



# **Transportation Penny Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Monday, May 23, 2016 at 5:30 PM**

**4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**2020 Hampton Street, Columbia SC 29202**

## **Agenda**

- 1. Call to Order:** Hayes Mizell, Chairman
- 2. Citizen's Input**

### **Information Items**

- 3. Update on Council Actions [Pages 3-7]**
- 4. Audit Updates**
- 5. The Comet:** Program update
- 6. PDT:** Program update, questions and answers
- 7. Small Local Business Enterprise Program:** Program update [Pages 8-25]
- 8. April 2016 Progress Report:** Questions and answers
- 9. Status of Kososki Motions of April 25, 2016**
  - a) Motion #1 [Page 26]
  - b) Motion #2 [Pages 27-33]
- 10. Status of Mizell Motions of April 25, 2016**
  - a) Motion #1 [Pages 34-38]
  - b) Motion #2 [Pages 39-47]

## **Action Items**

**11.Approval of Minutes:** April 25, 2016: [Pages 48 – 51]

**12.TPAC Staff Position:** Position Description

**13.Other Business**

**14.Adjourn**

**15.Next Scheduled Meeting: June 27, 2016 – 2020 Hampton Street**



### **3. Update on Council Actions**

#### **a. Atlas Road Widening Project- Norfolk Southern R.R. agreement**

Background: This was agreement with Norfolk Southern R.R. for \$35,000 to review County plans to widen Atlas Road with Richland Penny funding.

Action Taken: Council approved this agreement.

#### **b. Atlas Road Widening Project- CSXT R.R. agreement**

Background: This was an agreement with CSX R.R. for \$31,097 to review County plans to widen Atlas Road with Richland Penny funding.

Action Taken: Council approved this agreement.

#### **c. Bluff Road Widening Project – Tri-party R.R. agreement**

Background: This was a tri-party agreement with SCDOT and CSX R.R. to widen Bluff Road with Richland Penny funding. It allows the County to construct the project, and SCDOT to continue to maintain the drainage. It designates \$36,220 for CSX R.R. to review and inspection of a 36" pipe to be jack and bored within their right of way.

Action Taken: Council approved this agreement.

#### **d. Three Rivers Greenway Project- IGA with the City of Columbia**

Background: This was an agreement with The City of Columbia for the Three Rivers Greenway Project which states the County will construct the project, and the City will operate and maintain it.

Action Taken: Council approved this agreement.



**e. Pineview Road Widening Project- Executive Summary and Proposed Typical Sections**

Background: The PDT provided an executive summary from the concept report for the Pineview Road Widening Project. This report developed the alternatives presented to the public at a recent public information meeting, and included a proposed five lane section from Garners Ferry Road to Shop Road, and a proposed three lane section from Shop Road down to Bluff Road. The executive summary recommended alternate 1 as the typical section to be developed and constructed. In addition, it recommends eliminating the continuous two way center turn lane from the segment from Shop Road to Bluff Road due to flat traffic projections. Instead this segment would be resurfaced, and have sidewalks and bikeways constructed.

Action Taken: Council approved this executive summary and concept report.

**f. Shop Road Widening Project- Executive Summary and Proposed Typical Sections**

Background: The PDT provided an executive summary from the concept report for the Shop Road Widening Project. This report developed the alternatives presented to the public at a recent public information meeting, and included four alternates for review and comment. The executive summary recommended alternate 1 as the typical section to be developed and constructed.

Action Taken: Council approved this executive summary and concept report.

**g. Shop Road Extension Phase I Project- Contract modification with CDM Smith**

Background: This was a contract modification for \$73,577.13 with CDM Smith for the Shop Road Extension Phase I Project. It was for additional design work required by SCDOT to complete the construction plans. Without this work the County would have had to design a new bridge at an additional cost of roughly \$600,000 and would delay the project by over a year.

Action Taken: Council approved this contract modification.



**h. Time sensitive projects due to federal funding- North Main Street Widening Project**

Background: This project has \$10 million in federal TIGER grant funding which directs the project to be bid in June, and awarded in September of this year. In addition to the TIGER funding it includes an additional \$1.2 million in federal earmarks, \$30 million in Richland Penny funding, and \$3.8 million in City funding for water/sewer relocations. If the project is not bid and awarded the TIGER funding would be lost.

Staff recommended bidding the project on schedule with the hope that any hold on future funding would be resolved prior to the deadline for award which is September. The County could no-award the contract in September should the future quarterly disbursements of collections remain in flux.

In addition, there are several other projects that will be ready for bidding for construction in the next six months in jeopardy due to the threat of discontinuing quarterly disbursement of collections which are: Resurfacing Package H (20 miles of County roads), Bluff Road Widening Phase I, Shop Road Extension Phase I, and Hardscrabble Road Widening.

Action Taken: Council approved for staff to advertise North Main Street Widening Project as proposed.

**i. Mill Creek Mitigation Bank**

Background: On April 18<sup>th</sup> the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) approved the Mill Creek Mitigation Banking Instrument. This bank was approved for development by Council back in late 2013, was wholly funded by the Richland Penny Program, and its purpose is to provide mitigation credits to construct Richland Penny Projects that impact wetlands and streams. This was discussed during the last retreat, and there are excess mitigation credits that may be sold to prospective buyers which include SCDOT for some of their major projects in the midlands.

Staff has directed prospective credit buyers to place any such request in writing to include: a project description, type of credits needed (stream / wetland), schedule for credit purchase, and the USACE permit number to corroborate the request. Staff would then ascertain what excess credits are available for sale to ensure any sales would not interfere with Richland Penny project schedules, set a price, and then bring a recommendation back to Council for credit sale on a case by case basis. Proceeds from sales would be returned to the Richland Penny Program.



Action Taken: This was received as information only with no necessary action at this time.

**j. Resurfacing Projects**

Background: Last Spring Council approved the Pavement Management Study along with a two-year resurfacing list which included 37 miles of County roads with approximately \$11.0 million in funding. In recent months staff has identified an additional \$1.4 million in CTC funding that was approved for resurfacing of County roads. Based on this additional funding, and recent projections staff believes there may be \$1.5 million in funding for unassigned resurfacing projects. Transportation staff recommended coordination with the Public Works Department to identify segments of roads in poor condition not already included in the two-year list to be resurfaced with this additional funding. In addition, the recommendation was to use this funding to resurface sections with logical termini, but in some cases not an entire road if only a section is in poor condition. Staff would bring a list to full Council for ultimate approval of these projects prior to advertisement for construction bidding.

Action Taken: This was received as information only with no necessary action at this time.

**k. TPAC: Role and responsibility**

Background: On March 22<sup>nd</sup> Council held a work session to study the existing duties TPAC has, and discuss whether to make any changes to those duties. It was also discussed during the May 9<sup>th</sup> Transportation Ad Hoc Committee Meeting, and the Committee directed the Administrator to provide Council with a position description for a new employee position to staff TPAC.

Action Taken: This item was on the May 17<sup>th</sup> Council agenda, and before TPAC for discussion.

**l. Motion by Mr. Jackson**

Background: Included in the April 19<sup>th</sup> Council agenda was the following motion from Councilman Jackson: "I move that in order to promote fairness in the Penny Tax program that Richland County approve another On-Call team in an attempt to promote diversity and be true to the referendum."



Action Taken: No action was taken on this motion.



# TRANSPORTATION PENNY ADVISORY COMMITTEE UPDATE

May 19, 2016





**OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY TPAC UPDATE**

April 25, 2016 – May 23, 2016

**1. SLBE Certification Program Overview**

A) SLBE Firms by Industry Category

Primary Industry Category	Total Firms	Percentage
Construction Services	42	48.28%
Professional Services	26	29.89%
Non-Professional Services	3	3.45%
Engineering Services	10	11.49%
Architectural Services	5	5.75%
Wholesale Operations	1	1.15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	

B) Gender & Ethnicity of SLBE Firms

Ethnicity	SLBE Firms
African American	56 (64.37%)
Asian	2 (2.30%)
Caucasian	28 (32.18%)
Hispanic	1 (1.15%)

Gender	SLBE Firms
Male	59 (67.82%)
Female	28 (32.18%)

**2. SLBE Contract Participation**

- \$9,829,865.30 has been paid to firms that are solely SLBE certified; \$1,390,803.37 has been paid to firms that are solely DBE certified; additionally, \$1,506,303.04 was paid to firms that are both SLBE and DBE certified. The chart below shows the total SLBE and DBE payments when the aforementioned amount is added to each of the individual SLBE and DBE paid to date amounts (See Exhibit A)

	Including Payments to Firms both SLBE & DBE Certified	Percentage of Total
Payments to SLBE Certified Contractors	\$11,336,168.34	30.55%
Payments to DBE Certified Contractors	\$2,897,106.41	7.81%

- Total payments made on Penny Tax funded projects to date: \$37,103,736.78 (See Exhibit B)
- \$74,452,122.23 in Penny Tax Funds over twenty-three open contracts/service orders are currently being tracked by the OSBO in the B2GNow Compliance Management System. Fifteen (15) of the contracts are currently meeting their participation goals/utilization commitments (See Exhibit C)
- Of the five On-Call Engineering Team (OET) contracts, four are currently projected to meet their overall SLBE goal with existing issued task orders (See Exhibit D)



## EXHIBIT A

### Contractor Payment Summary

---

Every firm that has received payment on a contract funded by the Transportation Penny Tax is listed with the total amount paid to date. It is also noted if the firm is certified with our office as a Small Local Business Enterprise and/or with the SC Department of Transportation as a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise.

## Exhibit A

### Contractor Payment Summary

*List of primes and subcontractors that received payment between 1/1/2012 and 5/18/2016.*

Business Name	Certification(s) Held	Payments
AOS SPECIALTY CONTRACTORS INC.	DBE	\$586,697.83
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN ASSOCIATES		\$2,785.00
ARM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.		\$9,850.00
ARMSTRONG CONTRACTORS LLC	SLBE	\$120.00
AWS SERVICES, INC		\$21,337.68
BANCO/BANNISTER COMPANY, LLC	SLBE	\$432,046.10
BROWNSTONE CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC	SLBE	\$4,711,865.46
C.R. JACKSON, INC.		\$2,481,482.93
CAIRNS LAW FIRM LLC	SLBE	\$1,250.00
CAMPBELL CONSULTING GROUP, LLC	SLBE	\$466,065.80
CAROLINA BRIDGE CO. INC.		\$799,400.05
CAROLINA PAVEMENT MARKINGS, INC	DBE	\$13,640.16
CASE CONSULTING INC	DBE	\$2,750.00
CDM SMITH INC. (BOSTON, MA AND KANSAS CITY, MO)		\$369,465.00
CHAO & ASSOCIATES, INC.	SLBE, DBE	\$181,896.77
CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE, DBE	\$714,406.78
CMB CLEANING LLC	SLBE	\$1,000.00
CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT SERVICES, LLC	SLBE, DBE	\$159,122.56
COOGLER CONSTRUCTION, INC		\$84,265.50
CORLEY CONSTRUCTION, LLC	SLBE, DBE	\$105,709.76
COX & DINKINS	SLBE	\$908,178.08
D M CONLON INC	DBE	\$63,873.63
DAVIS & FLOYD, INC.		\$1,680,073.93
DENNIS CORPORATION	SLBE	\$1,177,723.22
DESA, INC.	SLBE, DBE	\$32,060.70
E.S.P. ASSOCIATES, P.A.		\$25,581.75
EAGLE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.		\$735,264.27
ELITE CONCRETE CONTRACTING, LLC	SLBE, DBE	\$18,518.26
F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$67,425.16
GENESIS CONSULTING GROUP		\$3,510.00
GEO-SYSTEMS DESIGN AND TESTING		\$3,000.00
GREENPOND CONSULTING		\$4,600.00
GRICE CONSULTING GROUP, LLC	DBE	\$177,646.54
GS2 ENGINEERING & ENVIRONMENTAL		\$8,606.92
HALEY RAY STRIPING, LLC D.B.A. HALEY RAY PAVEMENT MARKINGS	SLBE, DBE	\$5,125.97
HDR ENGINEERING INC., OF THE CAROLINAS		\$90,286.00
HERNDON INC.	DBE	\$40,265.70
HOLT CONSULTING COMPANY, LLC	SLBE	\$126,243.97
HUSSEY, GAY, BELL & DEYOUNG, INC.		\$337,033.21
ICA ENGINEERING, INC.		\$5,027,110.38
IREALTY INTERNATIONAL	SLBE	\$59,350.00
J. B. LADNER & ASSOCIATES, LLC	SLBE	\$70,330.19
JOHN BOWMAN ARCHITECT, PA, INC.	SLBE	\$6,000.00

