



**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
FAIRFIELD COUNTY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 10, 2020**

Present: Moses Bell, Jimmy Ray Douglas, Mikel Trapp, Bertha Goins, Doug Pauley, Cornelius Robinson, Clarence Gilbert, Council Members; Jason Taylor, County Administrator; Laura Johnson, Interim Deputy County Administrator; Tommy Morgan, County Attorney; Patti L. Davis, Clerk to Council.

In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80 (e), as amended, the following persons and/or organizations have been notified of the time, date and location of this meeting: The Independent Voice of Blythewood and Fairfield, The Country Chronicle and one hundred forty one other individuals.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Robinson called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Council Member Douglas, seconded by Council Member Gilbert, to approve the Agenda. ***The motion carried unanimously 6-0. (Council Member Bell was not present in the room when the vote was taken.)***

3. INVOCATION

Council Member Douglas led the invocation.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Council Member Trapp, seconded by Vice Chair Goins, to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of January 27, 2020, and the Work Session minutes of January 29, 2020. ***The motion carried unanimously 6-0.***

5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

None.

6. 1ST PUBLIC COMMENT (3 MINUTES): INPUT MUST PERTAIN TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA, FOR WHICH NO PUBLIC HEARING IS REQUIRED OR HAS BEEN SCHEDULED. THE TOTAL TIME ALLOCATED TO THIS PUBLIC COMMENT SEGMENT IS 30 MINUTES.

Council Member Bell joined the meeting during the comments of the first speaker.

- Jackie Workman - Audit
- Jeff Schaffer - Business

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

8. ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND ORDERS

A. Third and Final Reading Ordinance No. 737: An Ordinance to Amend Ordinance No. 714 to Establish the Rules and Regulations Pertaining to Animal Control in Fairfield County and Revise Chapter 4, Animals, of the Code of Ordinances, Fairfield County, South Carolina. Motion made by Council Member Douglas, seconded by Vice Chair Goins, to approve Third and Final Reading of Ordinance No. 733. Council Member Bell wished to reiterate that the changes must be communicated to the public in order to notify them of the new provisions of the ordinance prior to being charged. He further inquired if the County could possibly purchase harnesses to be available for purchase at the animal shelter. Mr. Taylor believes this would be a reasonable request. Also, in reference to the new ordinance, the County will be working with the local news media and Facebook. Unless the situation is extremely egregious, the citizen would initially get a warning so we can start educating. The goal is to get animals treated more humanely, not to fill up the courts. Council Member Bell thanked Mr. Innes for all the hard work he put into this ordinance. Chairman Robinson asked for Mr. Innes to come to the podium to say a few words. Mr. Innes stated the goal is for Fairfield County to progress with the animal laws like most other places are doing. Everyone will be asked to follow the ordinance, and Animal Control will be available to assist them with this. ***The motion carried unanimously 7-0.*** Following the vote, pictures were taken with Council, Animal Control and Hoof & Paw. Chairman Robinson also had to leave the meeting at 6:12 p.m. due to an emergency.

B. Resolution 2020-02: A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Conveyance of Property by the Fairfield County Forfeited Land Commission to Fairfield County. Motion made by Council Member Douglas, seconded by Council Member Gilbert, to approve Resolution No. 2020-02. Council Member Bell stated he had sent a note to Mr. Taylor concerning the property on Qualls Road questioning the land value of the property. In March of 2019, Council Member Bell stated he began to ask questions concerning this property being in the

