

GREENVILLE COUNTY COUNCIL

OVERSIGHT AD HOC COMMITTEE

September 11, 2025

5:07 p.m.

Committee Meeting Room

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of the meeting date, time, place, and agenda was posted online and on the bulletin board at County Square and made available to the newspapers, radio stations, television stations, and concerned citizens.

Committee Members Present:

Kelly Long, *Chairwoman*
Garey Collins, *Vice-Chairman*
Steve Shaw
Frank Farmer

Committee Members Absent:

Curt McGahhey

Staff Present:

Ted Lambrecht, *Deputy County Administrator*
Chris Antley, *County Attorney*
Regina McCaskill, *Clerk to Council*
Terrence Galloway, *Information Systems*

Others Present:

None

Call to Order:

Chairwoman Long

Innovation:

Councilor Farmer

Item (3)

County Performance Evaluation – Phase I / Selection of Departments

Chairwoman Long stated the purpose of the meeting was to continue the discussion of the proposed County Performance Evaluation and prioritize departments for the initial audit. During the previous meeting, the committee developed a “short list” of items to discuss. She stated Councilor Shaw had been unable to attend that meeting and she wanted to give him the opportunity to speak.

Councilor Shaw stated there was great public interest and demand to obtain an audit of the County Square project, including the new Greenville County Administration buildings. It was important to get a good audit or a good report of “all the dollars in and dollars out.” Mr. Shaw stated that, if approved, his motion would be the first step in obtaining information for some type of oversight, not necessarily by the committee, to provide an exact picture of the project, including the bonds involved, financing, and all other aspects of the project. He stated the public was demanding the information.

Action:

Councilor Shaw moved to authorize an outside audit of the County Square Redevelopment Project, including, but not limited to, the new County Square buildings, grounds, commercial and residential proposed development, and specifically the following:

1. A listing of all the checks or disbursements, whether paper or electronic, including the check number, the date, the vendor, and the amount.
2. Complete contracts for public review; any and all contractors and vendors.
3. A complete accounting of all bond payments, including the source account the bond was paid from.

Motion carried.

Chairwoman Long stated that the committee spent a great deal of time during the most recent meeting discussing the initiation of the performance evaluation process with the Sheriff's Office and EMS, examining efficiencies, and exploring possible ways to save money in those departments. She stated that Mr. Kernell had mentioned those two departments would be a good place to start, due to the high number of employees.

Councilor Collins stated he was comfortable starting the process with those two departments and would be glad to make a motion. He asked if the intent was to evaluate the Sheriff's Office as a whole, or just particular departments.

Chairwoman Long stated there was "no right or wrong answer", but the committee had discussed evaluating those employees directly under the Sheriff, along with EMS, not all of Public Safety.

Councilor Collins stated the Sheriff's Office and EMS were the two largest departments in the County. He stated it was important to be specific when designating departments to be evaluated. His research had revealed there may be one company that could evaluate both.

Action: Councilor Collins moved to initiate the performance evaluation process by evaluating the Sheriff's Office and EMS.

Councilor Collins suggested a focus on staffing, particularly with the Sheriff's Office. He stated it was important to determine if staffing was based on geography, the number of new homes being built, or simply the budget. It appeared as if the amount budgeted was currently the determining factor.

Motion as presented carried.

Councilor Shaw inquired about the next step in the process.

Chairwoman Long stated the next step depended on which departments were audited. For instance, the Sheriff's Office and EMS may be affiliated, and one company could perform both audits; however, the County Square Project audit would likely require a separate company. She stated there may be one company that could do all of them. Ms. Long stated the committee would need to develop a list of specific things to be audited.

Councilor Collins asked Mr. Antley if each department required a separate RFP.

Mr. Antley stated he was only able to provide a legal perspective. The requests would need to comply with the procurement ordinance. In considering the logistics of how the process would unfold, the answer should come through the administrative channels, likely from the Procurement Director. He stated the procurement process was mandatory for large contracts.

Chairwoman Long stated that the next items to be discussed were Road Money, FILOTS, and the Road Maintenance Fee. She had received several emails about both of those items. Councilor Long stated they could possibly be part of the initial audit. She stated the following should be addressed:

1. Where did the road money from the State come from, and where did it go once the County received it? What were those funds used for?
2. Where did the road money from FILOTS go? How was it being utilized? Did it go into the Infrastructure Bank?
3. Where did the \$25 Road Maintenance Fee go, and what was it used for?

Councilor Shaw asked if there was current litigation regarding the Road Maintenance Fee.

Mr. Antley stated the Road Maintenance Fee was re-implemented per state law. The statute was amended, but several counties were still involved in the appeal process. The ruling affected the entire state. Some of the counties would go bankrupt without that fee.