Business Name	Certification(s) Held	Payments
JOHN RAY WILLIAMS ASSOCIATES		\$1,500.00
KENNETH B. SIMMONS ASSOCIATES, LLC	SLBE	\$66,138.00
KIMLEY-HORN & ASSOCIATES, INC.		\$93,614.05
L.A. BARRIER & SON, INC.	DBE	\$106,473.25
LAD CORPORATION OF WEST COLUMBIA		\$4,013,498.54
LANE CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION		\$909,390.34
LCI-LINEBERGER CONSTRUCTION, INC.	DBE	\$194,403.06
LINDLER'S CONSTRUCTION OF SC		\$45,341.43
MARSHALL LANDSCAPING, INC.	DBE	\$6,956.90
MB KAHN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.		\$2,455,095.01
MCNAIR LAW FIRM, P.A.		\$36,647.32
MEAD AND HUNT, INC.		\$172,871.24
MEDINAS HAULING, INC.	DBE	\$127,984.95
MIZZELL & ASSOCIATES, LLC	SLBE	\$11,080.00
NEW SOUTH ASSOCIATES, INC.	DBE	\$13,326.58
OLH, INC.	SLBE	\$953,839.49
OZZIE NAGLER		\$9,450.00
P.J. NOBLE & ASSOCIATES	SLBE, DBE	\$100,010.37
PARRISH & PARTNERS	SLBE	\$210,363.24
PREMIER CONSTRUCTORS, INC.	SLBE, DBE	\$94,014.37
PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$12,139.76
RICHLAND PDT, A JOINT VENTURE		\$2,727,394.14
S&ME, INC.		\$44,416.08
S-2 ENGINEERING & CONSULTING, LLC	SLBE	\$30,000.00
SANDERS BROS CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.		\$53,521.06
SHORT COUNTS, LLC	SLBE	\$4,350.00
SLOAN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY INC		\$1,766,695.01
SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS		\$275,218.31
SRS ENGINEERING, LLC	SLBE	\$15,500.00
STRATEGIC BUSINESS POLITICS		\$7,520.00
TAYLOR BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION CO.	SLBE, DBE	\$95,437.50
THE DEQUINCEY NEWMAN LAW FIRM	SLBE	\$105,225.00
THE LANDPLAN GROUP SOUTH, INC.	SLBE	\$45,731.75
THE LAW OFFICES OF FREDERICK J. HALL III		\$1,375.00
THE TOLLESON LIMITED COMPANY	SLBE	\$427,465.00
WORKMAN TRUCKING COMPANY	DBE	\$56,784.77
<b>Total:</b>		<b>\$37,103,736.78</b>

*\* Contractors highlighted above have either not yet: received the payment issued by Richland County or completed the current month's payment audit and thus the payment total does not yet reflect the subtraction of any subsequent payments made to subcontractors from the most recent invoice/audit period. At the time of the creation of this report, each of the unreported contractors were within the allowed seven (7) day prompt payment period.*



## EXHIBIT B

### Contract Award and Payment Breakdown

---

A project is tracked by the OSBO when the work is in any way funded by the Transportation Penny Tax. Once all contractual documents are received, performance has begun, and the first payment has been issued, we begin tracking progress. For each contract we've included: the total contract value, total awards, total award share (award total retained after subtracting lower tiered subcontractor awards), total payments, and total payment share (payment total retained after subtracting lower tiered subcontractor payments). It also indicates for which goal certified firms' participation is counting towards. NOTE: If a contract has a dotted background, this indicates the contract has been completed and closed out. Shaded grey payments indicate a contract on which the prime has not yet reported the allocation of the last payment issued by Richland County.

*\* CN140005 is partially funded by the Public Works department. The award and payment amounts listed are calculated based on the percentage of Penny Tax funds used.*

**Exhibit B**  
Contract Award Breakdown

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
B1600880	McNair Law Firm	\$75,000.00	0.00%		Prime	McNair Law Firm, P.A.		\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$36,647.32	\$36,647.32
CN140005	RC-593-C-2014 (DRP Package B)	\$667,842.33*	0.00%		Prime	Lane Construction Corporation		\$667,842.33	\$569,609.38	\$521,194.05	\$422,961.10
				1	Subcontractor	AWS Services, Inc		\$21,337.68	\$21,337.68	\$21,337.68	\$21,337.68
				2	Subcontractor	GS2 Engineering & Environmental		\$3,915.67	\$3,915.67	\$3,915.67	\$3,915.67
				3	Subcontractor	Haley Ray Striping, LLC d.b.a. Haley Ray Pavement Markings	SLBE	\$3,175.97	\$3,175.97	\$3,175.97	\$3,175.97
				4	Subcontractor	LCI-LINEBERGER CONSTRUCTION, INC.	DBE	\$38,686.00	\$38,686.00	\$38,686.00	\$38,686.00
				5	Subcontractor	PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$2,472.86	\$2,472.86	\$2,472.86	\$2,472.86
				6	Subcontractor	Workman Trucking Company	DBE	\$28,644.77	\$28,644.77	\$28,644.77	\$28,644.77
CN140008	RC-PW-600-2014	\$735,264.28	0.00%		Prime	Eagle Construction Company, Inc.		\$735,264.28	\$735,264.28	\$735,264.27	\$735,264.27
CN150002	RC-PW-601-2014 (DRP Package D)	\$760,547.74	0.00%		Prime	Lane Construction Corporation		\$760,547.74	\$516,528.78	\$646,792.59	\$486,429.24
				1	Subcontractor	Armstrong Contractors LLC	SLBE	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00	\$120.00
				2	Subcontractor	Coogler Construction, Inc		\$157,129.16	\$157,129.16	\$84,265.50	\$84,265.50
				3	Subcontractor	GS2 Engineering & Environmental		\$4,691.25	\$4,691.25	\$4,691.25	\$4,691.25
				4	Subcontractor	Haley Ray Striping, LLC d.b.a. Haley Ray Pavement Markings	DBE	\$1,950.00	\$1,950.00	\$1,950.00	\$1,950.00
				5	Subcontractor	HERNDON INC.	DBE	\$46,360.49	\$46,360.49	\$40,265.70	\$40,265.70
				6	Subcontractor	PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$5,628.05	\$5,628.05	\$930.90	\$930.90
7	Subcontractor	Workman Trucking Company	DBE	\$28,140.00	\$28,140.00	\$28,140.00	\$28,140.00				
CN150003	LNTF Contract - Admin	\$2,834,100.00	51.00%		Prime	MB Kahn Construction Company, Inc.		\$2,834,100.00	\$761,614.00	\$2,757,495.79	\$649,669.89
				1	Subcontractor	Brownstone Construction Group, LLC	SLBE	\$935,253.00	\$569,843.00	\$937,747.90	\$582,542.10
				2	Subcontractor	DAVIS & FLOYD, INC.		\$204,228.00	\$175,887.00	\$194,023.80	\$181,023.80
				3	Subcontractor	iRealty International	SLBE	\$28,341.00	\$28,341.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
				4	Subcontractor	Grice Consulting Group, LLC		\$36,980.00	\$36,980.00	\$36,980.00	\$36,980.00
				5	Subcontractor	Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.		\$124,202.00	\$124,202.00	\$124,202.00	\$124,202.00
				6	Subcontractor	Campbell Consulting Group, LLC	SLBE	\$85,023.00	\$0.00	\$171,175.00	\$97,000.00
				7	Subcontractor	Banco/Barrister Company, LLC	SLBE	\$85,023.00	\$85,023.00	\$74,175.00	\$74,175.00
8	Subcontractor	ICA Engineering, Inc.		\$882,164.00	\$730,459.00	\$882,164.00	\$845,664.00				

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
				9	Subcontractor	S-2 Engineering & Consulting, LLC		\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
				10	Subcontractor	The Dequincy Newman Law Firm	SLBE	\$28,341.00	\$28,341.00	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
				11	Subcontractor	The Tolleson Limited Company	SLBE	\$113,364.00	\$113,364.00	\$13,500.00	\$13,500.00
				12	Subcontractor	OLH, Inc.	SLBE	\$170,046.00	\$170,046.00	\$116,739.00	\$116,739.00
CN150010	2014 Resurfacing Project Package B RC-101-PT-1415	\$1,204,393.90	6.00%		Prime	Sloan Construction Company Inc		\$1,204,393.90	\$1,037,042.24	\$1,204,393.89	\$1,044,493.23
				1	Subcontractor	CAROLINA PAVEMENT MARKINGS, INC	DBE	\$11,176.00	\$11,176.00	\$10,528.10	\$10,528.10
				2	Subcontractor	L.A. Barrier & Son, Inc.	DBE	\$56,183.00	\$56,183.00	\$40,950.00	\$40,950.00
				3	Subcontractor	PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$3,564.00	\$3,564.00	\$3,564.00	\$3,564.00
				4	Subcontractor	Sanders Bros Construction Co., Inc.		\$45,090.66	\$45,090.66	\$53,521.06	\$53,521.06
				5	Subcontractor	Taylor Brothers Construction Co.	DBE	\$51,338.00	\$51,338.00	\$51,337.50	\$51,337.50
CN150012	2014 Resurfacing Project Package A RC-100-PT-1415	\$966,171.65	16.00%		Prime	Sloan Construction Company Inc		\$966,171.65	\$775,588.15	\$966,171.65	\$722,201.78
				1	Subcontractor	CAROLINA PAVEMENT MARKINGS, INC	DBE	\$3,413.00	\$3,413.00	\$3,112.06	\$3,112.06
				2	Subcontractor	L.A. Barrier & Son, Inc.	DBE	\$42,683.00	\$42,683.00	\$37,368.75	\$37,368.75
				3	Subcontractor	LCI-LINEBERGER CONSTRUCTION, INC.	DBE	\$107,754.50	\$107,754.50	\$155,717.06	\$155,717.06
				4	Subcontractor	PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$3,672.00	\$3,672.00	\$3,672.00	\$3,672.00
				5	Subcontractor	Taylor Brothers Construction Co.	DBE	\$33,061.00	\$33,061.00	\$44,100.00	\$44,100.00
CN150013	Dirt Road Paving Package E RC-608-CN-2015	\$553,215.38	8.20%		Prime	C.R. Jackson, Inc.		\$553,215.38	\$509,936.18	\$445,069.33	\$411,457.93
				1	Subcontractor	L.A. Barrier & Son, Inc.	DBE	\$16,573.25	\$16,573.25	\$26,654.50	\$26,654.50
				2	Subcontractor	Marshall Landscaping, Inc.	DBE	\$19,550.20	\$19,550.20	\$6,956.90	\$6,956.90
				3	Subcontractor	P & L EROSION CONTROL ETC INC	DBE	\$7,155.75	\$7,155.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
CN150014	Greene Street Phase I and Foundation Square PDT-319-IFB-2014	\$12,725,045.63	12.52%		Prime	LAD Corporation of West Columbia		\$12,725,045.63	\$11,050,264.96	\$4,214,222.67	\$4,013,498.54
				1	Subcontractor	CMB CLEANING LLC	SLBE	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
				2	Subcontractor	Corley Construction, LLC	SLBE	\$142,060.00	\$142,060.00	\$50,709.76	\$50,709.76
				3	Subcontractor	Cox & Dinkins	SLBE	\$120,000.00	\$120,000.00	\$55,000.00	\$55,000.00
				4	Subcontractor	Haley Ray Striping, LLC d.b.a. Haley Ray Pavement Markings	DBE	\$43,076.41	\$43,076.41	\$0.00	\$0.00