Forfeited Land Commission and how it would be disposed. He understands there have been properties in the Commission which have been collecting rent. This particular property is a lot of land with one building valued at \$15,000. By contrast, all of Mt. Zion is 47,050 square feet and is only valued at \$20,000. In speaking with the homeowner, Council Member Bell stated he did not want the County to own this land and asked if the Council is accepting all of the land at once. Per Mr. Taylor, every piece of property on the attached list is being accepted. Council Member Bell questioned the process of how property is evaluated. Per Mr. Taylor, this is an issue for the assessor rather than the Forfeited Land Trust or the issue that is before Council today. However, he has had a number of discussions with the assessor in the past where the assessment did not make sense. Per Council Member Bell, the land owner also questioned if the price has been increased so he could not purchase the property back. He also acknowledged that the landowner does have some responsibility to have it reassessed. However, Council Member Bell feels more work is needed before the County accepts the property. Chairman Robinson stated the Forfeited Land Commission is transferring the property to the County. Council Member Bell stated the Resolution states "A Resolution Approving and Accepting the Conveyance of Property by the Fairfield County Forfeited Land Commission of Fairfield County" and stated the Council has to approve it. He is asking Council not to approve this Resolution tonight. Per Mr. Taylor, the Forfeited Land Trust had not been run correctly for a long time. The Commission consists of the Treasurer, the Clerk of Court and the Auditor. The properties then fall into this status after not having taxes paid for a period. The property then comes into the ownership of the Forfeited Land Commission. There are properties on the list that our Community Development Director has reviewed. There are a larger list of properties, many of which the County would not be interested in, and the bulk of these will be auctioned off to hopefully get them back to a productive status. However, this list of properties may have value to the County for infrastructure such as a pump station for those strategically placed along water and sewer lines. There are some on the list that are part of the grant project with Zion Hill. Council Member Bell stated there used to be a list sent to certain individuals once property got to the Forfeited Land Commission. Certain individuals then had the opportunity to purchase property. He knows the process is being fixed, but further questioned what is happening to the property that has been acquiring rent. Per Mr. Taylor, there are a couple of the properties that have problems. The agent will make a

recommendation on those properties to the Forfeited Land Trust to clear this up. The Forfeited Land Commission is responsible for clearing this up, not Council. An ordinance passed by Council a while back gives preference for the first opportunity to buy the house to the person living in the house. Vice Chair Goins stated her understanding is the properties are turned over to the County but still going through a process of elimination as to whether they can or cannot be used. Council Member Bell then questioned if the individual could come back to the County to purchase the property in question. Per Mr. Taylor, this could occur if Council chose to do so. He is hoping some of these properties can be used for redevelopment. For instance, some of the properties on Zion Hill, once they are cleaned up, this will be a lot with water, sewer, roads, sidewalks, etc. The County has no interest in keeping residential lots, and instead, they need to be brought into a state where a developer would be interested in rebuilding. Right now, they are hard to market; however, they have water, sewer, roads and they are good lots. Chairman Robinson returned to the dais at 6:17 p.m. Council Member Bell made a motion to table this Resolution until a later time in order to review the list further. Motion seconded by Council Member Trapp. ***Motion to table failed 2-5 with Council Member Trapp and Council Member Bell voting aye.*** Chairman Robinson then called for the vote on the original motion. ***Motion to approve carried 5-2 with Council Member Bell and Council Member Trapp voting nay.***

9. BOARD AND COMMISSION MINUTES - Received as Information

A. Disabilities and Special Needs Board

10. BOARD AND COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

None.

11. OLD BUSINESS

None.

12. NEW BUSINESS

None.

13. COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

A. Midlands STEM Proposal for School Resource Officer (SRO). Administration and Finance Committee made no recommendation. Mr.

Taylor requested for Mrs. Prince to come to the podium. He further stated there was a Proviso put forth by the State to cover SRO officers; however, it only covers the salary and not the vehicle and equipment. Mrs. Prince stated she is the new Executive Director and Principal at Midlands STEM. The school is now part of the Erskine Charter School District, and under this district, there was a grant proposal wherein two school would receive funding for an SRO. Mrs. Prince completed the application, and Midlands STEM was awarded one of the grants. The grant covers the salary and benefit cost for the SRO. Therefore, the request was made to the County for the remainder to cover the vehicle, equipment and any other needed items. Council Member Douglas inquired how long the grant will last. Mrs. Prince is not sure, but she believes it will be ongoing. She does not know beyond this school year and next school year. Per Mr. Taylor, Provisos can be renewed yearly or dropped and is not a guarantee. Mrs. Prince stated that Midlands STEM is a public charter school, which means they do not have tuition. Currently, they have around 170 students and most come from Fairfield County. Grades are covered from kindergarten through 10th grade, and grades 11 and 12 will be added in the next two years, along with K4. They are presently housed at Rockton Baptist Church, but there are plans to eventually build within the next couple of years. There have been two lockdowns this school year, and they could really use the assistance of an SRO. They are also the only public school in Fairfield County that does not have an SRO. Per Mr. Taylor, the County's portion of the request would be \$60,273.63. Motion made by Council Member Trapp, seconded by Council Member Gilbert, to approve the request as stated. Council Member Bell received an email from Mr. Thomas, and used cars were bought for the School District. If this is done for this request, the amount would be lower than stated. Council Member Bell also inquired what equipment is needed. This would include the uniform, the gun, walkie-talkie, etc. Per Mr. Taylor, the breakdown is as follows:

