes, 12.19 routes operate in the unincorporated Richland County, which equates to 29.73% of their service; 22.75 routes operate in the City limits, which equates to 55.48% of their service.

Ms. McBride requested the location for the shelters.

Mr. Andoh stated there are approximately 65 shelters throughout the service area. There are also permitting an additional 40 shelters, and they have an engineer that is aggressively trying to survey all 1,430 bus stops to determine where we can best put bus shelters.

Ms. McBride inquired about the process for selecting shelter locations.

Mr. Andoh responded, public right-of-way access, ridership of at least 50 boardings or more a day, and trip generators (i.e. County Administration, hospitals).

- b. Lower Richland Sewer Agreement with the City of Columbia (Purchase Option) – This item was taken up in Executive Session.
- c. Administrator Search Update – This item was taken up in Executive Session

14. **OPEN/CLOSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. An Ordinance Authorizing, pursuant to Title 12, Chapter 44, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, the execution and delivery of a fee agreement between Richland County, South Carolina and Kemira Chemicals, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware concerning a new project; authorizing and providing with respect to an existing project for the conversion of an arrangement for fee-in-lieu of tax payments between Richland County and Kemira Chemicals, Inc., under Title 4, Chapter 12, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to an arrangement under Title 12, Chapter 44, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended; and matters relating thereto – No one signed up to speak.
- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County and Eastover Solar LLC, a company previously identified as Project ES, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain special source credits; and other related matters – No one signed up to speak.

15. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 19-012MA, Roger Winn, HI to GC (5.88 Acres), 8911 Farrow Road, TMS # R17200-03-06 [THIRD READING]

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve all of the items on the agenda, up to

Executive Session.

Mr. Malinowski made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to follow the agenda.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Jackson, Kennedy and Manning

The vote was in favor of the substitute motion.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve the consent item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. **THIRD READING ITEMS**

- a. An Ordinance Authorizing, pursuant to Title 12, Chapter 44, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, the execution and delivery of a fee agreement between Richland County, South Carolina and Kemira Chemicals, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware concerning a new project; authorizing and providing with respect to an existing project for the conversion of an arrangement for fee-in-lieu of tax payments between Richland County and Kemira Chemicals, Inc., under Title 4, Chapter 12, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to an arrangement under Title 12, Chapter 44, South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended; and matters relating thereto – Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County and Eastover Solar LLC, a company previously identified as Project ES, to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain special source credits; and other related matters – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Myers, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

17. **REPORT OF ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

- a. Total Rewards Implementation – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee forwarded the item to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Hanna stated the recommendation is to accept the study; endorse the County working toward becoming an Employer of Choice, which includes a Total Rewards focus, authorize the County Administrator and Director of Human Resources to follow-up with employees and departments on the findings in the employee engagement responses; and authorize the Director of Human Resources to work with the consultant on the multi-year plan. As it relates to funding, there are basically 3 points. One, was the 2% pay increase, which Council approved and implemented in January 2019. The 2nd step, as it relates to funding, they propose to approve the new pay grades, and bring employees up to the minimum of those pay grades. That equates to about \$1.4 million, and funding is available in the budget. The next step would be bringing employees up to a more competitive pay structure, based on the study. The cost of that is approximately \$10 million. Mr. Hayes said there would be \$1 million available in 2020 to begin implementation of this phase.

Ms. Newton stated part of the committee's recommendation was that HR was going to provide an implementation schedule. She inquired if that is something that is going to be developed, or is HR proposing that the \$10 million be approved in FY19.

Mr. Hanna stated, on p. 252 of the agenda, there is Phase I, Phase II, Phase III and Phase IV listed. In August 2019, they would implement the \$1.4 million, with the assistance of the Finance Department. The next phase would be the \$1 million investment in January 2020. The future phases would be subject to funding being approved by the Council in the budget in subsequent fiscal years.

Ms. Newton inquired, for clarification, if the proposal in the timeline that it all be completed by FY2021, or just that we begin disbursing funds to implement the plan in 2021.

Mr. Hanna stated it would be well received by employees if we could implement it in FY2021. Being realistic, he does not think that is going to be the case.