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
				5	Subcontractor	Harland Enterprises, Inc.	DBE	\$1,165.96	\$1,165.96	\$0.00	\$0.00
				6	Subcontractor	L.A. Barrier & Son, Inc.	DBE	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				7	Subcontractor	PREMIER CONSTRUCTORS, INC.	SLBE	\$1,339,978.30	\$1,339,978.30	\$94,014.37	\$94,014.37
CN150017	2014 Resurfacing Project Package C PDT-1002-CN-2014	\$1,345,620.61	9.50%		Prime	Carolina Bridge Co. Inc.		\$1,345,620.61	\$908,639.15	\$1,058,118.32	\$799,400.05
				1	Subcontractor	D M CONLON INC DAN-KEL CONCRETE CUTTING, CORING & SCANN		\$102,647.50	\$102,647.50	\$63,873.63	\$63,873.63
				2	Subcontractor	Elite Concrete Contracting, LLC	DBE	\$83,428.48	\$83,428.48	\$18,518.26	\$18,518.26
				3	Subcontractor	L.A. Barrier & Son, Inc.	DBE	\$44,405.48	\$44,405.48	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
				4	Subcontractor	Lindler's Construction of SC		\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$45,341.43	\$45,341.43
				5	Subcontractor	Medinas Hauling, Inc.	DBE	\$195,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$127,984.95	\$127,984.95
				6	Subcontractor	PROTECTION SERVICE INC		\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
CN160006	Design & Construction of Six Intersection Improvements	\$9,000,000.00	10.00%		Prime	C.R. Jackson, Inc.		\$9,000,000.00	\$7,726,500.00	\$2,520,525.00	\$2,070,025.00
				1	Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	DBE	\$598,500.00	\$270,000.00	\$450,500.00	\$450,500.00
				2	Subcontractor	Cox & Dinkins		\$310,500.00	\$310,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				3	Subcontractor	P.J. Noble & Associates	DBE	\$18,000.00	\$18,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				4	Subcontractor	HERNDON INC.	DBE	\$55,590.00	\$27,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				5	Subcontractor	P & L EROSION CONTROL ETC INC	DBE	\$55,590.00	\$27,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				6	Subcontractor	SOUTHERN CONCRETE & CONSTRUCTION INC	DBE	\$1,260,040.00	\$612,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				7	Subcontractor	THE SHARON COMPANY INC	DBE	\$18,530.00	\$9,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CN160007	Vista Greenway Phase Two (Lincoln Tunnel Greenway) PDT-139-CN-2015	\$1,230,330.18	17.50%		Prime	AOS Specialty Contractors Inc.		\$1,230,330.18	\$0.00	\$649,397.83	\$211,477.44
				0	Prime Self Performing	AOS Specialty Contractors Inc.	DBE	\$1,013,792.07	\$1,013,792.07	\$375,220.39	\$375,220.39
				1	Subcontractor	Chao & Associates, Inc.	SLBE	\$19,685.28	\$19,685.28	\$7,700.00	\$7,700.00
				2	Subcontractor	Corley Construction, LLC	SLBE	\$86,123.11	\$86,123.11	\$55,000.00	\$55,000.00
				3	Subcontractor	Grant Electrical Contracting	DBE	\$61,516.51	\$61,516.51	\$0.00	\$0.00
				4	Subcontractor	In Line Paving Industries, LLC		\$49,213.21	\$49,213.21	\$0.00	\$0.00
				5	Subcontractor	Lane Construction Corporation		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				6	Subcontractor	Taylor Brothers Construction Co.	SLBE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00



Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
CPS13014	CDM Smith Contract Modification 2 Shop Road Extension Phase 1B	\$379,443.41	0.00%		Prime	CDM Smith Inc. (Boston, MA and Kansas City, MO)		\$379,443.41	\$379,443.41	\$369,465.00	\$369,465.00
CPS15015	LNTP (RC-Q-2014-DRP)	\$302,813.30	98.00%		Prime	Dennis Corporation		\$302,813.30	\$1,958.77	\$301,731.22	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Dennis Corporation	SLBE	\$145,445.40	\$145,445.40	\$128,191.10	\$128,191.10
				1	Subcontractor	J. B. Ladner & Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$48,871.90	\$48,871.90	\$60,489.75	\$60,489.75
				2	Subcontractor	Mizzell & Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$4,080.00	\$4,080.00	\$4,080.00	\$4,080.00
				3	Subcontractor	P.J. Noble & Associates	SLBE	\$94,010.00	\$94,010.00	\$100,010.37	\$100,010.37
				4	Subcontractor	Strategic Business Politics		\$8,478.77	\$8,478.77	\$6,520.00	\$6,520.00
CPS15027	Notice to Proceed: Program Management/Public Outreach/Design for the Dirt Road Paving Program	\$3,890,567.40	100.00%		Prime	Dennis Corporation		\$3,890,567.40	\$0.00	\$1,067,372.56	\$35,760.07
				0	Prime Self Performing	Dennis Corporation	SLBE	\$1,968,276.40	\$1,968,278.00	\$1,013,772.05	\$1,013,772.05
				1	Subcontractor	J. B. Ladner & Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$367,000.00	\$367,000.00	\$9,840.44	\$9,840.44
				2	Subcontractor	Mizzell & Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$163,649.00	\$163,649.00	\$7,000.00	\$7,000.00
				3	Subcontractor	P.J. Noble & Associates	SLBE	\$395,676.00	\$395,676.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				4	Subcontractor	Strategic Business Politics		\$161,209.00	\$161,209.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
CPS15028	Service Order No. P&P #1	\$27,283.61	100.00%		Prime	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$27,283.61	\$0.00	\$24,863.24	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$27,283.61	\$27,283.61	\$24,863.24	\$24,863.24
CPS15039	Atlas Road Widening - On Call Engineering Services Agreement RC-Q-2014-OET	\$1,952,335.64	78.10%		Prime	Cox & Dinkins		\$1,952,335.64	\$151,000.00	\$893,941.40	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Cox & Dinkins	SLBE	\$810,738.00	\$810,738.00	\$600,259.41	\$600,259.41
				1	Subcontractor	CASE CONSULTING INC	DBE	\$15,600.00	\$15,600.00	\$2,750.00	\$2,750.00
				2	Subcontractor	Chao & Associates, Inc.	SLBE	\$70,890.00	\$70,890.00	\$10,093.50	\$10,093.50
				3	Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE	\$207,418.44	\$207,418.44	\$101,825.94	\$101,825.94
				4	Subcontractor	DAVIS & FLOYD, INC.		\$493,560.00	\$493,560.00	\$89,679.80	\$89,679.80
				5	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$138,149.20	\$138,149.20	\$32,852.75	\$32,852.75
				6	Subcontractor	John Bowman Architect, PA, Inc.	SLBE	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
CPS16014	Service Order No. M&H #1	\$1,137,317.02	30.00%		Prime	Mead and Hunt, Inc.		\$1,137,317.02	\$0.00	\$348,757.12	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Mead and Hunt, Inc.		\$629,673.50	\$629,673.50	\$172,871.24	\$172,871.24
				1	Subcontractor	Chao & Associates, Inc.	SLBE	\$292,021.32	\$292,021.32	\$143,825.18	\$143,825.18

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
				2	Subcontractor	DESA, Inc.	SLBE	\$49,827.95	\$49,827.95	\$32,060.70	\$32,060.70
				3	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$165,794.25	\$165,794.25	\$0.00	\$0.00
CPS16015	Service Order No. CECS #1	\$2,180,746.70	92.00%		Prime	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.		\$2,180,746.70	\$0.00	\$478,347.85	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE	\$1,359,400.23	\$1,359,400.23	\$116,100.96	\$116,100.96
				1	Subcontractor	Chao & Associates, Inc.	SLBE	\$120,947.21	\$120,947.21	\$20,278.09	\$20,278.09
				2	Subcontractor	Cox & Dinkins	SLBE	\$281,020.25	\$281,020.25	\$252,918.67	\$252,918.67
				3	Subcontractor	Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc.		\$43,629.05	\$43,629.05	\$43,134.05	\$43,134.05
				4	Subcontractor	P.J. Noble & Associates	SLBE	\$45,885.64	\$45,885.64	\$0.00	\$0.00
				5	Subcontractor	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$188,534.92	\$188,534.92	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
				6	Subcontractor	S&ME, Inc.		\$141,329.40	\$141,329.40	\$44,416.08	\$44,416.08
CPS16017/ B1501160	Richland PDT, A Joint Venture M.B. Kahn Construction, ICA Engineering, Brownstone Construction Group (RC-Q-2014-PDT)	\$33,100,000.00	51.00%		Prime	Richland PDT, A Joint Venture		\$33,100,000.00	\$11,169,537.32	\$16,837,746.05	\$2,727,394.14
				1	Subcontractor	Brownstone Construction Group, LLC	SLBE	\$6,075,962.00	\$6,075,962.00	\$4,129,323.36	\$4,129,323.36
				2	Subcontractor	Cairns Law Firm LLC	SLBE	\$11,500.00	\$11,500.00	\$1,250.00	\$1,250.00
				3	Subcontractor	Campbell Consulting Group, LLC	SLBE	\$1,265,470.04	\$665,470.04	\$726,936.90	\$369,065.80
				4	Subcontractor	Banco/Bannister Company, LLC	SLBE	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00	\$357,871.10	\$357,871.10
				5	Subcontractor	DAVIS & FLOYD, INC.		\$2,462,669.60	\$2,368,669.60	\$1,472,120.33	\$1,409,370.33
				6	Subcontractor	iRealty International	SLBE	\$77,600.00	\$77,600.00	\$46,350.00	\$46,350.00
				7	Subcontractor	SRS Engineering, LLC	SLBE	\$15,500.00	\$15,500.00	\$15,500.00	\$15,500.00
				8	Subcontractor	The Dequincey Newman Law Firm	SLBE	\$900.00	\$900.00	\$900.00	\$900.00
				9	Subcontractor	Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc.		\$504,019.89	\$504,019.89	\$212,831.21	\$212,831.21
				10	Subcontractor	ICA Engineering, Inc.		\$7,137,952.27	\$6,171,494.55	\$4,806,638.15	\$4,181,446.38
				11	Subcontractor	ARM Environmental Services, Inc.		\$9,850.00	\$9,850.00	\$9,850.00	\$9,850.00
				12	Subcontractor	Grice Consulting Group, LLC	DBE	\$235,162.82	\$235,162.82	\$140,666.54	\$140,666.54
				13	Subcontractor	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$10,570.00	\$10,570.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
				14	Subcontractor	MA ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC.	DBE	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				15	Subcontractor	NEW SOUTH ASSOCIATES, INC.	DBE	\$23,492.71	\$23,492.71	\$13,326.58	\$13,326.58
				16	Subcontractor	OLH, Inc.	SLBE	\$180,332.19	\$180,332.19	\$188,998.65	\$188,998.65
				17	Subcontractor	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$110,700.00	\$110,700.00	\$46,500.00	\$46,500.00

