

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Kit Smith, Chair
District 5

Mike Montgomery
District 8

Paul Livingston
District 4

Joseph McEachern
District 7

Valerie Hutchinson
District 9

*November 28, 2006
6:00 PM*

**Richland County Council Chambers
County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street**

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes – October 24, 2006: Regular Session Meeting [Pages 3 – 5]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

- A. Assessor's Office: Budget Amendment to Increase the Starting Salary for the Vacant Appraiser I Position and Funding for an Additional Appraiser I Position**
[Pages 6 – 11]
- B. Approval of Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Grants**
[Pages 12 – 14]
- C. Farmer's Market Independent Construction Manager**
[Pages 15 – 17]
- D. Public Hearing and Resolution in Support of JEDA Bond Issue for Palmetto Health Alliance**
[Pages 18 – 22]
- E. Industrial Park Account: Budget Amendment (\$50,000)**
[Pages 23 – 24]
- F. Software Purchase for Human Resources/Information Technology**
[Pages 25 – 27]

G. Microsoft Licensing

[Pages 28 – 29]

H. Funding for Columbia City Ballet (\$5,000)

[Pages 30 – 31]

I. Funding for All-American Community Idol / Columbia Festival for the Arts (\$159,000)

[Pages 32 –33]

*This is a time sensitive issue that was received after the agenda deadline. This item has been added with the consent of the Chair of the Committee.

II. Items for Discussion / Information

A. Update on Personnel Policies and Procedures

B. Adoption of Financial Plan

C. Recreation Items:

1. Recreation Bond (\$26,000,000)

2. Bible Way Foundation / Recreation Commission Property

D. December A&F Committee Meeting Date

III. Items Pending Analysis

There are no items pending analysis.

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2006 6:00 P.M.

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

Chair: Kit Smith
Member: Paul Livingston
Member: Joseph McEachern
Member: Valerie Hutchinson
Member: Mike Montgomery

ALSO PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Damon Jeter, L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Roxanne Matthews, Joe Cronin, Larry Smith, Amelia Linder, Gary Watts, Anna Almeida, Jennie Sherry-Linder, John Hixon, Daniel Driggers, Rodolfo Callwood, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 26, 2006 (Regular Session) – Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Pope requested that Item A be moved to before the Presentations.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to reorder the agenda and approve the agenda as amended. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Coroner: Request to Change Part-Time Clerk I Position to Full-Time Secretary (Deferred during September 26, 2006 A&F meeting) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place. The vote in favor was unanimous.

PRESENTATIONS

Lexington/Richland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council (LRADAC), Ds. Deborah Francis, President & C.O.O. – Ms. Deborah Francis made a brief presentation and requested that Council consider providing \$4 million toward the construction of a new facility on Colonial Drive.

Historic Columbia Foundation, Ms. Robin Waites, Executive Director – Ms. Robin Waites gave a brief presentation regarding the Woodrow Wilson House. The Historic Columbia Foundation requested approximately \$1 million from Council to facilitate the renovations on the Woodrow Wilson House.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Election Commission: Budget Amendment for Voting System Hardware and Software Maintenance (\$25,396.00) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Lease Agreement and Budget Amendment for the Opening of a New Library Facility in Ballentine – Mr. David Warren, Richland County Library, made a brief presentation regarding this item.

Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Ms. Smith, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Resolution Identifying the Cultural Council of Richland and Lexington Counties as the Designated Art Organization for Richland County – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Potential Bond Items – Ms. Smith requested that a work session be held on November 14th and that staff provide a brief synopsis of each item.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward these items to a work session on November 14th and reserve a place on the Council agenda for a report on these items. A discussion took place. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Regional Air Quality Committee Update – Mr. Pope suggested that a joint Richland County/Lexington County letter be sent to the Regional Council of Government asking them to coordinate and provide recommendations regarding this item.

Ordinance to Restructure the Public Works Department – Mr. McDonald stated that this issue will be reintroduced during the FY 2007-2008 budget.

Overview of Demographic Compensation Data – Mr. Hanna gave a brief presentation. The committee requested that staff bring a report back to the next committee meeting.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:00.

Submitted by,

Kit Smith, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Budget Amendment to Increase the Starting Salary for the Vacant Appraiser I Position and Funding for an Appraiser I position in the Assessor's Office

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Assessor's Office, Department 1755, budget in the amount of \$43,610 for the purpose of increasing the starting salary of the vacant Appraiser I position and the hiring of an additional Appraiser I. The increase in salary for the vacant position in the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year is \$4,465 and the funding for the additional Appraiser I position at \$30,000 is \$39,145.

B. Background / Discussion

In 1978, when I was employed by the Richland County Board of Assessment Control, this office was staffed with 30 employees, and the taxable properties numbered 87,995. I made a request of Council to increase the number of employees by adding 6 appraisers and 7 clerical staff members. Our numbers then increased to 43 employees handling 91,275 parcels by 1980. As we moved through the first general reassessment in 1982, I downsized the office to 38 employees and by 1984 downsized to 36 employees handling 102,721 properties. That figure remained constant until 1993 when we added one employee and were handling 120,114 properties.

