

County CEO Work Session
WIA Consortium Counties: Clarendon, Kershaw, Lee and Sumter

Wednesday, August 10, 2011 - 9:00 AM
Santee-Lynches Regional Council of Governments
36 West Liberty Street, Sumter, SC 29150

Meeting Minutes

The following were in attendance at the meeting:

- Dwight Stewart, Clarendon County Council Chairman
- Gene Wise, Kershaw County Council Chairman
- Arthur Beasley, Lee County Council Chairman
- Eugene Baten, Sumter County Council Chairman
- Johnathan Bryan, Sumter County Attorney
- Dr. Bill Painter, Santee-Lynches Regional Council of Governments Board Chairman
- Gary Mixon, Sumter County Administrator
- Jim Darby, Santee-Lynches RCOG Executive Director
- Kathy Powell, Santee-Lynches RCOG Finance Director and Deputy Director
- Areatha Clark, Interim Workforce Development A/E Director
- Donna Thames, Workforce Development Administrative Assistant

I. Call to Order

The County Chief Elected Officials (CEOs) Work Session Meeting was called to order at 9:01 AM by Mr. Dwight Stewart, Clarendon County Council Chairman.

II. Approve the Meeting Facilitator (M)

Mr. Stewart made a **motion to appoint Dr. Bill Painter as the Meeting Facilitator for today's meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Arthur Beasley.** There being no discussion; Mr. Stewart called for a vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

III. Adoption of the Agenda (M)

Dr. Bill Painter asked if there were any questions or additions or deletions to the Agenda. Mr. Dwight Stewart made a **motion to approve the adoption of the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gene Wise.** There being no discussion, Dr. Painter called for the vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

Dr. Painter provided a brief history and of the sequence of events between the Santee-Lynches Regional Council of Governments (SLRCOG) and the Santee-Lynches Workforce Investment Board (SLWIB). His briefing covered a period beginning last fall, when the SLWIB voted for the SLRCOG to become the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) One-Stop Operator and to run the One-Stops in the Santee-Lynches region, thru a SLWIB Meeting on May 17, 2011 when the full Board voted to discontinue services with SLRCOG and go out for an RFP for a new One-Stop Operator to provide services at the conclusion of the current contract. [June 30, 2011].

Dr. Painter, as the Chairman of the SLRCOG's Board, on June 20th, 2011 called for a joint meeting between the SLRCOG's Executive Board and the SLWIB's Executive Board. At this meeting, the Committee Members voted to go into Executive Session. All staff was excused from the meeting. The SLRCOG listened to the SLWIB's Executive Committee as they presented their perspective on the sequence of events on that had taken place. They wanted SLRCOG out of the picture. In particular, they wanted one person out of the picture. Dr. Painter went on to explain that at the end of the Joint Meeting, he had no other recourse, based on the Federal law and the COG's current role as the Administrative Entity, but to direct Mr. Jim Darby to contact each of the four Chairmen of the County Councils and call for an "Emergency Meeting" to discuss what the four counties should do as a WIA Consortium. Dr. Painter added that he supported this meeting.

At the "Emergency Meeting" with the CEOs, there was discussion regarding updating the 2002 Consortium Agreement to meet the regulations of the Federal law. Legal advice was recommended and there was a decision to suspend the present WIB Board until the CEOs from Clarendon, Kershaw, Lee and Sumter Counties could make other appointments to the WIB Board. One of the Consortium's members requested putting the process on temporary hold. The decision was made to stop the process. Legal advice was requested. Mr. Johnathan Bryan, Sumter County Attorney, was asked to review the 2002 Agreement and to come back with a revised Agreement and advice on how best to proceed.

Dr. Painter asked if there were any additions, corrections or questions to his brief history report. Mr. Arthur Beasley stated that they did not want to suspend the present SLWIB Board but to stop the meetings. Mr. Eugene Baten added that the CEOs wanted to stop all operations and not the SLWIB Members. There were additional discussions regarding replacing WIB Members. Mr. Baten asked Dr. Painter – "you said that the SLWIB Board asked the SLRCOG to run the One-Stops. Was this as of January 1st, 2011?" Dr. Painter replied "yes" and agreements were drawn up [first a MOA and then a Contract] and signed by both boards. Mr. Baten then questioned Dr. Painter regarding who he was referring to when he stated that the SLWIB Board wanted one person out. Mr. Baten stated that other CEO members may have been present at the joint (COG/WIB) meeting, but he was not and asked if this was confidential information. Dr. Painter responded that the SLWIB Executive Committee Members stated they had lost confidence in the Executive Director of the SLRCOG. Mr. Baten then questioned why they had lost confidence. Was this person not meeting the goals of the One-Stops? Dr. Painter replied that this was a personnel matter and if they wished to discuss it further, and they could, someone would need to make a motion to go into Executive Session. Mr. Baten stated he could wait and suggested they move forward with the agenda items.