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
				18	Subcontractor	S-2 Engineering & Consulting, LLC	SLBE	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00
				19	Subcontractor	Short Counts, LLC	SLBE	\$4,350.00	\$4,350.00	\$4,350.00	\$4,350.00
				20	Subcontractor	The Tolleson Limited Company	SLBE	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$196,500.00	\$196,500.00
				21	Subcontractor	MB Kahn Construction Company, Inc.		\$2,878,232.79	\$2,878,232.79	\$1,805,425.12	\$1,805,425.12
				22	Subcontractor	OLH, Inc.	SLBE	\$1,161,006.09	\$1,161,006.09	\$648,101.84	\$648,101.84
				23	Subcontractor	The Dequincey Newman Law Firm	SLBE	\$94,650.00	\$94,650.00	\$91,325.00	\$91,325.00
				24	Subcontractor	The Law Offices of Frederick J. Hall III		\$11,500.00	\$11,500.00	\$1,375.00	\$1,375.00
				25	Subcontractor	The Tolleson Limited Company	SLBE	\$327,500.00	\$327,500.00	\$215,025.00	\$215,025.00
CPS16019	Three Rivers Greenway: Saluda Riverwalk Phase I	\$99,194.00	0.00%		Prime	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC		\$99,194.00	\$0.00	\$85,983.00	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC	SLBE	\$73,849.00	\$73,849.00	\$61,138.00	\$61,138.00
				1	Subcontractor	Architectural Design Associates		\$3,285.00	\$3,285.00	\$2,785.00	\$2,785.00
				2	Subcontractor	Genesis Consulting Group		\$3,510.00	\$3,510.00	\$3,510.00	\$3,510.00
				3	Subcontractor	Geo-Systems Design and Testing		\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
				4	Subcontractor	Greenpond Consulting		\$4,600.00	\$4,600.00	\$4,600.00	\$4,600.00
				5	Subcontractor	John Ray Williams Associates		\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
CPS16020	Service Order No. Holt #1	\$97,452.12	65.60%		Prime	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC		\$97,452.12	\$0.00	\$90,253.62	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC	SLBE	\$27,426.12	\$27,426.12	\$18,458.57	\$18,458.57
				1	Subcontractor	HDR Engineering Inc., of the Carolinas		\$30,544.00	\$30,544.00	\$31,731.30	\$31,731.30
				2	Subcontractor	The LandPlan Group South, Inc.	SLBE	\$39,482.00	\$39,482.00	\$40,063.75	\$40,063.75
					Prime	Parrish & Partners		\$341,345.76	\$0.00	\$196,227.32	\$0.00
CPS16033	Service Order No. P&P #2	\$341,345.76	86.80%	0	Prime Self Performing	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$165,813.74	\$165,813.74	\$102,300.00	\$102,300.00
				1	Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE	\$98,871.76	\$98,871.76	\$45,979.88	\$45,979.88
				2	Subcontractor	Construction Support Services, LLC	SLBE	\$31,604.60	\$31,604.60	\$30,585.56	\$30,585.56
				3	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$17,361.88	\$17,361.88	\$17,361.88	\$17,361.88

Contract Number	Contract Title	Contract Value	Goal	#	Vendor Type	Business Name	Goal Type	Total Award	Award Share	Total Payment	Payment Share
				4	Subcontractor	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		\$27,693.78	\$27,693.78	\$0.00	\$0.00
CPS16036	Service Order No. Holt #2	\$916,256.00	58.40%		Prime	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC		\$916,256.00	\$0.00	\$329,686.89	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC	SLBE	\$344,728.00	\$344,728.00	\$107,785.40	\$107,785.40
				1	Subcontractor	Construction Support Services, LLC	SLBE	\$139,004.00	\$139,004.00	\$128,537.00	\$128,537.00
				2	Subcontractor	DESA, Inc.	SLBE	\$23,316.00	\$23,316.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				3	Subcontractor	E.S.P. Associates, P.A.		\$46,422.00	\$46,422.00	\$25,581.75	\$25,581.75
				4	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$81,545.00	\$81,545.00	\$3,560.04	\$3,560.04
				5	Subcontractor	Grice Consulting Group, LLC	DBE	\$10,949.00	\$10,949.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				6	Subcontractor	HDR Engineering Inc., of the Carolinas		\$241,948.00	\$241,948.00	\$58,554.70	\$58,554.70
				7	Subcontractor	The LandPlan Group South, Inc.	SLBE	\$28,344.00	\$28,344.00	\$5,668.00	\$5,668.00
CPS16041	Service Order No. P&P #3	\$1,285,471.73	82.30%		Prime	Parrish & Partners		\$1,285,471.73	\$0.00	\$22,200.00	\$10,000.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$578,408.42	\$578,408.42	\$12,200.00	\$12,200.00
				1	Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE	\$295,584.97	\$295,584.97	\$0.00	\$0.00
				2	Subcontractor	Construction Support Services, LLC	SLBE	\$161,533.30	\$161,533.30	\$0.00	\$0.00
				3	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$85,139.26	\$85,139.26	\$0.00	\$0.00
				4	Subcontractor	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		\$142,253.48	\$142,253.48	\$0.00	\$0.00
				5	Subcontractor	Southern Vistas, Inc.	SLBE	\$22,552.30	\$22,552.30	\$0.00	\$0.00
CPS16047	Service Order No. P&P #4	\$218,238.03	78.10%		Prime	Parrish & Partners		\$218,238.03	\$0.00	\$26,650.49	\$0.00
				0	Prime Self Performing	Parrish & Partners	SLBE	\$137,286.31	\$137,286.31	\$13,000.00	\$13,000.00
				1	Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	SLBE	\$2,985.82	\$2,985.82	\$0.00	\$0.00
				2	Subcontractor	Construction Support Services, LLC	SLBE	\$19,767.00	\$19,767.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
				3	Subcontractor	F&ME CONSULTANTS, INC.		\$25,123.00	\$25,123.00	\$13,650.49	\$13,650.49
				4	Subcontractor	Infrastructure Consulting & Engineering, PLLC		\$22,648.56	\$22,648.56	\$0.00	\$0.00
				5	Subcontractor	Southern Vistas, Inc.	SLBE	\$10,427.34	\$10,427.34	\$0.00	\$0.00
CSV16030	Utility Agreement 1 Greene Street Phase 1 (PDT-319-IFB-2014)	\$325,587.00	0.00%		Prime	South Carolina Electric & Gas		\$325,587.00	\$325,587.00	\$275,218.31	\$275,218.31



## EXHIBIT C

### Active Contract & Task Order Summary

---

This report is a summary of the twenty three open contracts currently being monitored by the OSBO. For each contract we've included: the total contract value, the amount Richland County has paid to the prime contractor to date, the amount paid to subcontractors to date, the contractual goal or utilization commitment, the current participation rate, and the difference. The difference is highlighted when a prime is not currently meeting its contractual goal or utilization commitment. These contracts are more closely monitored between the 30/60/90 evaluation periods.

## Exhibit C

### Active Contract Task Order Summary

Contract Number	Contract Description	Prime	Contract Value	Payments to Prime	Payments to Subs	Goal	Participation	Difference
B1600880	McNair Law Firm	McNair Law Firm, P.A.	\$75,000.00	\$36,647.32	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CN140005	RC-593-C-2014 (DRP Package B)	Lane Construction Corporation	\$667,842.33	\$521,194.05	\$70,507	0.0%	13.5%	13.5%
CN150002	RC-PW-601-2014 (DRP Package D)	Lane Construction Corporation	\$760,547.74	\$646,792.59	\$70,476	0.0%	10.9%	10.9%
CN150010	2014 Resurfacing Project Package B RC-101-PT-1415	Sloan Construction Company Inc	\$1,204,393.90	\$1,204,393.89	\$102,816	6.0%	8.5%	2.5%
CN150012	2014 Resurfacing Project Package A RC-100-PT-1415	Sloan Construction Company Inc	\$966,171.65	\$966,171.65	\$240,298	16.0%	24.9%	8.9%
CN150013	Dirt Road Paving Package E RC-608-CN-2015	C.R. Jackson, Inc.	\$553,215.38	\$445,069.33	\$33,611	8.2%	7.6%	-0.6%
CN150014	Greene Street Phase I and Foundation Square PDT-319-IFB-2014	LAD Corporation of West Columbia	\$12,725,045.63	\$4,214,222.67	\$200,724	12.5%	4.8%	-7.8%
CN150017	2014 Resurfacing Project Package C PDT-1002-CN-2014	Carolina Bridge Co. Inc.	\$1,345,620.61	\$1,058,118.32	\$148,003	9.5%	14.0%	4.5%
CN160006	Design & Construction of Six Intersection Improvements	C.R. Jackson, Inc.	\$9,000,000.00	\$2,520,525.00	\$450,500	10.0%	28.0%	18.0%
CN160007	Vista Greenway Phase Two (Lincoln Tunnel Greenway) PDT-139-CN-2015	AOS Specialty Contractors Inc.	\$1,230,330.18	\$649,397.83	\$437,920	17.5%	67.4%	49.9%
CPS13014	CDM Smith Contract Modification 2 Shop Road Extension Phase 1B	CDM Smith Inc. (Boston, MA and Kansas City, MO)	\$379,443.41	\$369,465.00	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CPS15027	Notice to Proceed: Program Management/Public Outreach/Design for the Dirt Road Paving Program	Dennis Corporation	\$3,890,567.40	\$1,067,372.56	\$1,030,612	100.0%	96.6%	-3.4%
CPS15039	Atlas Road Widening - On Call Engineering Services Agreement RC-Q-2014-OET	Cox & Dinkins	\$1,952,335.64	\$893,941.40	\$720,929	78.1%	80.6%	2.5%
CPS16014	Service Order No. M&H #1	Mead and Hunt, Inc.	\$1,137,317.02	\$348,757.12	\$175,886	30.0%	50.4%	20.4%

Contract Number	Contract Description	Prime	Contract Value	Payments to Prime	Payments to Subs	Goal	Participation	Difference
CPS16015	Service Order No. CECS #1	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	\$2,180,746.70	\$478,347.85	\$390,798	92.0%	81.7%	-10.3%
CPS16017/ B1501160	Program Development Team (RC-Q-2014-PDT)	Richland PDT, A Joint Venture	\$33,100,000.00	\$16,837,746.05	\$7,128,970	51.0%	42.3%	-8.7%
CPS16019	Three Rivers Greenway: Saluda Riverwalk Phase I	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC	\$99,194.00	\$85,983.00	\$61,138	0.0%	71.1%	71.1%
CPS16020	Service Order No. Holt #1	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC	\$97,452.12	\$90,253.62	\$58,522	65.6%	64.8%	-0.8%
CPS16033	Service Order No. P&P #2	Parrish & Partners	\$341,345.76	\$196,227.32	\$178,865	86.8%	91.2%	4.4%
CPS16036	Service Order No. Holt #2	HOLT Consulting Company, LLC	\$916,256.00	\$329,686.89	\$241,990	58.4%	73.4%	15.0%
CPS16041	Service Order No. P&P #3	Parrish & Partners	\$1,285,471.73	\$22,200.00	\$12,200	82.3%	55.0%	-27.3%
CPS16047	Service Order No. P&P #4	Parrish & Partners	\$218,238.03	\$26,650.49	\$13,000	78.1%	48.8%	-29.3%
CSV16030	Utility Agreement 1 Greene Street Phase 1 (PDT-319-IFB-2014)	South Carolina Electric & Gas	\$325,587.00	\$275,218.31	\$0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
			<b>\$74,452,122.23</b>	<b>\$33,284,382.26</b>				



## EXHIBIT D

### OET Master Contract & Task Order Detail / Rollup

---

This document combines the various task orders issued on each of the five On-Call Engineering Team (OET) contracts to show progress towards the overall goal. Each has a set SLBE participation goal that must be met over the five year term. The goal can be found by looking on the corresponding firm's table on the 'Master Contract' row in the 'Goal' column. The average SLBE participation of all of a particular firm's service orders is listed on the 'Entire Contract' row in the 'For Credit Percent' column.