In 2005, we had 37 full time employees handling 150,956 properties. At this point we had maximized the efficiency of the Richland County Assessor's Office. In 1983, we had one employee for every 2,521 parcels; today, we have one employee for every 4,193 parcels.

Clearly, we have reached a point at which we have to add staff or the quality of work will diminish. The major problem we have at the present time is that we have 12 appraisers in the field, along with 3 supervisors and one deputy assessor; sixteen people employed in the appraisal section for 155,000 parcels. This means that each person would be responsible for 9,700 parcels. However, when considering the 3 supervisors who have the responsibility of supervising the 12 appraisers, the number of properties for each appraiser would then increase to 10,356 properties. We have reached a point of critical mass in that if we cannot increase the number of appraisers, and if someone were to leave unexpectedly, we would be crippled.

<u>County</u>	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>Appraisers</u>	<u>Average Number of Parcels Per Appraiser</u>
Beaufort	120,000	18	6,666
Lexington	114,000	16	7,125
Spartanburg	150,153	19	7,902
Horry	208,000	24	8,666
Anderson	120,000	13	9,230
Richland	155,328	15	10,356

If one reviews the history of the appraisal section, over the last three years we have employed and lost 6 appraisers. The starting salary at Richland County is \$22,259. We require that the applicant have a college degree, that he provide dependable transportation, and that he possess a valid South Carolina Driver's License. In today's market, the starting salary of \$22,259 for a college graduate is absolutely laughable. We have attempted to sell the career program; however, the difficulty we have had is that the applicants, at best, are marginal.

We have hired appraisers who have been unsuccessful at other jobs, and they have brought some of those same traits to the County. We have tried to hire persons over the age of fifty, but at this starting salary, we are only getting marginal people, who come and go, and we are no better off today than we were one year ago. I have a vacancy for an appraiser I, the entry-level position, which essentially has not been filled in a year.

Listed below are the starting salaries from other counties:

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>STARTING SALARY RANGE</u>
Spartanburg	\$26,403 to a high of \$39,432
Florence	\$26,722 to a high of \$39,621
Greenville	\$28,041 to a high of \$44,706
Charleston	\$29,473 to a high of \$44,512
Lexington	\$32,427 to a high of \$46,798
Richland	\$22,259

Each of the counties requires that their personnel have a college degree and they must be licensed by the State of South Carolina within a particular time frame. Based on my years of experience, we have a good career path; however, the problem is the starting salary is not enough to attract the kind of people we need in this office. It takes us eighteen months to thoroughly train an appraiser.

Beginning in 1997, we processed 13,906 straight transfers, and in 2005, we processed 18,963 straight transfers. We created 97 subdivisions with 3,338 new lots. In new construction, we did 9,508 in 2005 keeping in mind that we have essentially the same administrative size staff that we did twenty years ago.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Deed Count</u>	<u>Increase or Decrease (over past year)</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
1997	13,310	465	
1998	14,120	810	
1999	15,584	1,464	
2000	14,604	- 980	
2001	14,205	- 366	
2002	15,558	1,353	
2003	16,767	1,209	9.50%
2004	18,514	1,747	7.80%
2005	19,434	920	10.40%
Total Increase over the past 3 Years			27.70%

I am bringing this to your attention because, as you know, I will be leaving the Assessor's Office within the next two or three years. The Council has always said to me, please leave it a better place than you found it, and that is my objective.

For the past three years, I have worked as closely as I could with the then County Administrator, reminding him of these same statistics concerning our pay scale and the number of parcels being handled by the current staff. If we were to suffer one or two people leaving, we would be crippled, because we do not have the manpower to do the work. Additionally, based on the past twelve months, I have not been able to employ a qualified candidate who is willing to work because of the starting salary.

You will note that in the budget year 2005-2006, substantial pay increases were given to the paramedics and building inspectors. I am advised that a building inspector must have a high school education, and they now start at \$30,000. This is a far cry from the starting salary of our appraisers who must be college graduates and who are responsible for adding more than \$800,000,000, eight hundred million, in value to the tax rolls. We need people who are highly qualified, smart, self-starters, dependable and who want to be here to do the job. In addition, they must be able to deal with the general public, which is at best, difficult.

I am proud of what we have accomplished and I believe we can continue with that level of success. But I have one or perhaps two appraisers who are eligible for and receive food stamps and who are under the WIC program. I'm not sure that is where we need to be in terms of accomplishment and getting quality people to do quality work.

While we have been together for twenty-eight years, and while we administrate to an 18.5 billion dollar tax roll, we have stretched the capabilities of the existing personnel to the limit, and we are in crisis.