There was no other discussion on this Agenda Item.

IV. Proposed New WIA Consortium Agreement (M)

Mr. Johnathan Bryan stated that he had printed the Workforce Investment Act (ACT) that dates back to 1998. He had also prepared excerpts from Title 29 of the U.S. Code/Law and

passed them out to the CEOs. Mr. Bryan also reminded the CEOs that the ACT had had amendments added to it. Mr. Bryan made sure the CEOs had copies of the original WIA Consortium Agreement (2002) and the draft of the new WIA Consortium Agreement (2011), which has been revised to better conform with the Federal law.

A. Review of the 2002 WIA Consortium Agreement:

Mr. Bryan reviewed the 2002 WIA Consortium Agreement and compared it with the Workforce Investment Act and the Federal Law.

- Mr. Bryan stated that Paragraphs 1 and 2 were consistent with Section 2832 of the Federal Law and with Section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). (Reference was made to Section 2832 – Page 13).
- Mr. Bryan read Section 2832, Page 14, (c), (1), (b), (i) – Appointment and Certification of Board – In general in a case in which a local area includes more than 1 unit of general local governments, the Chief Elected Officials (CEOs) of such units may execute an agreement that specifies the respective roles of the individual chief elected officials. **This section provides the need for an agreement.**
- Attention was also brought to (1) – in the appointment of the members of the local board from the individuals
- Paragraph 3 of the original agreement – Consortium Membership – The Chair of the County Council (or his/her designee) of Consortium. **CEOs (Chairman of County Council) are allowed to send a designee.** Dr. Painter asked if the “designee” refers to (sending someone for) meetings. Mr. Bryan replied that the designee does refer to meetings. Mr. Gene Wise asked if the designee could be the County Administrator. Mr. Bryan replied that the CEOs can make the decision among themselves regarding the designee. Mr. Eugene Baten stated that the CEOs are authorizing someone to act on their behalf, but it does not take away the CEOs’ responsibilities.
- Paragraph 4 of the original agreement – Workforce Development Area (WDA) Local Workforce Investment Board (WIB) – reference was made to Section 117 and Section 2832, Page 13, (b), (2) – Composition of the Board. **(Criteria for the Members of the WIB).** In the original agreement, percentages were given based on population of each county.
- Paragraph 5 of the original agreement – Local Workforce Investment Board Officers – Mr. Bryan explained that this is the same as outlined in Section 2832, Page 15.
- Page 2 of the 2002 Consortium Agreement – The Counties shall jointly bear the responsibility for meeting the standards of membership. Membership to the WIB shall be made by appointment of the County Councils In the Law, Page 14 – Section 2832, (c), (B) (I) – **is different from the old agreement.** Mr. Bryan explained that in an area with more than one county, **the CEOs will appoint members to the WIB.** He then referenced (c) (A) that states the CEO is authorized to appoint members of the local boards. He explained that the role of the four CEOs is to appoint members to the WIB. Mr. Bryan stated that in other regions, the County Council Chairmen, not the County Council, appoint the members. (I repositioned where this appears in the sentence to make the intent clearer)