## Exhibit D

### OET Master Contract Task Order Progress

#### RC-Q-2014-OET (Cox & Dinkins)

Category	Contract Number	Contract Value	Total Paid	Total Credit Paid	Goal	For Credit Percent
Task Order	CPS15039	\$1,952,336.00	\$893,941.00	\$720,929.00	78.10%	80.65%
Master Contract	RC-Q-2014-OET (C&D)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	60.00%	0.00%
All Task Orders		\$1,952,336.00	\$893,941.00	\$720,929.00	78.10%	80.65%
<b>Entire Contract</b>		<b>\$1,952,336.00</b>	<b>\$893,941.00</b>	<b>\$720,929.00</b>	<b>78.10%</b>	<b>80.65%</b>

#### RC-Q-2014-OET (Civil Engineering Consulting Services)

Category	Contract Number	Contract Value	Total Paid	Total Credit Paid	Goal	For Credit Percent
Task Order	CPS16015	\$2,180,747.00	\$478,348.00	\$390,798.00	92.00%	81.70%
Master Contract	RC-Q-2014-OET (CECS)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	89.00%	0.00%
All Task Orders		\$2,180,747.00	\$478,348.00	\$390,798.00	92.00%	81.70%
<b>Entire Contract</b>		<b>\$2,180,747.00</b>	<b>\$478,348.00</b>	<b>\$390,798.00</b>	<b>92.00%</b>	<b>81.70%</b>

#### RC-Q-2014-OET (HOLT Consulting)

Category	Contract Number	Contract Value	Total Paid	Total Credit Paid	Goal	For Credit Percent
Task Order	CPS16020	\$97,452.00	\$90,254.00	\$58,522.00	65.60%	64.84%
Task Order	CPS16036	\$916,256.00	\$329,687.00	\$241,990.00	58.40%	73.40%
Master Contract	RC-Q-2014-OET (HOLT)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	66.00%	0.00%
All Task Orders		\$1,013,708.00	\$419,941.00	\$300,513.00	59.09%	71.56%
<b>Entire Contract</b>		<b>\$1,013,708.00</b>	<b>\$419,941.00</b>	<b>\$300,513.00</b>	<b>59.09%</b>	<b>71.56%</b>

#### RC-Q-2014-OET (Mead & Hunt)

Category	Contract Number	Contract Value	Total Paid	Total Credit Paid	Goal	For Credit Percent
Task Order	CPS16014	\$1,137,317.00	\$348,757.00	\$175,886.00	30.00%	50.43%
Master Contract	RC-Q-2014-OET (M&H)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	37.00%	0.00%
All Task Orders		\$1,137,317.00	\$348,757.00	\$175,886.00	30.00%	50.43%
<b>Entire Contract</b>		<b>\$1,137,317.00</b>	<b>\$348,757.00</b>	<b>\$175,886.00</b>	<b>30.00%</b>	<b>50.43%</b>

#### RC-Q-2014-OET (Parrish & Partners)

Category	Contract Number	Contract Value	Total Paid	Total Credit Paid	Goal	For Credit Percent
Task Order	CPS15028	\$27,284.00	\$24,863.00	\$24,863.00	100.00%	100.00%
Task Order	CPS16033	\$341,346.00	\$196,227.00	\$178,865.00	86.80%	91.15%
Task Order	CPS16041	\$1,285,472.00	\$22,200.00	\$12,200.00	82.30%	54.95%
Task Order	CPS16047	\$218,238.00	\$26,650.00	\$13,000.00	78.10%	48.78%
Master Contract	RC-Q-2014-OET (P&P)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	79.00%	0.00%
All Task Orders		\$1,872,339.00	\$269,941.00	\$228,929.00	82.89%	84.81%
<b>Entire Contract</b>		<b>\$1,872,339.00</b>	<b>\$269,941.00</b>	<b>\$228,929.00</b>	<b>82.89%</b>	<b>84.81%</b>



## 9. Status of Kososki Motions of April 25, 2016:

### a. Motion #1

#### Motion:

The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee requests that beginning in April 2016, the Committee will regularly receive payment information for all Transportation Penny entities. Explanation/ Background - The TPAC currently receives payment information only for certified firms (Exhibit A of the Bi-Weekly Report), not non-certified firms. For example, payments to M B Kahn, Lane Construction, Sloan, C R Jackson, etc. do not appear on any exhibits. This prevents the TPAC from understanding total payments. The TPAC receives payment information on certified firms that have lower award amount, but does not receive information on non-certified firms with much larger award amounts.

#### Status:

This item will be presented to the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee during their next meeting.



## **b. Motion #2**

### Motion:

The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee requests a written explanation of why Transportation Penny payments to certified firms are (a) allowed to exceed their award limits and (b) once exceeded, why they are allowed to continue exceeding their award limits. Explanation/Background: Exhibit A of the December 11, 2015 report shows the total award to Brownstone at \$3,176,133. Total payments in this December report to Brownstone are \$3,498,971.21. The January 22, 2016 report shows payments to Brownstone at \$3,507,945.26 with no change in award amount. Again in the February 22, 2016 report, payments increased to \$3,745,315.84 with no change in award amount. A second example is Campbell Consulting. The December 11, 2015 and January 22, 2016 reports show payments of \$330,624.56 with an award amount of \$325,110. Then in the February 22, 2016 report, Campbell received total payments of \$356,592.06 with no change in the award amount of \$325,110.

### Status:

A response was provided by staff on May 10<sup>th</sup>, and is enclosed. A response email was submitted by Ms. Kososki which is also enclosed.

April 25, 2016 TPAC Meeting Report  
 Firms with payments exceeding award amounts by contract  
 Exhibit B

Contract Number	Contract Title	Prime Contractor	Vendor Type	Subcontractor	Total Award	Total Payment	% Overage	Page #
1. CN150003	LNTP Contract - Admin	MB Kahn Construction Company, Inc.	Subcontractor	Campbell Consulting Group, LLC	\$85,023.00	\$171,175.00	101.33%	8
2. CPS16015 CN160006	Service Order No. CECS #1 Design & Const. of Six Intersection Improvements	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	Prime Self Performing Subcontractor	CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES, INC.	\$270,000.00	\$450,500.00	66.85%	9
3. CPS15015	LNTP (RC-Q-2014-DRP)	Dennis Corporation	Subcontractor	J. B. Ladner & Associates, LLC	\$48,871.90	\$60,489.75	23.77%	10
4. CN150012	2014 Resurfacing Project Package A RC-100-PT-1415	Sloan Construction Company Inc	Subcontractor	LCI-LINEBERGER CONSTRUCTION, INC.	\$107,754.50	\$155,717.06	44.51%	8
5. CPS16019	Three Rivers Greenway: Saluda Riverwalk Phase I	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC	Subcontractor	Ozzie Nagler	\$4,500.00	\$9,450.00	110.00%	12
6. CPS15015	LNTP (RC-Q-2014-DRP)	Dennis Corporation	Subcontractor	P.J. Noble & Associates	\$94,010.00	\$100,010.37	6.38%	10
7. CN150010	2014 Resurfacing Project Package B RC-101-PT-1415	Sloan Construction Company Inc	Subcontractor	Sanders Bros Construction Co., Inc.	\$45,090.66	\$53,521.06	18.70%	8
8. CPS16019	Three Rivers Greenway: Saluda Riverwalk Phase I	Kenneth B. Simmons Associates, LLC	Subcontractor	Architectural Design Associates	\$1,530.00	\$2,785.00	82.03%	12
9. CN150017	2014 Resurfacing Project Package C PDT-1002-CN-2014	Carolina Bridge Co. Inc.	Subcontractor	Lindler's Construction of SC	\$8,110.00	\$45,341.43	459.10%	9
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$403,894.90</b>	<b>\$682,164.75</b>	<b>69.90%</b>	

**From:** [TONY EDWARDS](#)  
**To:** [Bill Wiseman](#); [Carol Kososki](#); [Derrick Huggins](#); [Dorothy Sumpter](#); [Frank Anderson](#); [Hayes Mizell](#); [J.T. McLawhorn](#); [Jennifer Bishop](#); [Jim Faber](#); [Murray Coleman](#); [TPAC](#); [Natalie Cappuccio Britt](#); [Philip Simoneaux](#); [Trevor Bowers](#); [Virginia Sanders](#)  
**Cc:** [Chris Gossett](#); [BRENDA PARNELL](#); [Rob Perry](#); [KRISTEN HUTTO](#); [SHAWN SALLEY](#)  
**Subject:** TPAC: Kososki (04-25-16) Motion #2 Response  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 10, 2016 4:43:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [Carol Kososki Spreadsheet.pdf](#)

---

TPAC,

The following is in response to the second motion presented by Carol Kososki during the last TPAC meeting on April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016. I have also attached the document she presented at that meeting to this email for reference. The wording in red was added to show the verbiage for the SLBE report.

OSBO Response to motion:

In order to answer this motion, it is necessary to first explain the current compliance reporting process. The Office of Small Business Opportunity enters the contract information provided by the County's Transportation Department into the B2GNow Diversity Management System (B2G) upon receipt. Most information regarding subcontractor utilization or commitment levels is provided as a percentage of the contract value. On the first business day of every month, every invoice received in the month prior is entered into B2G for confirmation of payment receipt by the prime contractor. The prime contractor has two weeks to respond with the corresponding amount retained as self-performing and the amount(s) paid to each subcontractor. Thereafter, the subcontractor has seven days to confirm or deny receipt of the indicated payment date and/or amount.

Our office has constant access to information regarding payments issued by Richland County so that information is always current. The exact subcontract award information is the variable that we often do not receive in a timely manner. NOTE: The subcontract award amounts entered into the compliance management system which are on the TPAC update reports are calculated by the utilization percentage indicated on the bid or later agreed upon by Richland County and the Prime.

While we monitor the subcontract progression; the actual subcontractors' contract scope, terms, conditions, and award amounts are ultimately determined by the Prime. The Prime is simply required to meet (or exceed) any contractual utilization commitments while staying within the overall project budget.