Ms. Myers stated she has been in favor of this since the beginning, but she has also been asking for a more detailed implementation timeline. She would like to know what the timelines and what amounts of money we are planning to inject into it at each of those dates. Secondly, she inquired, if the numbers, in the agenda packet on p. 166, will bring the Public Defender's Office up to parity with Solicitor's Office. She stated, if we have lawyers coming into the Solicitor's Office, and the Public Defender's Office on equally footing, then they should be paid equal money. We should not be paying more to prosecute people than to defend them. She inquired if the Total Rewards survey has come back and included the Legal Department and the County Attorney.

Mr. Hanna stated the Total Rewards study does include the Legal Department and the County Attorney, but he will have to get back with Ms. Myers regarding the Public Defender's Office.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, once the study is implemented, EMS, Detention Center, and all of the other frontline critical care employees will be up to parity with their counterparts.

Mr. Hanna stated once the study is completely implemented the answer to the question is "yes".

Ms. Myers stated the reason she has consistently requested a clear implementation schedule was so

Council could decide if they wanted to be more aggressive and phase it in earlier, or if they wanted to move money from other places and get it done. Without the information it is hard for her to advocate to get that, and talk with her colleagues to see if we can do it in a shorter period of time.

Mr. Hanna stated they need approximately \$11.4 million to completely implement the study. In talking with Mr. Hayes, as it relates to the current available budget, we have the \$1.4 million to bring the employees up to the minimum and another \$1 million that would be available in January 2020.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Hayes gave them a listing last week of a lot of different funds where there was money. If you would be a little bit more aggressive, there might be people on Council that would be willing to get the salaries where they need to be.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to defer this item to the June 4th Council meeting.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson and McBride

Opposed: Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy and Manning

The vote was in favor.

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

- a. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of an infrastructure credit agreement to provide for infrastructure credits to North Main Senior, LLC; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Mr. Jackson stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

Mr. Malinowski stated he does not recall that we usually approve credit agreements that is being located within a municipality.

Mr. Ruble stated, as you may recall in years past, affordable housing projects were not taxed. The Federal law changed requiring that the entities had to be for profit, in order to take advantage of Federal credits. In doing that, the Federal law put many of these developers in a quandary. If they became for profit to receive these credits, they also became obligated to pay County taxes, which made the deals undoable. They are trying to do a work around at the General Assembly, but they have not got that accomplished. In the meantime, they have come to us and said, "You were not getting these taxes in the past anymore. Would you be willing to do a tax credit, in order to help us achieve our goals?" And the response from the Economic Development Committee, was yes, we think affordable housing is important.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why they get 60 days to pay their administrative fees.

Mr. Ruble stated the question of administrative fees came up in the Economic Development Committee, and the committee asked for, received and reviewed the pro forma.

Ms. Terracio inquired if the project was already under construction.

Mr. Ruble stated he believes the groundbreaking is scheduled soon.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: Kennedy, Manning and McBride

The motion for reconsideration failed.

19. **REPORT OF THE RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE**

I. NOTIFICATION OF VACANCIES

- a. Accommodations Tax – Three (3) Vacancies (2 applicants must have a background in the lodging industry and 1 applicant must have a background in the cultural industry)
- b. Hospitality Tax – Three (3) Vacancies (2 applicants must be from the Restaurant Industry)
- c. Employee Grievance Committee – Six (6) Vacancies (Must be a Richland County employee; 2 seats are alternates)
- d. Board of Assessment Appeals – Three (3) Vacancies
- e. Board of Zoning Appeals – Four (4) Vacancies
- f. Building Codes Board of Appeals – Four (4) Vacancies (1 applicant must be from the Architecture Industry; 1 from the Gas Industry; 1 from the Building Industry; and 1 from the Fire Industry as alternates)
- g. Procurement Review Panel – Two (2) Vacancies (1 applicant must be from the public procurement arena and 1 applicant must be from the consumer industry)
- h. Planning Commission – Four (4) Vacancies
- i. Internal Audit Committee – Two (2) Vacancies (applicant with CPA preferred)
- j. Community Relations Council – Two (2) Vacancies
- k. Library Board – Four (4) Vacancies

- l. Township Auditorium Board – Two (2) Vacancies
- m. Richland Memorial Hospital Board – Two (2) Vacancies
- n. Midlands Workforce Development Board – One (1) Vacancy (Education seat; must represent education sector.
- o. Airport Commission – One (1) Vacancy

Ms. Newton stated the committee recommended to advertise for the vacancies.