Mr. Antley stated it was important for the committee to stay within the agenda. Any potential motion about something other than a performance review should have been noticed on the agenda. For instance, the committee could request financial audits; however, they were not on the current agenda. He stated that he was concerned a vote on that type of issue might violate FOIA.

Chairwoman Long stated it depended on how the committee looked at tracking money coming in from various entities and how it flowed through the County. She asked Mr. Antley to suggest the correct way for the committee to obtain that information.

Mr. Antley stated the request to obtain that type of information may be a performance evaluation of a specific department, such as the Finance Department. He stated that most of the documentation Councilor Long was referring to was tracked through various documents available for the committee's review. Mr. Antley stated that it was his understanding that the performance reviews would concentrate on how resources were being allocated, specifically in terms of factors such as the number of employees and how departments were operating, either from an efficiency standpoint or other relevant matrices. Determining specific information about fees appeared to be more of a traditional financial audit.

Chairwoman Long stated she felt tracking those funds would be considered a performance review, ensuring the monies were used for their intended purpose.

Mr. Antley stated that, as Ms. Long was the chair of the committee, it was her decision. His intent was to ensure they were staying within state law.

Mr. Lambrecht stated that information could be pulled from the County's financial system. The committee may want to have staff compile that information, rather than including it in the performance review. He stated all the money was accounted for.

Chairwoman Long stated that she understood, but simply reviewing the information supplied by staff was not an audit. She stated that the purpose was to have a third party perform the audit to ensure funds were going where they were supposed to, and to inform the public. She stated the public did not know how the performance evaluations were to be carried out, and they certainly did not know about laws. Ms. Long stated the performance evaluation would be an informative tool to show how the County's systems were set up and how they were being run.

Mr. Antley stated he wanted to remind the committee that anything they approved would be reported out to full Council for a vote.

Councilor Shaw stated it appeared the answers to his motion could be found in the Finance Department. He asked if he needed to recall his motion for an amendment, as he wanted to add, specifically, that it appeared that the answers could be found in that department. Mr. Shaw stated he did not know if that should be mentioned or supplementally included, as he did not indicate a specific department, and the agenda indicated selection of departments.

Mr. Antley advised Mr. Shaw that if he wanted to designate a specific department, his original motion would have to be reconsidered; however, he could move to amend the original motion.

Councilor Shaw stated he wanted to reconsider his original motion in order to amend it and add the Department of Finance as the specific department.

Action: Councilor Farmer moved to reconsider Councilor Shaw's motion regarding the County Square Redevelopment Project to include the Finance Department as the specific department to be audited.

Motion to reconsider carried.

Action: Councilor Shaw moved to amend his original motion to include the Finance Department as the specific department to be audited.

Motion to amend carried.

Action: Councilor Shaw moved approval of the motion as amended.

Motion as amended carried.

Chairwoman Long stated that if the committee wanted to examine the Road Money and the FILOTs, it appeared the Finance Department would be the appropriate department to audit for that information.

Councilor Shaw stated in terms of the FILOT parameters, GADC would be the department to audit. He asked if GADC was a separate entity or one of the County's departments.

Chairwoman Long asked if those funds went through the Auditor's Office.

Councilor Shaw stated the Auditor's Office administered the FILOT monies.

Councilor Collins stated most of the data regarding the road money and FILOTs was already available; the committee wanted a third party to audit that information. Mr. Kernell could help set that up. He stated it did not appear as if the committee was out of order or violating FOIA, as an efficiency audit could be considered part of a performance audit.

Chairwoman Long stated Mr. Kernell had informed the committee during the previous meeting that 31% of the monies collected from FILOTs stayed with the County, and the remainder was distributed among the taxing entities. The County's portion would be audited as part of the performance evaluation.

Councilor Collins stated that the County's financial policy guidelines explicitly stated where the FILOT money was to be initially allocated. Mr. Collins stated that he had requested a document specifying how the FILOT money was to be distributed; he had not yet received it.

Chairwoman Long asked the committee members to weigh in on the possibility of including the road monies and FILOT funding in the audit.

Councilor Collins stated that he would like to focus on the efficiencies within the Sheriff's Office and EMS; he did not want to become overwhelmed with too much information.

Chairwoman Long asked Mr. Collins if he was saying that he did not want to audit the road money.

Councilor Collins stated he wanted to audit that money; however, he preferred to wait until the Sheriff's Office and EMS had been audited. The Committee could audit the smaller departments later on.

Councilor Farmer agreed with Mr. Collins. He wanted to focus on the Sheriff's Office and EMS initially.

Councilor Collins stated the committee could keep the road money “on the hot seat”. Once the process was initiated with the Sheriff’s Office and EMS, they could then consider other departments. The Sheriff’s Office and EMS audits would provide information that could be used for the next budget cycle.

Item (4) **Public Comment Session**

There were no speakers.

Item (5) **Adjournment**

Action: Councilor Farmer moved to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Jessica M Stone
Deputy Clerk to Council