The "overages" notated occur because of one or any combination of the following three reasons: 1) a change order or contract modification was processed by the contracting department/entity and was not forwarded to our office; 2) the prime contractor reported incorrectly; or 3) the original "committed" amounts were not a contractual obligation but instead a good faith agreement and were altered due to any number of reasons.

In conclusion, we would like to thank you for your thorough review of the SLBE report provided in the last TPAC agenda. I hope our above explanation answers all your questions and explains how the amounts in question reflect how the prime contractor can have their subs perform additional work without the overall contract running over budget. In actuality we should applaud all contractors who are providing more work to their subs and allowing them to gain more experience, thus helping them become more accomplished contractors, which is one of the many goals of the SLBE program.

If you have any other questions or concerns regarding this information, please contact Brenda Parnell or me and we'll be happy to discuss this further.

Thanks,

*Tony Edwards, P.E.*

**Preconstruction Project Manager  
Transportation Department  
Richland County Government  
201 Arbor Lake Drive Columbia, SC 29223  
Email: [Edwardst@rcgov.us](mailto:Edwardst@rcgov.us)  
Office Phone: 803-726-6148**



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not read, use, copy, or distribute this e-mail message or its attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or telephone immediately, and destroy all copies of the original message.

**From:** [C.K](#)  
**To:** [To: Bill Wiseman](#); [Derrick Huggins](#); [Dorothy Sumpter](#); [Frank Anderson](#); [Hayes Mizell](#); [J.T. McLawhorn](#); [Jennifer Bishop](#); [Jim Faber](#); [Murray Coleman, TPAC](#); [Natalie Cappuccio Britt](#); [Phillip Simoneaux](#); [Trevor Bowers](#); [Virginia Sanders](#); [Chris Gossett](#); [BRENDA PARNELL](#); [Rob Perry](#); [KRISTEN HUTTO](#); [SHAWN SALLEY](#)  
**Subject:** Reply to Tony Edwards May 10, 2016 Response to TPAC: Kososki (04-25-16) Motion #2 Regarding Financial Reporting  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 17, 2016 1:51:45 PM

---

Tony,

Thank you for your May 10 response to my motion regarding financial reporting as presented during the 4/25/16 TPAC meeting. Additionally, thank you for the explanation of process and timing issues involved in Penny financial reporting.

**Nevertheless, I believe that my motion regarding improved financial reporting merits additional attention.**

First, however, I applaud the on-going improvement in financial reporting to the TPAC. In particular, the "Bi-Weekly Report" as of Rob Perry's email attachment of May 13, 2016 is now provided after a gap of several months (although included in the monthly TPAC Agenda for those months). The "Bi-Weekly Report" is now improved to provide the following:

1. Inclusion of payments to all primes and subcontractors instead of just SLBE organization payments. This is a real improvement.
2. The coding of all primes and subcontractors in Exhibit A as to whether they are SLBE, DBE, both, or neither. This is very helpful.
3. The inclusion of payment detail in Exhibit B at a project level. This is a major increase in financial transparency to the TPAC and to all other interested parties.

*However, there are continuing issues with these cited improvements.* For example, the referenced "Bi-Weekly Report" received on May 13 has Exhibit B sorted by subcontractor number within project. Exhibit B included in the April 25 Agenda did not. It is difficult to align and analyze the updated figures because of this difference in sort orders.

Also, not all primes in Exhibit B are coded as "Prime Self Performing". This has the attendant problem of masking the prime's "self" award level and also payments. It further results in payment summations within a project not totaling the overall project payments: e.g. see CN150002 (DRP Package D) for Lane Construction Corp. **All primes performing services within the project should have a new line labeled "Prime Self Performing" so that their award level, payments and possible overages are explicitly shown in the report.**

I hope that some consistency can be obtained in Exhibit B reporting so that sort orders, formats, accurate project summations, frequency of presentation, etc can be stabilized to ease review. Presenting a spreadsheet version of Exhibit B along with

the pdf version would really allow a great deal more comprehensive review.

I have the following response and observations regarding your comments:

1. If the "award amount" is subject to delays, estimates, etc, a footnote should be added to that column in Exhibit B with the reference tag at each project's subcontractor where the award is not "firm". I am assuming that awards to primes are "firm" (if not, the same would hold for them as well).
2. I would expect that award levels for subcontractors would be "firmed up" at the next "Bi-Weekly Report" especially for those whose expenditures have exceeded their award level. NOTE: Several of those cited in my April 25 spreadsheet still have payments beyond their award levels as reported in the May 13 Bi-Weekly Report:
  - *6 of 9 original firms noted on my spreadsheet of April 25 where expenditures exceeded awards have not yet been cleared. Expenditures still exceed awards for those firms (e.g., Campbell Consulting, Sanders Bros Construction).*
  - *2 of the original examples of expenditures exceeding awards have been cleared by increasing their awards to the previously cited payments (i.e., Architectural Design Assoc and Ozzie Nagler)*
  - *The final firm of 9 identified firms, Civil Engineering Consulting is partially, but not fully rectified.*
3. I further understand that the prime is ultimately responsible to bring the project in on budget (i.e., award level) and some subcontractors can be higher or lower than their award at project completion. **What is not clear, however, is what happens when the overall payments to the project begin to exceed the overall project award. Is there a control at the prime level so that can not happen? Or when the overall project payments equal the overall award and the project is not done--is there a control to prevent percent of budget paid from advancing too far ahead of percent completed to the point that project completion is in jeopardy or project overrun appears likely?**

Finally, I would like to conclude with your observation about the positive nature of SLBE subcontractors who exceed their award level by doing additional tasks and activities beyond their original scope. This is indeed a positive outcome as long as the total project comes in under or at the overall award level. Clearly, however, if one SBLE is enhanced out of another SBLE's award reduction within the project, then there is no net gain. The CN150003 (LNTP Contract-PDT Admin) seems to fall into this very situation. Additionally of the nine subcontractors identified in my April 25 spreadsheet with project payment overages, two were coded as SBLE, three as DBE, and four were neither. Clearly SBLE subcontractors are not the sole beneficiaries of additional work orders. Regardless, overall budgets need to be managed and projects should be completed within their budget.



I appreciate your thoughtful response and the substantial staff work involved in supplying critically important financial and programmatic data to the TPAC.

--

Carol Kososki  
803-787-1706 (h)  
803-238-5591 (c)  
[carolk2005@gmail.com](mailto:carolk2005@gmail.com)



## **10. Status of Mizell Motions of April 25, 2016:**

### **a. Motion #1:**

#### Motion:

The Transportation Advisory Committee (TPAC) requests that the Richland County Administrator routinely provide the TPAC with copies of written communications from or to the South Carolina Department of Revenue (DOR) regarding DOR allegations set forth in its December 3, 2015 letter to the County, and in subsequent related letters.

#### Status:

Enclosed you will find the most recent correspondence between Richland County and DOR.

## Beverly Harris

---

**From:** PIO Office Email  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 11, 2016 4:23 PM  
**Subject:** Richland County Council Defends Penny against State DOR Assault  
**Attachments:** Richland County Council Defends Penny against State DOR Assault.pdf; Letter 05052016.pdf



Public Information

# NEWS RELEASE

Visit us online at [www.RCgov.us](http://www.RCgov.us)  
Email us at [PIO@RCgov.us](mailto:PIO@RCgov.us)

## FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

May 11, 2016

### Richland County Council Defends Penny against State DOR Assault

(RICHLAND COUNTY) – The South Carolina Department of Revenue has overstepped its legal authority in withholding the proceeds of a voter-approved penny sales tax from Richland County, and in the process has put in jeopardy the County’s ability to fund critical infrastructure improvements as well as the public transportation upon which thousands of County residents depend on daily.

DOR has not provided a clear response to repeated requests by Richland County Council for proof of the legal authority that the state tax collector has to withhold the funds it is collecting. The state agency also has, without adequate explanation, singled out Richland County in a manner unlike any of the other counties in South Carolina that collect such a tax.

“Therefore, we must conclude that, despite the absence of legal authority, you are attempting to overturn the Richland County Transportation Penny Program as approved by the voters of the County,” County Council Chairman Torrey Rush said in a letter to DOR Director Rick Reames III. The letter is a unified response by the County Council in defense of its residents and taxpayers.

The County has issued more than \$50 million in debt as part of the \$450 million in planned projects to be funded by the sales tax penny approved by voters in 2012. The County’s credit rating, the projects that have already contracted or are planned, and the jobs they have and will create are now at risk because of the department’s unprecedented action.

Along with withholding the County’s funds, the DOR is attempting to force the County to pay for administrative expenses related to the projects outside of the sales tax revenues, a demand that would force either a tax hike or cuts to other vital County services — including the COMET bus system — despite the administrative costs being specifically authorized by the referendum the voters approved.

“The DOR has no obvious authority to tell the County how to spend the people’s money, especially not in a way that is inconsistent with the referendum approved by the citizens. That would be violating the voters’ trust in us, and we’re certainly not going to increase our citizens’ tax burden because of the department’s capricious actions,” Chairman Rush said.

“Because we’re not capitulating to their demands they are putting years of planning and real progress at grave risk,” the Council Chairman added.

Richland County Council will continue to argue its case that the funds should be released.

Updates about penny sales tax program are available at [www.richlandpenny.com](http://www.richlandpenny.com)

Separately, “We also intend to vigorously defend the will of the people of Richland County who approved this sales tax against lawsuits filed by private citizens who are attempting to impose their agenda on this public body,” Chairman Rush said in reference to actions filed by a Greenville businessman in the name of the South Carolina Public Interest Foundation and by a Columbia real estate broker.

“This same out-of-town group has sued the State and local governments across South Carolina over similar issues,” Chairman Rush said.

“They basically dislike local governments and want to substitute their own judgment for those decisions made by people who were elected by the citizens of this County to make these critical decisions,” Chairman Rush added. “We fully expect to prevail.”

##

# RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

## SOUTH CAROLINA

FROM THE DESK OF DISTRICT 7 REPRESENTATIVE TORREY RUSH

May 4, 2016

Rick Reames III, Director  
South Carolina Department of Revenue  
300A Outlet Pointe Blvd  
Post Office Box 125  
Columbia, South Carolina 29214

**Re: Richland County Transportation Penny Program**

Dear Director Reames:

I write in response to your letter of April 27, 2016. As the Chairman of the Richland County Council, I take these matters very seriously. Accordingly, upon receipt of your letter, I called an emergency meeting of the Richland County Council on April 29, 2016, and had subsequent discussions with the County Council on May 3, 2016. This letter represents a unified response of the County Council in defense of our citizens and taxpayers.

We feel like we must defend ourselves because you have singled out Richland County in a manner unlike any of the counties in this State that also collect a Transportation Penny ("Penny"). We have repeatedly requested that you provide us with the legal authority serving as a basis for your positions and actions and, despite those requests, the Department has refused to provide us with that legal authority. So, therefore we must conclude that, despite the absence of legal authority, you are attempting to overturn the Richland County Transportation Penny Program ("Program") as approved by the voters of the County. I remind you that the referendum question included authorization to spend penny proceeds on administrative costs, which you have consistently questioned during this process.

As a County Council, it is our job to maintain the covenant with our voters: we must not deviate from the referendum question. If we were to abide by your requests, we would be forced to pay administrative costs from the County's General Fund, which would require us to raise taxes. We cannot impose that kind of burden on our citizens.