Uniform	\$ 5,800
Car	28,136
Graphics	295
800 radio	5,400
Walkie-Talkie	4,600
Uniforms	200
Laptop	1,955
Cell phone	480

Council Member Bell stated the same should be done as for the School District with purchasing a used car. Chairman Robinson agrees with this. He also inquired of Sheriff Montgomery concerning how long it would take to get the position filled as he would ideally like to bring this back during budget season. Council Member Douglas stated he was for waiting until budget season; however, they would lose the grant. Mrs. Prince agreed with this statement. Council Member Bell and Council Member Gilbert agreed it should move forward. Chairman Robinson requested for Mrs. Johnson to break down the numbers. Per Mrs. Johnson, this was passed by the S.C. General Assembly to appropriate over \$11M to the Department of Education for fiscal year 19-20, and is part of Proviso 1.86 to support SRO officers in school that do not have this. According to the Proviso, it is for fiscal year 19-20, and more than likely, there will be the same Proviso. They carry from fiscal year to fiscal year. Mrs. Johnson cannot be certain it will carry past this. Council Member Bell stated if this request is approved, the equipment could be transferred to the Sheriff's Department, so the Council would not lose anything. Chairman Robinson stated a position would be added that would have to be funded. Council Member Pauley stated there is no guarantee this will be received from year to year. He inquired if an application will need to be done from year to year. Per Mrs. Prince, once accepted for the grant, then they are accepted for the grant and will not need to reapply. Vice Chair Goins stated she believes the question is whether there is a particular time-frame for this decision, whether it needs to be done now or will there be time to take this up during the budget process. She does understand the need and safety concern. Mrs. Johnson inquired of Mrs. Prince if she received the same letter as the School District giving a deadline. Per Mrs. Prince, if they wait until budget season, the school would not get the grant. Council Member Douglas inquired of the deadline. Mrs. Johnson knows the Sheriff's deadline but cannot state to Mrs. Prince's deadline, and Mrs. Prince could not recall. She knows it is coming up soon and has received emails concerning this. Chairman Robinson stated if this is approved tonight and no officer is found until later, how would this work going forward. Per Mrs. Johnson, the State would have to be contacted for this question. On the last allocation, the full amount was received within a couple of weeks for the officer. Council Member Douglas inquired if it could be voted on tonight and be contingent upon the information that is needed. Council Member Bell made a motion to amend the original motion to accept the proposal except for the purchase of a used vehicle and contingent upon the deadline. Council Member Gilbert seconded the amendment to the

motion. Per Mr. Morgan, the questions are when is the deadline and use of funds for a used vehicle instead of a new vehicle. Council Member Pauley inquired if the officer has to be in the school by a certain time to receive the grant. Per Mrs. Prince, it just has to be approved and the County is in the process of hiring. **Motion passed 6-1 with Council Member Pauley voting nay.**

- B.** Presentation of FY 2018-2019 Audit - Brian D'Amico, Elliott Davis. Mr. Taylor introduced Mr. D'Amico, who thanked Council for the opportunity to present tonight. Per Mr. D'Amico, the presentation will be a high level overview of the audit process and the results. First, he will explain the County's responsibility to prepare the financials and the firm's ultimate responsibility. The County's responsibility is to maintain effective internal controls over financial reporting and compliance and ensure the financial statements are accurately prepared. The County owns this document, and the auditor comes in behind them to audit the numbers. The auditor's responsibility is to obtain reasonable evidence that the financial statements are free from material misstatement. Every single transaction is not looked at. There are certain risk assessments performed with energy being spent on the riskier areas. For the 2019 year, Elliott Davis has issued the highest level of assurance that can be provided, which is an unmodified opinion.