In Favor: Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Terracio and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

20. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. FY19 – District 4 Hospitality Tax Allocations – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

Ms. Myers requested Ms. Dickerson amend the motion to include the H-Tax allocation requests for District 11 and District 10, which are on the “Additional Motions List”.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- b. FY19 – District 7 Hospitality Tax Allocations – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- c. FY19 – District 11 Hospitality Tax Allocations – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- d. FY19 – District 10 Hospitality Tax Allocations – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Walker

The motion for reconsideration failed.

- e. Design of Southeast Water System Expansion Project (Phase I) – Mr. Khan stated they are

requesting, at this point, is to allow us to utilize the available funding in the Southeast Wastewater Project, and do the Southeast Water Project design and engineering, in conjunction with the wastewater project. Several months back, we had a presentation regarding water accessibility and feasibility to several parts of Richland County. This is one of the areas that was recommended, and blessed during that meeting. If acceptable to you, they could do the design and engineering of 2 projects in the same corridor and save some costs.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to who came up with this idea originally, staff or Ms. Myers.

Mr. Khan stated it was a project that was identified by staff.

Mr. Malinowski stated under recommended action there is an amount of \$270,000. He inquired if that is the total cost, or will there be a request for additional funds.

Mr. Khan stated for the design and engineer of the project, as shown is the briefing document, that will be the total cost. If there are changes going forward, there will be a need for additional funding.

Ms. Myers stated this is not a pet project that she brought forward. This was the water project that we approved last year, but we did not approve the money to go with it. Because the engineering company is already out in the field doing the engineering for the Southeast wastewater, Mr. Khan suggested rather than sending them back out separately, to let them do both of them at the same time.

Mr. Khan stated we are saving as much as we are spending on this project.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we are appropriating funds from the 2020 budget.

Mr. Khan stated they have an existing contract that has an amount of \$270,000 available, which will not be utilized until Quarter 1 of 2020. In the near future, they will be bringing a CIP in front of you which will include the services for both of those projects. The design for both projects will be done at the same time. For construction engineering services there will be additional amounts needed, which will be presented to you as part of the CIP. If approved, they will go forward with the construction stage. Essentially, they are taking money out and reallocating it temporarily and will replenish it in the 2020 budget.

Ms. Myers stated the urgency of the request is that they are already out in the field doing the engineering now, and if we wait it will be \$400,000.

Mr. Hayes stated, for clarification, funds are currently in the CIP fund. Mr. Khan is saying they are going to reallocate funding that set aside totally for sewer, and use a portion of it for water. Then, when the budget is approved for FY20 to replenish those funds.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve staff's recommendation.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconsider this item.

Opposed: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The motion for reconsideration failed.

21. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Opposed: Manning

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote was in favor of going into Executive Session.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 10:00 PM and came out at approximately 10:56 PM

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson and Livingston

Present but Not Voting: McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- a. Lower Richland Sewer Agreement with the City of Columbia (Purchase Option) – Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to direct staff to proceed as discussed in Executive Session, and bring back information for the June 4th Council meeting.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Malinowski

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Administrator Search Update – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to begin discussion with the candidate regarding the negotiations for the contract.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Jackson, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

22. **MOTION PERIOD**

- a. Resolution Honoring John Bryant Lint for earning the rank of Eagle Scout on April 2, 2019
[MALINOWSKI] – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to adopt the resolution for John Bryant Lint.

In Favor: Terracio, Malinowski, Newton, Myers, Kennedy, Manning, Walker, Dickerson, Livingston and McBride

Present but Not Voting: Jackson

The vote in favor was unanimous.

23. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:58 PM.