- Mr. Bryan read the terms of appointment and explained that in the new agreement all references to Local Elected Officials (LEO) are changed to state Chief Elected Officials, (CEO).
- Paragraph 6 – Administration – LEOs will be changed to CEOs. The Consortium counties..... shall either establish an administrative unit or contract with the existing administrative unit to carry out the administrative provisions of the WIA legislation. Reference was made to Section 2832, Pages 16-17 – Budget and Administration. (It was noted that it will not relieve the CEOs or the governor of the liability.....)
- Dr. Painter stated that in the State of SC, all areas are not large enough to be considered a workforce development area (WDA) and used the term “balance of the state”. Mr. Darby replied that this does not exist anymore. It was a term used during the JTPA program. All SC Counties as well as some large urban areas are organized as WDAs.
- Mr. Bryan stated that the CEOs will receive the Workforce funds and they will be responsible for them.
- Mr. Gene Wise asked what type of Audit is provided and if the CEOs receive a copy of the audit report.
- Ms. Kathy Powell, Finance Director of SLRCOG, responded that the SLRCOG is audited by an independent auditor each year, as well as SCDEW annually audits the WIA funds. Each County receives a copy of the audit report. Ms. Powell was then asked the history of the audits. She explained that the SLRCOG has received a clean audit, except for one year and the findings were corrected within the next fiscal year.
- Dr. Painter stated that in the 2002 Agreement, the CEOs appointed Santee-Lynches Regional Council of Governments to be the Administrative Entity. However, the Chief Elected Officials of the four county councils may choose to be the Administrative Entity.
- Mr. Arthur Beasley responded that he feels that by serving on the COG’s board, he has some control and responsibility with the COG as the Administrative Entity.
- Paragraph 7 – Grant Recipient – Mr. Bryant explained that the local grant recipient is the Consortium of CEOs. He then read from Page 17, Section III Disbursal – the local grant recipient or an entity designed shall disburse such funds.... Mr. Bryan stated that this will be a change in the new agreement.
- Paragraph 8 – Withdrawal - at least 6 months
- Paragraph 9 – Cooperation - The governing body of each County agrees to cooperate....
- Dr. Painter asked if there were any questions. There were none.

B. Review of the New WIA Consortium Agreement by Mr. Bryan:

Mr. Bryan stated that the new, updated agreement is consistent with the Federal Law and provides both references where the CEOs can review the ACT and the Law.

- #1 – Purpose – Section 116 of the ACT is the same as 2831, Page 9 of the Law – The purpose of forming a multi-county Consortium is to enable jointly the provisions..... as a Local Workforce Investment Area of the WIA. The Governor shall appoint certain areas – i.e. Kershaw, Clarendon, Lee and Sumter Counties - as workforce investment areas.

- #2 – Geographic Service Area – Reference was made to Section 2831, Page 9, (B) – (Governor Hodges was in office during this time).
- #3 – Consortium Memberships – **“Designee” was deleted by the attorney.** Mr. Gene Wise stated there may be times when he would not be able to meet and asked if he could send someone since the designee portion was removed from this section of the agreement. Mr. Johnathan Bryan said this statement could be added back to the new agreement. Mr. Eugene Baten stated he would like to see “designee” added back.
- Dr. Painter asked for a motion if the CEOs wanted to make a change in #3 and add back “designee”. There was discussion to add the language from the old agreement back in the new agreement.
- Dr. Painter then asked if the CEOs wanted to list who the “designee” might be – i.e. Vice Chair, Secretary, etc. There was discussion and it was decided to leave it “generic”.
- **A motion was made by Mr. Eugene Baten to add “his or her designee” back to paragraph #3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gene Wise.** There being no discussion, Dr. Painter called for the vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**
- #4 – Roles and Responsibilities – (A thru D) – Reference was made to Section 2832, Page 17 – under Administration (I) and (II).
- In Section 2832 - Appointments, functions of local boards, local plans, budgets, administration, etc. are outlined.
- Mr. Gene Wise stated he was not comfortable with the term *liability for misuse of funds*, and he did not see this in the original agreement. He asked if this sentence (# a) could be deleted.
- Dr. Painter asked why he wanted this removed. Mr. Wise replied that he did not see the need to re-state the law. Mr. Arthur Beasley stated that he did not want to reinforce the misuse of funds. Dr. Painter asked if this would create a problem. Mr. Bryan explained that this information was included in the new agreement for the CEOs successors (so they would be informed when reading the agreement even if they did not read the law). Mr. Beasley stated that he had confidence in Santee-Lynches’ handling of the WIA program and funds and noted that some of the CEOs, by virtue of their position on SLRCOG’s Board, meet directly with the COG’s Finance Director when serving on the Finance Committee. He stated that none of the CEOs have the time to follow up and we must trust who we have appointed. The key point is to have the right person who will take the responsibility. He further emphasized that all of the CEOs have a right to sit on the COG Board, where they receive feedback from the Finance Director.
- **A motion was made by Mr. Gene Wise to remove Section A under # 4 – Roles and Responsibilities. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dwight Stewart.** Dr. Painter asked if there were any additional discussions. Mr. Wise stated that this information was included to educate future CEOs. Mr. Beasley asked for Mr. Bryan’s opinion. Mr. Bryan stated that the “Law will prevail” and reminded the CEOs that they can inform their successors. Mr. Wise then questioned if the first part of the sentence should remain thru grant recipient..... and delete the remaining part to the sentence. **A motion was made by Mr. Gene Wise to delete the remaining part of the sentence after grant recipient. The**