- General Fund/Fund Balance: The total fund balance increased \$507,000 to over \$22M. Unassigned fund balance decreased \$3.2M to \$10M. In 2018 and 2019, approximately \$4M was carved out and committed for the hospital transaction, and another \$4M was assigned for the Mt. Zion project. This was done to help facilitate the transaction. So, unassigned fund balance has decreased, but it is still 33% of actual expenditures and 32% of budgeted expenditures. The County has approximately 4.0 months of available spending with the GFOA recommendation being 2.0 months. The County should strive for six months, but four months is very strong.
- General Fund Revenues: Increased approximately \$2.7M, which is 9% from the prior year. The categories that increased were taxes of \$1.6M and investment income of \$863,000.
- General Fund Expenses: Increased approximately \$1.9M up to \$30M, which is a 7% increase; however, they were still under budget by \$1.2M. General government increased \$717,000 and capital outlay increase of \$660,000.

- Other Funds: Fairfield Facilities Corporation has a remaining restricted fund balance of \$4.3M. It spent \$1.4M.
- All other County funds are lumped into and combined into the non major government funds category. Fund balance is equally divided between restricted funds of \$2.5M (health and welfare and debt service) and committed fund balance of \$2.8M (public works and capital outlay).
- Other disclosures: Capital assets - The County has net of \$62.6M, capital outlay spending of \$7.3M and depreciation of \$3.2M. The general fund had about \$660,000 with the rest of it being spent mainly in the Fairfield Facilities Corporation and non major capital projects. The long-term liabilities include general obligation bonds of just over \$4M and a \$599,000 issuance during the current year; revenue bonds net discounts of \$24.2M; accrued compensated absences of \$760,000; net pension liability, part of the State Retirement System and the Police Officer's Retirement System, of \$25.9M, an increase of \$667,000; and the OPEB liability, with the County changing its actuary, of \$9.1M, increase of \$4.2M. Council Member Bell questioned the reason for the increase in the net pension liability. Per Mr. D'Amico, this balance is the combination of the County's portion of the State Retirement System (SCRS) and the Police Officer's system. The balance is estimated at the State level by an actuary and then pushed down pro rata the amount of contributions the County puts in to all the other participants in the plan. Council Member Bell further questioned if this would be based on number of employees or salary. Mr. D'Amico stated this is really the number of people retiring and getting closer to retirement. The OPEB liability is something the County can manage. These are benefits the County determines for their employees. The Council has no control over whether it offers benefits or not or how to change the benefits. This has to be done at the State house. The State did provide a 1% credit for the net pension liability to help employers pay down the future commitment.
- Compliance Reporting: One document is required under government auditing standards. This is based on testing of the internal controls over financial reporting and compliance with laws and regulations. An opinion is not given regarding the County's internal controls, but if findings and deficiencies are identified, the auditor is required to report, if they reach a certain significance level. This year, two deficiencies were

identified which are categorized as significant deficiencies. This is not the highest level of finding, but it is in the middle tier. The two items include one in procurement and one in HR-payroll changes. Both were felt to meet the significant threshold to include in the audit document. Council Member Trapp inquired what the two items were. Per Mr. D'Amico, these are detailed in the back of the report. A random sample was carved out and specifically looked at capital additions. One of these findings included a vehicle purchase that was over the \$25,000 threshold and was not approved by members of Council. This has been discussed in Council, and the audit firm has reviewed these minutes. Council Member Trapp inquired which vehicle was in question, and Mr. D'Amico stated it was the vehicle for administration. He does not know the specific details of the vehicle. Council Member Bell referred to page 84, "the County office of Procurement issued a purchase order without obtaining the proper level of approval as outlined in the Procurement Manual". He feels it is amazing this finding would be stated in this way when he has documents showing the County Administrator authorized the truck purchase. Council Member Bell's question now is why the auditor stated the County Office of Procurement issued a purchase order as he is amazed the blame goes to the Procurement Director when it was authorized by the administrator. Per Mr. D'Amico, their interpretation of the Procurement Manual, and this is not just for Fairfield County, there is a Procurement Manual and a Procurement Office, and that office is headed up by a Procurement Director. It is their responsibility, their day-to-day duties for the County, to abide by the Procurement Manual. He understands the approval is documented, but the approval in the auditor's eyes is not the approval that is required per the Procurement Manual. This finding addresses the fact that County Council has approved certain thresholds that give certain people authority. The Council wants any purchase that is not budgeted to come before County Council for approval. That did not happen, and this is how it was deemed a finding. Council Member Bell stated again that we are assigning blame in this document to the Procurement Director of the Procurement Office when it was authorized by the County Administrator. Mr. D'Amico realizes the County Administrator should not have authorized that purchase, but the finding is that the Procurement Manual and the threshold were not followed. Council Member Gilbert stated