We also must defend the County's credit rating, its contractual obligations and the jobs created by the Program. If you refuse to allocate to us the Penny collected in our County, then you put all of these things in great peril. We have issued debt dependent on the Penny, we have signed contracts



# RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

## SOUTH CAROLINA



Mr. Rick Reames, III  
May 4, 2016  
Page Two

dependent on the Penny and many of our citizens are employed in construction positions funded by the Penny.

You have suggested we follow a "uniform standard" that has not been applied to any other county in South Carolina. That is just not reasonable. We follow the standards required by the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB), which is a uniform standard applied to all local governments.

We appreciate your recognition that the COMET bus system is almost totally dependent on the receipt of Penny funds. On behalf of the system and its users, we would not be comfortable relying on your decision regarding what is or is not needed in the way of "emergency funding." Again, we do not believe you have the authority to do so and we must protect our citizens who rely on the system for daily transportation.

It is our duty to protect our citizens and the Richland County Transportation Penny Program. Therefore, we are left with little choice but to pursue our legal options to confirm our position that you do not have the authority to overrule this County Council, our voters or State law.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Torrey Rush".

Torrey Rush  
Chairman



## **b. Motion #2:**

### Motion:

The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee (TPAC) requests that at each TPAC meeting an appropriate representative of Richland County make a presentation updating the TPAC on all actions taken by the County to resolve, clarify, or refute allegations made by the DOR in its December 3, 2016 letter to the County, and in subsequent related communications. *Explanation/Background:* Citizens of Richland County expect the TPAC to monitor the implementation of the Transportation Penny Program, including administration of Penny Tax revenue. In light of the South Carolina Department of Revenue's letter of December 3, 2015 to the County, and subsequent related letters, it is necessary for the TPAC to be fully informed about ongoing developments to resolve, clarify, or refute the DOR allegations.

### Status:

Included in this agenda you will find the Council Actions Report from the Regular Session Council Meeting held May 3, 2016. Included in that report are the most recent actions Council has approved as it relates to DOR.



**RICHLAND COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT**  
Office of the County Administrator

**Council Actions Report  
Regular Session Council Meeting  
May 3, 2016  
6:00PM**

**Call to Order:** Rush

**Invocation:** Jeter

**Pledge of Allegiance:** Jeter

**Approval of Minutes**

- a. **Regular Session: April 19, 2016:** Approved as published.
- b. **Zoning Public Hearing: April 26, 2016:** Approved as published.

**Adoption of Agenda:** Adopted as amended. Item 29, Finance Department: Departments Projected to be over budget for FY16, was moved to item 23a. The Report of the Search Committee was added to the agenda under the Report of the Chair. The language of item 24 was updated to reflect the language included in the public hearing for this item.

**Report of the Attorney for Executive Sessions Items:**

- a. **Department of Revenue Update**
- b. **Report of the Search Committee**

**Citizen's Input:** One person spoke.

**Report of the County Administrator:**

- a. **Richland 101 Graduation:** Beverly Harris, Director of the County Public Information Office, presented information to Council regarding the success of the Richland 101 program and the graduating Class of Spring 2016. Two of the graduates (Suzanne Wright and Sabrina Todd) provided their reflections on the class to Council.
- b. **Public Work Proclamation:** Ismail Ozbek, Director of the County Public Works Department, was presented with a Proclamation from Council honoring the Public Works Department for their efforts and recent achievements.

**Report of the Clerk of Council:**





# RICHLAND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the County Administrator

- a. **REMINDER: Budget Work Sessions: May 5 - General Fund; May 12 - Special Revenue, Enterprise, and Millage Agencies; May 17 – Grants:** Ms. Onley reminded Council of the upcoming Budget Work Sessions on May 5 (General Fund), May 12 (Special Revenue, Enterprise and Millage Agencies) and May 17 (Grants).
- b. **REMINDER: Lower Richland (District 10) Budget Input/Town Hall Meeting, May 11, 6:00 PM, Hopkins Park:** Ms. Onley reminded Council of the Lower Richland (District 10) Budget Input/Town Hall Meeting on May 11<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 PM at Hopkins Park.
- c. **Black Pages Funding Request:** Council denied this request. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL, FINANCE, GRANTS**

## Report of the Chair:

- a. **Report of the Search Committee:** Executive Session item.

Ms. Dixon thanked the County Departments for their participation and support of Denim Day.

## Open/Close Public Hearings

- a. **An Ordinance Amending the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 General Fund Annual Budget to appropriate \$62,751 of General Fund Balance to fund the costs for Board of Voter Registration & Elections Commission associated to conduct the Special Election(s) for the vacated District 10 Seat.** No one spoke.

## 1. Approval of Consent Items

- a. **An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 2, Administration; Article VII. Boards, Commissions and Committees; Section 2- 332. Boards, Commissions and Committees Created; Subsection (L), Richland County Business Service Center Appeals Board; Paragraph (2), Membership; so as to revise the membership requirements of the Business Service Center Appeals Board:** Council gave second reading approval to the ordinance amendment. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL, LEGAL, BUSINESS SERVICE CENTER, ADMINISTRATION**
- b. **Sonoco Recycling Agreement for Professional Services:** Council awarded the renegotiated recycling contract to Sonoco Recycling, effective (retroactively) April 1, 2016. **ACTION: FINANCE, SOLID WASTE, PROCUREMENT, LEGAL**



**RICHLAND COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT**  
Office of the County Administrator

- c. **Petition to Close Hastings Alley in Olympia:** Council approved the request to close Hastings Alley. **ACTION: PUBLIC WORKS, LEGAL, EMERGENCY SERVICES, PLANNING**
  
- d. **Petition to Close Portion of Jilda Drive:** Council approved the request to close Jilda Drive. **ACTION: PUBLIC WORKS, LEGAL, EMERGENCY SERVICES, PLANNING**
  
- e. **Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Forest Acres for Inspections of Commercial Structures:** Council approved the agreement between the City of Forest Acres and Richland County to partner in the provision of required building code inspections. Staff will amend the agreement to reflect that expenses for staff time, material, and legal costs (if any) relative to the agreement will be invoiced to the City of Forest Acres and shall be reimbursed by the City of Forest Acres within 30 days of being invoiced by the County. **ACTION: LEGAL, BUILDING SERVICES, FINANCE, CLERK OF COUNCIL**
  
- f. **Resolution Regarding the Assessment of Vehicles for Taxation Purposes:** Council directed staff to send a letter to the County's legislative delegation requesting that they propose legislation to amend the South Carolina State Code of Laws, Section 12-37-2680; determination of assessed value of vehicles to allow for the use of the "black book" value as determined on a quarterly basis as the method of assessing the value of vehicles for taxation purposes. **ACTION: ADMINISTRATION**
  
- g. **Emergency Services Department – Fire Tanker Truck Purchase:** Council awarded the bid to Spartan (Pierce) for four (4) demo/stock tankers in the amount of \$886,052. **ACTION: FINANCE, EMERGENCY SERVICES, LEGAL, PROCUREMENT**
  
- h. **Conservation Department - Conservation Easement Acquisition Costs:** Council approved the request to pay \$2,591.17 for the partial costs of acquiring two conservation easements providing landowner incentives to permanently protect 311 acres of streams, wetlands and forestland for future environmental and economic benefits. **ACTION: CONSERVATION, FINANCE, PROCUREMENT, LEGAL**
  
- i. **Conservation Department - County Acquisition of Forfeited Land Parcel:** Council approved the transfer of parcel R16907- 03-08 from the Forfeited Land Commission to Richland County. **ACTION: CONSERVATION, FINANCE, LEGAL, SUPPORT SERVICES**



**RICHLAND COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT**  
Office of the County Administrator

- j. County Administration Building and County Public Health Building Flooring**  
**Contract:** Council approved the contract with O'Neal Flooring in an amount not to exceed \$653,167 to provide labor and materials needed to remove the existing flooring in the County Administration and Health Buildings and replace with new flooring materials. **ACTION: FINANCE, LEGAL, SUPPORT SERVICES, PROCUREMENT, CAPITAL PROJECTS**
- k. Council Motion Regarding the Human Resources Director reporting to the County Administrator:** Council postponed any amendments to the County's organizational chart until the new County Administrator is hired. **ACTION: ADMINISTRATION, HUMAN RESOURCES**

**2. Third Reading Items**

- a. An Ordinance Amending the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 General Fund Annual Budget to appropriate \$62,751 of General Fund Balance to fund the costs for Board of Voter Registration & Elections Commission associated to conduct the Special Election(s) for the vacated District 10 Seat:** Council deferred this item to the May 17, 2016 Council meeting. **ACTION: LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL, FINANCE, ELECTIONS**

**3. First Reading Items**

- a. An Ordinance Authorizing the issuance and sale of not to exceed \$29,000,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2016A, or such other appropriate series designation, of Richland County, South Carolina; fixing the form and details of the bonds; delegating to the County Administrator certain authority related to the bonds; providing for the payment of the bonds and the disposition of the proceeds thereof; and other matters relating thereto:** Council gave first reading approval to the ordinance. **ACTION: LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL, FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION**
- b. An Ordinance Authorizing the issuance and sale of not to exceed \$15,500,000 Broad River Sewer System General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2016B, or such other appropriate series designation, of Richland County, South Carolina; fixing the form and details of the bonds; delegating to the County Administrator certain authority related to the bonds; providing for the payment of the bonds and the disposition of the proceeds thereof; and other matters relating thereto:** Council gave first reading approval to the ordinance. **ACTION: LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL, FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION, UTILITIES**



# RICHLAND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the County Administrator

- c. **An Ordinance to raise revenue, make appropriations, and adopt a budget for Richland County, South Carolina for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2016 and ending June 30, 2017:** Council gave first reading approval by title only to the ordinance. **ACTION: LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL, FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION**
- d. **An Ordinance Authorizing the levying of ad valorem property taxes, which, together with the prior year's carryover and other State levies and any additional amount appropriated by the Richland County Council prior to July 1, 2016, will provide sufficient revenues for the operations of Richland County Government during the period from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017:** Council gave first reading approval by title only to the ordinance. **ACTION: AUDITOR, ASSESSOR, TREASURER, FINANCE, LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL, ADMINISTRATION**

## 4. Report of Administration & Finance Committee

- a. **Finance Department: Departments Projected to be over budget for FY16:** Council gave first reading approval to the budget amendment in the amount of \$1,528,000. Council requested clarity from the Magistrate regarding the costs / savings associated with the operation of the 24 hour bond court. **ACTION: FINANCE, CORONER, DETENTION CENTER, CLERK OF COUNCIL, LEGAL, MAGISTRATE**
- b. **Council Motion Regarding Hospitality Tax Revenue:** Council approved to proceed with working with our legislative delegation to widen the scope of allowable uses of Hospitality Tax revenues to provide the County with greater flexibility, which could prove useful in funding other items not specifically outlined in the current legislation. **ACTION: ADMINISTRATION**
- c. **Conservation Department: Project Agreement with City of Columbia for Owens Field Park Construction:** Council approved the transfer of \$240,065 from the Conservation and Stormwater Department budgets as well as \$170,000 of SCDHEC reimbursable funds to the City of Columbia for construction of the Owens Field Park project, contingent upon Legal review and approval of an agreement with the City of Columbia for the construction of Owens Field Park. **ACTION: LEGAL, CONSERVATION, FINANCE, PROCUREMENT**
- d. **Council Motion Regarding the Release of Funds:** Council approved the release of funds, in an amount up to \$62,400, being held in the Stormwater fund balance to be allocated for the dredging of silt from Lake Katherine. Any use of these funds for a collaborative effort to dredge the Lake must be done pursuant to an intergovernmental