motion was seconded by Mr. Eugene Baten. Dr. Painter called for a vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.** Dr. Painter then called for a vote on the original motion which would now carry the amended portion. He called for a vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

- **#4 (b)** – The CEOs may designate an Administrative Entity to serve..... (Reference was made to Section 2832, (d), (3), (B), (i), (II), Page 17). Mr. Bryan reminded the CEOs that they have the authority to designate someone.
- Mr. Eugene Baten made a **motion to delete the sentence “Such a designation shall not relieve the CEOs of any liability for misuse of WIA grant funds”.** The motion was seconded by **Mr. Gene Wise.** Dr. Painter asked if there was any discussion. There being no further discussion, Dr. Painter called for a vote. **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Bryan then read the remaining paragraph..... Prior to designating an Administrative Entity to serve as a grant subrecipient, the CEOs will enter into a **separate Roles and Responsibilities Agreement.....**
- **#4 (c) – List of Criteria** – Mr. Bryan stated that there was a change made to appoint the WIB Members by the CEOs rather than the County Councils. He reminded the CEOs that once this agreement is signed, the old contracts will not be valid.
- Dr. Painter emphasized that an appointment to the WIB Board may be from a business industry representative and that member may be transferred or may leave the area. If that occurs, the CEOs will replace that Board Member. Dr. Painter asked if the CEOs were in agreement with the term limits as listed in paragraph 5. Mr. Eugene Baten asked if, when they appoint an individual to the Board, the entire CEOs vote on this member. Mr. Bryan stated “yes”. The nomination of a WIB Member by a CEO will be brought before all four CEOs. Dr. Painter reminded the CEOs that they would need to have a Consortium Meeting, from time to time, for business purposes.
- **#4 (d)** – The CEOs and the local WIB may enter into an agreement that describes the respective roles and responsibilities of the parties as follows: (Same as in Section 2832, Page 17). Mr. Bryan reminded the CEOs that this is what the Law says **How money is received, managed, etc.**
- **#4 (d) (i)** – Subject to the approval of the CEOs, the local board **will develop a budget**
- **#4 (d) (ii)** – Subject to the local WIB is responsible for **selecting one-stop operator...** (Reference to Page 16 of the Law). Mr. Gene Wise asked if the WIB will be making recommendations to the CEOs. Mr. Bryan responded... “this is what the law says”. Mr. Wise replied that the CEOs will need many agreements – i.e. budget, bylaws, etc.
- **#4 (d) (iii)** – Subject to the local WIB is responsible for **developing by-laws...** Mr. Bryan reported that the Law does not state this. This paragraph was developed by Mr. Darby and Mr. Bryan to allow the CEOs to proceed. Mr. Dwight Stewart asked if the WIB will be subject to the Employment Freedom Act. Mr. Bryan responded that this can be added. Mr. Stewart stated that voting by email is a concern of his. Again Mr. Bryan stated that this can be added/clarified in the By-Laws that are developed.