he believes a term is being misused, in that the Procurement Manual is a guideline. Mr. D'Amico stated this is what the Council wants the employees to follow to ensure that the County is protected. Council Member Gilbert further stated it has not been changed to consider it as a manual, it says guideline. Council Member Bell stated the facts are correct, but it is how the blame was assigned he feels is wrong. Council Member Bell further stated there were purchases in connection with the Farmers' Market with violations, and this is documented. Mr. D'Amico stated his professional opinion is that the Council hires an administrator, and you don't want that administrator to have to approve or follow up on every single purchase that is made by the County. Vice Chair Goins stated her understanding is that these are recommendations. There was a finding and a recommendation for future correction, but there is no blame being placed, and Mr. D'Amico agrees. Council Member Bell further stated cause is listed in the report, which means the blame. In Mr. D'Amico's opinion, where cause is described, it is the breakdown in the internal control. The threshold is established that puts in place a proactive control to make sure employees don't make purchases without certain levels of approval. The Procurement office is in charge of making sure that those approvals happen. The administrator is at fault for approving it at the same time as the purchase order was issued. Council Member Bell stated there are other things that did not go through procurement, but the auditor had said those were not tested. Mr. D'Amico stated because the 25 threshold was obviously an important cut-off because they had to come to County Council, any individual transaction over \$25,000 was looked into. Discussion ensued concerning if the procurement rules are a manual or a guideline. Per Mr. D'Amico, the manual has good guidelines on what should happen. If the guidelines were really off and granted approval to people who should not have this authority, the auditors would come before Council and have a finding that even though the manual or guidelines are being followed, and he would use these terms interchangeably, there is a breakdown in internal controls because those guidelines are not strong enough. He feels they are strong enough, they just have to be enforced and followed. Council Member Pauley inquired if it would be possible for the County to work with Elliott Davis on a new recommended Procurement Policy. Mr. D'Amico stated they

would be happy to assist the County with this. Council Member Bell inquired if there is a need to do this. Per Mr. D'Amico, there are some inconsistencies within the document and some contradictory language and confusion, so they would like the opportunity to point some of these out. The document is materially good, but it could be fine-tuned. Chairman Robinson stated this has been discussed in the past, and he agrees this needs to be done. Council Member Trapp inquired, to be clear, that the finding was the Procurement Director at the time, Mrs. Sheila Pickett, purchased a vehicle on her own without any kind of approval. Per Mr. D'Amico, this is not what the finding is saying. The Procurement Office issued a purchase order so the County could purchase the vehicle. There were levels of approval, but it did not meet the level the manual stated. Council Member Trapp inquired concerning the levels of approval. Mr. D'Amico stated anything over \$25,000 had to be approved by Council, and Council did not approve it. Again, Council Member Trapp inquired if the report is stating that the Procurement Director at the time, Mrs. Sheila Pickett, purchased the vehicle without approval from County Council. Per Mr. D'Amico, this is correct. Chairman Robinson stated he nor the County is taking this stance. Council Member Bell stated again that Elliott Davis is not saying anything about the person who approved it. Mr. D'Amico stated their finding is that it did not get the proper approval. Mr. D'Amico stated the other finding was in pay changes and was deemed a significant deficiency. Research was done on those who received a raise over a certain threshold. Out of these, the firm got 22 forms. There were two particular pay changes that did not have any forms to review. It was noted as part of the 22 forms that there were seven different types of forms that were used. Therefore, they knew there was not a consistent form that was being used across all County departments. Each of these seven different forms had different levels of approval, with some only requiring one level of approval and some requiring three levels of approval. Council Member Bell read from the report stating "effective July 2019, the Human Resource Director reports to the County Administrator. The wage changes have been changed to require consistent approvals." He further questioned if July 1, 2019, is included in this audit. Mr. D'Amico stated no. This statement was management's response to the finding. In addition to the inconsistent forms, it was noted that 12 out of the 22 forms