**RICHLAND COUNTY  
GOVERNMENT**  
Office of the County Administrator

agreement between the parties involved. **ACTION: LEGAL, PUBLIC WORKS,  
FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION**

**5. Report of Economic Development Committee**

- a. **Developing a Multi-County Park with Fairfield County; Authorizing the execution and delivery of an agreement governing the Multi-County Park; Authorizing the inclusion of certain property located in Richland County in the Multi-County Park; Authorizing the execution of an intergovernmental agreement; and other related matters:** Council gave first reading approval by title only to the ordinance. **ACTION: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AUDITOR, ASSESSOR, TREASURER, FINANCE, LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL**
- b. **Authorizing the conversion of a 1996 Fee in Lieu of ad valorem taxes arrangement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Bose Corporation and other matters related thereto:** Council gave first reading approval to the ordinance. **ACTION: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AUDITOR, ASSESSOR, TREASURER, FINANCE, LEGAL, CLERK OF COUNCIL**

**6. Report of Rules & Appointments Committee**

**a. Notification of Appointments**

- i. **Animal Care Advisory Committee:** Council voted to appoint Tracy Wales and Nicole Howland. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL**
- ii. **Board of Assessment Appeals:** Council voted to re-appoint John Kososki. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL**
- iii. **Board of Zoning Appeals:** Council voted to re-appoint Frank Richardson and to appoint Jason C. McLees. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL**

**7. Report of the Ordinance Review Committee**

- a. **An Ordinance Amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 26, Land Development; Article VI, Supplemental Use Standards; Section 26- 152, Special Exceptions; Subsection (d), Standards; Paragraph (22), Radio, Television and Other Transmitting Towers; Subparagraph c.; Clause 1; so as to amend the setback requirements for towers abutting residentially zoned parcels:** Council gave first reading approval to the ordinance amendment. **ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL, LEGAL, PLANNING**



# RICHLAND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the County Administrator

8. **Citizen's Input:** One person spoke.

9. **Other Items**

10. **Executive Session**

- a. **Department of Revenue Update:** Council authorized the Richland County legal representative to take whatever steps are necessary including litigation to protect the Transportation Penny. The vote to reconsider failed. **ACTION: LEGAL, TRANSPORTATION, ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE**

Council approved that if the funds are withheld by the Department of Revenue, the County will set aside \$50.9M of the available penny funding to pay the bond participation note, if needed, in October 2016. The vote to reconsider failed. **ACTION: LEGAL, TRANSPORTATION, ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE**

- b. **Report of the Search Committee:** Council approved engaging the Mercer Group to conduct a search for a new County Administrator. **ACTION: LEGAL, ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE, PROCUREMENT, HUMAN RESOURCES**

11. **Motion Period:**

- a. **I move that Council consider approving the following HOAs: (1) Cary Lake [District 8]; (2) Beaver Dam [District 9]; (3) Lower Rocky Ford [District 6]; and (4) Lake Dogwood [District 11] to pursue the creation of special tax districts [PEARCE]:** Council sent this item to the D&S Committee. **ACTION: ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE, LEGAL**
- b. **I move that administration put an immediate freeze on all the funding available for the penny tax program on all invoices that have not been paid. Only funding for operations for staff should be used. The SLBE office at this point should be fully staffed and be ready for full operation to ensure compliance from the PDT and any other company doing business under the program. All contracts pertaining to the Penny Tax Program should be frozen immediately. Failure from staff to carry out council's directive on hiring qualified staff immediately should be terminated. Note: Richland County cannot continue to run a penny tax program without an office fully staffed with the professionals needed to ensure compliance. Council did give staff directive to fully staff that office and so far staff has refused to carry out council's wishes. [JACKSON]:** Council sent this item to the A&F Committee.



# RICHLAND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Office of the County Administrator

## **ACTION: PROCUREMENT, ADMINISTRATION, TRANSPORTATION, HUMAN RESOURCES**

- c. **Any Richland County Department that perceives a budget shortfall needs to advise Administrative staff immediately of that potential problem. When the item appears on a committee agenda it must do so with all backup / justification materials and a representative that department must be present at every meeting to respond to questions that may be asked. [MALINOWSKI]: Council sent this item to the A&F Committee. ACTION: ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE**
  
- d. **I am requesting a resolution be presented to the Capital City / Lake Murray Country Visitor group in recognition of their 35 years of serving Richland County and the Midlands. [MALINOWSKI]: Council unanimously approved the Resolution. ACTION: CLERK OF COUNCIL**

**12. Adjournment:** Council adjourned at approximately 8:21PM.

**TRANSPORTATION PENNY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2016  
RICHLAND PENNY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TEAM OFFICE  
201 ARBOR LAKE DRIVE, COLUMBIA SC**



***In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.***

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Hayes Mizell, Carol Kososki, Murray Coleman, Trevor Bowers, Bill Wiseman, Frank Anderson, J. T. McLawhorn, Virginia Sanders, Dorothy Sumter, Philip Simoneaux, Councilman Paul Livingston, and Councilman Norman Jackson

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Tony Edwards, Shawn Salley, Michelle Onley, Brenda Parnell, Tony McDonald and Kristen Hutto

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

**CITIZEN'S INPUT**

No one signed up to speak.

**UPDATE ON COUNCIL ACTIONS**

Mr. Edwards stated Council approved the 2016 Bikeway and Sidewalk Project recommendations on April 5<sup>th</sup> and the Resurfacing Package H on April 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Livingston stated there is an upcoming Transportation Penny Ad Hoc Committee. He will direct staff to forward a meeting notice to the TPAC Committee members. The TPA C Committee recommendations will be placed on the agenda for further discussion.

**AUDIT UPDATE**

Mr. Mizell stated the purpose of this item is to get information regarding the ongoing audits.

Mr. Driggers stated the scope of the audit has been completed with Elliot Davis. The scope has been provided to Council for review. Council comments are due back by the end of the week. Once the comments have been received, staff will ready to move forward.



Mr. Driggers further stated from a financial perspective staff believes the audit of the transportation funds is included in the annual audit. This audit is more programmatic.

Mr. McDonald stated the County is continuing to work with the Department of Revenue.

Mr. McLawthorn thanked staff for their continued work on this matter.

#### **THE COMET**

Dr. Schneider stated in respect to auditing there is a couple of key components related to the COMET:

- Receive Federal, State and local dollars
- Obligated to follow Federal guidelines for all Federal procurements
- Every 3 years an intensive audit is conducted by the Federal Transit Administration
- State of South Carolina also conducts an audit
- FTA conducted a Performance & Management review in 2012
- FTA conducted a Procurement Oversight in Summer 2014
- A transactional review is conducted by an external auditor
- Do not have sole source contracts
- \$2.665 million goes to para-transit service
- \$13.690 allocated to the Penny Transportation Program
- The Board meets every other month
- The committees meet monthly
- Projected ridership of 2.5 million this year; 16% increase

Ms. Kososki requested an in depth audit/financial report from the COMET.

Mr. McLawhorn requested County staff to meet with the COMET staff to compile an audit report for the TPAC Committee members.

#### **SMALL LOCAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM**

Ms. Parnell gave a brief overview of the Small Local Business Enterprise Program.

Ms. Sanders inquired about the additional staff needed for the office. In addition, she inquired as to who tracks the overruns on the contracts.

Ms. Parnell stated Administration would have to address the job vacancies. The overruns come from the work authorizations and are approved by the Transportation Department.

Mr. Edwards is to request Mr. Perry provide a written response to the issue of the overruns listed in the monthly report.

**Transportation Penny Advisory Committee**

**April 25, 2016**

**Page Three**

Mr. McDonald stated the matter of hiring the additional personnel has been put on hold until the issue with the Department of Revenue has been resolved.

Ms. Sanders inquired about drafting of the RFPs.

Mr. McDonald stated the RFPs are drafted by the Procurement Department.

Mr. David Beatty expounded upon Mr. McDonald's response. The PDT does some of the design preparation, which they are under contract for. When the projects are ready to go to design teams (Dirt Road and the 5 On-Call), County staff assigns the projects to those teams.

**FEBRUARY/MARCH 2016 PROGRESS REPORT**

Ms. Kososki thanked staff for the improvements to the progress report this month.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**January 25, 2016** – The minutes were approved unanimously.

**MOTIONS**

Mr. Mizell requested that any committee members that wishes to make a motion to do so in writing; therefore, there is an accurate record of the motion.

**Ms. Kososki's Motions**

**Motion #1:** The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee requests that beginning in April 2016, the Committee will regularly receive payment information for all Transportation Penny entities.

**Explanation/ Background** – The TPAC currently receives payment information only for certified firms (Exhibit A of the Bi-Weekly Report), not non-certified firms. For example, payments to M B Kahn, Lane Construction, Sloan, C R Jackson, etc. do not appear on any exhibits. This prevents the TPAC from understanding total payments. The TPAC receives payment information on certified firms that have lower award amount, but does not receive information on non-certified firms with much larger award amounts.

Ms. Kososki moved, seconded by Ms. Sanders, to approve the recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Motion #2:** The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee requests a written explanation of why Transportation Penny payments to certified firms are (a) allowed to exceed their award limits and (b) once exceeded, why they are allowed to continue exceeding their award limits.

**Explanation/Background:** Exhibit A of the December 11, 2015 report shows the total award to

**Transportation Penny Advisory Committee**

**April 25, 2016**

**Page Four**

Brownstone at \$3,176,133. Total payments in this December report to Brownstone are \$3,498,971.21. The January 22, 2016 report shows payments to Brownstone at \$3,507,945.26 with no change in award amount. Again in the February 22, 2016 report, payments increased to \$3,745,315.84 with no change in award amount. A second example is Campbell Consulting. The December 11, 2015 and January 22, 2016 reports show payments of \$330,624.56 with an award amount of \$325,110. Then in the February 22, 2016 report, Campbell received total payments of \$356,592.06 with no change in the award amount of \$325,110.

The committee debated when an overage in a contract (3%, 5%, etc.) should be brought to the committee's attention.

Ms. Kososki moved, seconded by Mr. Coleman, to approve the recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Mr. Hayes Motions**

**Motion #1:** The Transportation Advisory Committee (TPAC) requests that the Richland County Administrator routinely provide the TPAC with copies of written communications from or to the South Carolina Department of Revenue (DOR) regarding DOR allegations set forth in its December 3, 2015 letter to the County, and in subsequent related letters.

Mr. Mizell moved, seconded by Mr. Wiseman, to approve the recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Motion #2:** The Transportation Penny Advisory Committee (TPAC) requests that at each TPAC meeting an appropriate representative of Richland County make a presentation updating the TPAC on all actions taken by the County to resolve, clarify, or refute allegations made by the DOR in its December 3, 2016 letter to the County, and in subsequent related communications. *Explanation/Background:* Citizens of Richland County expect the TPAC to monitor the implementation of the Transportation Penny Program, including administration of Penny Tax revenue. In light of the South Carolina Department of Revenue's letter of December 3, 2015 to the County, and subsequent related letters, it is necessary for the TPAC to be fully informed about ongoing developments to resolve, clarify, or refute the DOR allegations.

Mr. Mizell moved, seconded by Mr. Wiseman, to approve the recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, MAY 23, 2016 AT 5:30 PM**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:45 p.m.