- Dr. Painter questioned if the By-Laws are to be established by the WIB or CEOs. Mr. Bryan responded that the WIB will establish the By-Laws, but they are subject to the approval of the CEOs.
- **#4 (d) (iv)** – The local WIB shall **report quarterly in writing** to the Consortium CEOs **regarding its progress provide annual briefings**
- Dr. Painter asked what the A/E's role is. Mr. Bryan replied that this would be discussed shortly. Dr. Painter stated that the WIB Members are volunteers.
- Dr. Painter reminded the CEOs that the A/E Staff is going to work with the CEOs and the WIB. There was a question if there is a process and Mr. Bryan responded “yes”. He stated that a chart diagram could be developed with the CEOs at the top. He reminded them that everything goes back to the CEOs. Dr. Painter stated that if the CEOs choose to enter into a contract with the Administrative Entity, the A/E Staff would report information back to the CEOs. Mr. Baten asked about the conflict between the WIB Members and the RFP. Did the WIB have the right to go out for an RFP? The Board is made up of private and public sector (51%/49%). Do they think that because they are made up of 51% private, they have the right? Dr. Painter referred this question to Mr. Bryan, who responded. The WIB has the right to request a RFP in search of a provider. They can request the A/E Staff to handle the “leg work” and then receive approval by the WIB Board or Executive Board. Once the RFP bids come in, the bids must be “rated and ranked by a Committee” and then a recommendation will be made to the CEOs as the Consortium. Dr. Painter added that the WIB does have the authority, if the CEOs approve. Mr. Baten then asked if the CEOs must enter into an agreement with WIB Board. Dr. Painter replied that the WIB will bring a recommendation to the CEOs. . (Reference is made to Section (d) (ii) of the new agreement – Subject to the agreement of the CEO....)
- Dr. Painter asked the CEOs to refer to the timeline and provided the sequence of events that have taken place: A/E Staff prepared the RFP at the request of the WIB, public announcements were made, ads in the newspapers, bidding conference held for offerors to ask questions, bid(s) received on August 4th; rating and ranking committee to rate and rank proposals individually and then will make a recommendation thru the A/E Entity (SLRCOG) to the WIB Executive Board and the full Workforce Investment Board. The WIB will in turn submit their recommendations to the CEOs for approval. This is the process in place. The CEOs have the final approval. Mr. Baten replied that “this is not what it is sayingsubject to the agreement”. Dr. Painter replied that this is a process of submitting bids and if we prepare the agreement, the Consortium will state that the CEOs have the final word.
- Mr. Baten questioned why on Page 2 of the revised agreement under (d) (i), the word approval is used in lieu of agreement. “Subject to the approval of the CEOs.....Mr. Bryan responded that in the law, Section 2841, Page 24, the CEOs could reference what the Federal Government states.
- Dr. Painter stated the in the revised By-Laws, [referring to the previous discussion re: By-Laws], the process and procedures will be included in regards to RFPs.
- Mr. Bryan stated that there are 2-parts of the agreement: Procedures regarding the RFP and the decision process.

- There were additional discussions on adding this in the By-Laws and Mr. Bryan explained that this process is different from the Local Government Planning Commission process with which the CEOs might be more familiar. Here, there is a Board and the CEOs.
- **#5** – LWIB was deleted and replaced with WIB. It was explained that if there is a member on the Board who is not acting appropriately the CEOs can take them off the Board. Dr. Painter re-emphasized that the term is for a three-year term. Mr. Baten asked if there should be a statement added that a member has to be appointed after the first three years. Dr. Painter asked if Mr. Baten wanted to add (2) 3-year terms, and then have new Board Members, but there may be a situation when someone needs to stay or be replaced. Mr. Bryan stated a term limit clause can be added if the CEOs want to hold someone over. Mr. Beasley responded that in the smaller counties there may not be someone looking to serve on the Board. Dr. Painter repeated what Mr. Beasley was stating that Mr. Beasley liked having an option. Mr. Bryan added that wording could be added to indicate a term of 3 years or unless stipulated by the CEOs or until a predecessor is appointed.
- **A motion was made by Mr. Dwight Stewart and seconded by Mr. Arthur Beasley to add “or until his/her successor is appointed”:** The motion was approved unanimously.
- **A second motion was made by Mr. Eugene Baten and seconded by Mr. Gene Wise to change the word from “may” to “will”.** The terms of appointment will be for three (3) years..... The motion was approved unanimously.
- Ms. Kathy Powell questioned if you appoint all members now, the terms will not be staggered as stipulated in the agreement. Mr. Bryan stated that some of the members will be asked to serve 1 year, some 2 years and the rest for 3 years.
- Mr. Gene wise then asked if he could only appoint members from Kershaw County. Mr. Jim Darby stated that the language in the agreement states that the four CEOs will collectively approve the WIB members and a process should be made clear. Mr. Bryan referred everyone to the new agreement, paragraph (4) (c). Mr. Beasley responded that in the smaller counties, there are only certain categories ... we need clarification Functional groups of representation. (Reference was made to Section 2832, Page 14, (4) Majority and Composition of the Board on Page 13). Mr. Bryan informed the CEOs that they would have to refer to both documents.
- Dr. Painter referred back to the revised agreement #4 (c) and read “The local Workforce Investment Board Membership..... state criteria established under Section 117 (b) Mr. Darby added that nominations will come to the CEOs to vote on. Mr. Bryan stated that some nominations will come from businesses or the Chamber of Commerce, etc. In the past, nominations have been provided by the WIA A/E Staff per Mr. Darby following the Federal guidelines.
- **#6 – Total membership of 36.** The information provided in the revised agreement came from the Census. No questions were asked.
- **#7 – Grant Recipient** – Statement was read. No questions were asked.
- **#8 - Withdrawal** – Mr. Bryan stated that this was similar to the existing document. No questions were asked.
- **#9 – Cooperation** - Statement was read. No questions were asked.