lacked any explanation or the reason for the change. In three of the forms, the prior rate of the individual was not included. The person approving had no way of knowing what the change really was because the prior amount was not listed on the form. Council Member Bell inquired how this was found, and Mr. D'Amico stated payroll testing is done every year. Once one was identified, the sample was expanded. On two of the 22 forms, it was noted only one person approved the pay rate change. There are several things wrong, and the auditors want to see a consistent form being used and make sure there is at least 2-3 levels of approval. Council Member Bell asked if there was room on the form itself for additional signatures. Per Mr. D'Amico, there was only one listed approver on the form. Council Member Bell then stated the person who approved it was following the guidelines. Mr. D'Amico stated this finding is not to say the individual didn't merit the increase, but to say they think it's a lack of internal control. Further, Mr. Bell opined there was a breakdown in the system versus the person who provided the approval, and Mr. D'Amico agreed. The firm think there needs to definitely be more than one level of approval, hold all departments and employees to a consistent standard, include the current pay rate on the request form and, obviously, based on the position or department, have the proper people approving this before HR and payroll process the change. Council Member Pauley inquired if these deficiencies happened prior to July 2019, and Mr. D'Amico stated yes. The single audit also tested the WIOA cluster. This particular grant was the only major fund this year. No findings related to compliance were found, and an unmodified opinion was issued.

- Summary: An unmodified opinion was issued on the financial statements as a whole and also an unmodified opinion on compliance over major federal programs. Overall, the County, as demonstrated in the finance highlight slides, is in good financial condition as of June 30, 2019. The two findings have been discussed, and no findings were reported related to grants. Mr. D'Amico stated the firm appreciates the opportunity to work with the County, and the finance department and the treasurer's office were extremely helpful during this process. Council Member Bell stated he realizes everything cannot be tested, but as some are tested and cause and effect are listed, he did not see this happening in the report. Of course, this is his assessment. Also, how the conclusions were drawn,

especially on one item, is suspect. It appears to Council Member Bell that more items should have been tested in this category. Vice Chair Goins stated she understands this work is difficult, and she appreciates their time. Also, she believes the final basic purpose of the audit is to bring to the attention of the business what is lacking and how they can improve the process. She thanked Mr. D'Amico for bringing these issues to the Council's attention and for accepting that they will work with us to help improve the manual or guideline in order to move forward. Mr. D'Amico stated going into the next year, there should be an open line of communication. In this particular situation, the firm went through the minutes to identify some of the issues. However, next year he is offering to have a direct line of communication with Council. If you feel there is a risky area, please let him know, and this will be incorporated as part of the procedures.

C. Ty Davenport, Economic Development Director: Year-End Economic Development Summary. Mr. Taylor stated this update had been planned for a previous meeting, but this did not work out. This is a list of the successes the County had last year. Per Mr. Davenport, Economic Development can be broken down into four parts: Education, New/Existing, Infrastructure and Product Development.

- **Education:** Mr. Davenport feels the County has made real progress in this area. The Promise Program and the program that allows the kids to study concurrently for their Associate's Degree while in high school are two fantastic Economic Development tools that prospects like to hear about. These are always a part of the presentation. Other notable items: Chanda Jefferson, 2020 Teacher of the Year and 13 career programs offered at Fairfield Career and Technology Center. Midlands Tech is also a real asset to this process.
- **New/Existing Industries:** The Economic Development Department continues to work with the economic development alliances that market the County, which includes Central SC, I-77 Alliance and the South Carolina Department of Commerce. The Department is deeply involved in the process of helping to make recommendations to upgrade infrastructure and planning for the future. The department is also involved in developing new sites and looking forward to new spec buildings.
- **New Announcements:**