- **#10 – Amendments** - Statement was read. No questions were asked.
- Dr. Painter asked the CEOs if there were in a position to move forward since they had made revisions to the Consortium Agreement. Mr. Gene Wise stated that he could not sign until his County Attorney reviewed the agreement. Mr. Arthur Beasley agreed.
- Mr. Bryan stated that there is “NO Agreement until all four CEOs sign”. He added that the CEOs needed to vote on the changes made today.
- **Mr. Dwight Stewart made a motion to approve the new Consortium Agreement and changes pending approval by each County’s legal authority. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gene Wise. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**
- Mr. Bryan was asked if the revised document would be emailed to the CEOs and their local government’s legal counsel. Mr. Bryan responded “YES”.

V. Roles and Responsibilities Agreement (M)

Mr. Johnathan Bryan asked if there were any questions regarding the Roles and Responsibility document? Mr. Bryan then asked a question about “**SC Works**”. Mr. Darby responded that this is the new brand name the State has adopted to market the One-Stop operations; the name has been changed. Whoever is elected to operate the One-Stops will operate under “**SC Works**”. Mr. Darby added that the Consortium Agreement would need to be in place and signed prior to reviewing the “Roles and Responsibilities” agreement. Dr. Painter asked the CEOs to read this document and study. Mr. Bryan added that if the CEOs would read Section 2832 of the Law in its entirety, they would understand the roles and responsibilities. Mr. Bryan then asked to be excused for another appointment. Dr. Painter thanked him for his time and efforts.

VI. Timeline RFP One-Stop Operator Selection Process

Dr. Painter explained the importance of the timeline and the sequence of events as of today:

- WIB requested an RFP.
- Announced in the media and newspapers.
- Bidder’s Conference.
- 5 Organizations were represented at the Bidder’s Conference.
- Bid date has passed.
- Only one bid came in.
- WIB Meeting – August 18.
- CEO to approve bid recommendation between August 18 – 24 for the One-Stop Operator.
- There was a question on just having one Bid. Mr. Beasley responded that the more bids that are received, the more you can rate and rank. It is hard to pick someone when there is only one bid.
- There was discussion on relying on Mr. Darby and his staff to make a recommendation.
- Dr. Painter reminded them that they were all elected officials and when we go through a procurement process, we ask the hard questions. As a City Council Member, his experience has been if there is only one bid received, the process is null and void.

- Dr. Painter suggested that the CEOs find out why there was only one bid. Possibly by asking a third party to do “due diligence” and make phone calls to the other organizations that came to the bidder’s conference but who did not present a bid. Dr. Painter asked if they should possibly ask Mr. Bryan to make the calls. By having a third party make the calls, it will take the responsibility off of the CEOs and the A/E Staff.
- Mr. Gary Mixon, Sumter County Administrator, made a suggestion to ask Mr. Bobby Galloway, the Sumter County Procurement officer to make the phone calls. Mr. Mixon said he would be familiar with what questions to ask and might be less intimidating than an attorney calling.
- **There was a motion made by Mr. Arthur Beasley and seconded by Mr. Dwight Stewart to ask Mr. Bobby Galloway to make phone calls on behalf of the CEOs to find out why the other organizations did not provide a proposal to the RFP.**
- There was discussion on providing Mr. Galloway with a timeline. Prior to the WIB Meeting on August 18th was decided. Mr. Galloway will be asked to report back to Mr. Baten, who will share the information with the other CEOs and Mr. Darby.
- **All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

VII. Other Business

No Other Business was brought forth.

VIII. Adjourn

The County CEO Work Session Meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.

Recorded by:

Donna Thames