- Mekra Lang: This business is a manufacturer of side-view mirrors for trucks. They are creating 15 new jobs and investing \$7M with their recent expansion. The Council toured the facility recently, and it is very impressive. The company has a lot of technology involved with this process.
- MLILY: This is the biggest investment in the County since Mack Truck, \$48M investment with creation of upwards of 250 new jobs. The facility is amazing.
- Pharmacy-Lite Packaging: This is located in the old Wal-Mart building. This new plastic injection molding company will create 33 new jobs with an investment of more than \$3M. The company makes pill bottles.
- Sea Pro: This business should be operational in June, including 135 new jobs with a \$3M investment in equipment, not including the building and up-fit costs. MLILY, Pharmacy-Lite and Sea Pro are in close proximity to the Town, and hopefully, this will help the Town grow, and the merchants in the downtown area will benefit.
- QuaLex Manufacturing, LC: This business is out of the Walter Brown Industrial Park. They have about 60 employees with an investment of \$2M in equipment that does not include the building up-fit. They supply train manufacturing. They are hoping to find other customers, and as they do this, they will add more employees. They are happy in the area and had a good experience hiring people.

To sum up the investment and what it means to the County, revenue over the next 5 years is just under \$2M. Typically, the bulk of the tax break comes in the first 5 years, so after 5 years, the taxes and fees will actually increase.

- Unemployment Rate: In 2010, the rate was about 10% and got up to 14%. Currently, this is now down to 3.1%.
- From 2010 to 2016, there was \$28.2M invested in the County and 420 jobs created. Over the last 14 months (comparing 14 months to 6 or 7 years), we have \$62.9M of new investment and 493 jobs. The future looks bright, and there are several prospects looking at the County currently. We also celebrate the existing industry: Isola, BOMAG, Element, Breakthru Beverage, Dominion Energy, Midlands Technical College,

Carolina Technical Fabrics, Pro Pallet and Palmetto Imaging Technology. Even though we have had the success of \$63M and almost 500 jobs, the County infrastructure is being stressed, and it's time to expand. We all know additional wastewater capacity is needed, but it is needed for several reasons, including new industry and housing. The County only has one vacant industrial building left, and this is getting significant interest. Mr. Davenport stated six months from now talks will begin concerning building another spec building. Presently, properties are being looked at that would make sense for the County to grow. Also, the County is looking into doing some pre grading for industry. This would make it easier for the business to move forward. The County has property in Dominion territory and would like to have property in the Coop territory. Mr. Davenport stating everyone can follow the department on Facebook and Twitter. Again, the County is in great shape from the job standpoint. There are still residents who work out of the County, but hopefully as new businesses come into the County, those residents will be able to work locally, shop locally and be able to spend more time with their family. Council Member Bell stated nothing he says is for anyone to take personally, as it is only how he feels and believes. He appreciates the work Mr. Davenport is doing along with Mr. Taylor in bringing industry to the County. Vice Chair Goins also thanked Mr. Davenport and Mr. Taylor and all who support the team. In addition, she thanked the industry, because without their interest, input and sacrifices, these opportunities would not be available to us. Mr. Davenport closed with saying the presentation will be available on Facebook.

Council Member Douglas left the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

14. CLERK TO COUNCIL'S REPORT

None.

15. COUNTY COUNCIL TIME

Trapp: Council Member Trapp wished to congratulate Jenkinsville Water Company for winning an award at the National Conference, #2 out of 37 entries, for the second best tasting water in the nation.

16. EXECUTIVE SESSION (SUBSEQUENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION, COUNCIL MAY TAKE ACTION ON MATTERS DISCUSSED IN EXECUTIVE SESSION).

At 7:33 p.m., motion made by Council Member Trapp, seconded by Council Member Gilbert, to go into executive session **(a) to Receive Legal Advice and Discussion of Negotiations Concerning Proposed contract for Purchase of Property Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 30-4-70(a)(2). Motion carried 6-0.**

At 7:45 p.m., motion made by Council Member Gilbert, seconded by Council Member Trapp, to come out of executive session and return to open session. **Motion carried 6-0.** Chairman Robinson reported no action was taken in executive session.

17. ADJOURN

At 7:49 p.m., it was moved by Council Member Trapp and seconded by Vice Chair Goins to adjourn. **The motion carried 6-0.**



PATTI L. DAVIS
CLERK TO COUNCIL



CORNELIUS ROBINSON
CHAIRMAN