During the past three or four years, the administration has not listened to department heads as we defined our needs and requirements. A good solid department has to grow at the same rate or pace as the County grows. Clearly, you cannot operate a fast growing county with the same staffing level that you had more than twenty-five years ago.

We need immediate help to increase the entry-level salary of the Appraiser I position. We need to fill the open vacancy and add one additional appraiser in a new position. This will help to equalize the workload and to ensure a quality work product. We will need the personnel to efficiently perform the overwhelming workload that will be required to successfully complete Reassessment 2008 and meet the scheduled deadline for implementation in 2009.

C. Financial Impact

I. Salary Increase for vacant Appraiser I position

\$4,465

Calculation:

- 1. \$39,145 - \$30,216 = \$8,929
- 2. \$8,929 / 12 months = \$ 744
- 3. \$ 744* 6 months = \$ 4,465

II. New Position

\$39,145

Calculation:

Appraiser I

Salary	\$ 30,000
FICA Expense	\$ 2,295
Regular Retirement	\$ 2,310
Health & Dental	\$ 4,540
Total Compensation	\$ 39,145

D. Alternatives

- 1. Approval for supplemental funding of the current salary for the vacant Appraisal I position-\$4,465 and authorization of a 17th Appraiser position-\$39,145.
- 2. To leave the vacant Appraiser I position unfilled and not add a needed Appraiser I position; thereby, keeping the Assessor’s office from fulfilling its mission.

At this point I would reiterate the point, Richland County is growing at a fast pace and the Assessor’s office until this point has been able to accomplish its mission; however, the County has grown at such a rate over the past 3 years, that the Assessor’s office simply does not have the staff to keep up with this continued growth. Richland County appraisers are accountable for approximately 10,356 parcels per appraiser, while counties of Richland’s parcel count only are responsible for an average of 7,718 parcels per appraiser. Therefore, a Richland County appraiser is responsible for almost a 2,438 parcels more per appraiser, while at the same time earning almost \$13,000 less per year.

The average or median starting salary for the same position in 5 counties similar to Richland is \$36,000, which is \$13,741 more than the salary of an Appraiser I in Richland County. The starting salary for an Appraiser I in Richland County is \$22,259, no exceptions and we require that the applicant be a college graduate. At this salary, we have had extreme difficulty finding acceptable candidates to interview much less to hire. Two months ago, we had an Administrative Assistant position open in the Appraisal section that had a starting salary identical to the Appraiser I. Because these two positions were lined up one after the other on Human Resource’s on-line postings of vacant positions, there were applicants that were contacted for interviews that basically laughed in our face that we would require the education and dedication of the Appraisal I position and offer the very same salary to a high

school graduate in a support position. During the previous year we have hired 3 different gentlemen for the vacant Appraiser I position, only to have 2 of them leave after less than two months on the job; and one of these hires took the same position with Lexington County at a higher starting salary. The third was to start on a Monday, but called that Monday morning and stated he just could not work for the \$22,259 and had accepted another position at a higher rate of pay. Lastly, we have offered the job to almost 10 other candidates that had interviewed and all turned the position down strictly based on the salary.

As you know, the legislature passed a law that goes into effect January 1, 2007 that requires our office to assess at the "Point of Sale", which means that every deed that is recorded in Richland County will have to be thoroughly researched. In the previous data, you saw that the total number of deeds processed annually by the Assessor's office has increased 27% over the previous 3 years, while our staff has remained the same. Along these same lines, there is the growth that Richland County has experienced over the last 10 years. Today, new subdivisions and development are reaching the County lines in all directions. Therefore, the appraisers are traveling distances of approximately 15-25 miles to reach their work site. In 2006, these appraisers were responsible for adding more than \$800,000,000, eight hundred million, in value to the tax roll.

As you can see, we need appraisers that are college educated, conscientious and self-starters and the only way to get that kind of quality is to increase the starting salary of an Appraiser I to a minimum of \$30,000 per year.

E. Recommendation

The immediate approval of additional funding for the vacant Appraiser I position, as well as the supplemental funding of an Appraiser I position.

Recommended by: John Cloyd **Department:** Assessor **Date:** 11/13/2006

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that this be provided to HR to evaluate with the class and compensation implementation already approved for FY 07.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval of this request will require a budget amendment ordinance and the identification of a funding source.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/22/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that the reclassification of the Appraiser I position be addressed through the Classification and Compensation Study, which is scheduled for implementation in early 2007. It is further recommended that the request for an additional Appraiser I position be addressed in the budget for FY 08. Handling these two requests in this manner will avoid the requirement of a mid-year budget amendment.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Grants

A. Purpose

Trinity Housing Corporation is requesting that Richland County Council accept three Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Grants currently under their purview. Council is requested to approval the concept of accepting these grants.

B. Background / Discussion

For the last several years, Trinity Housing Corporation has been the grantee for these grants. There are currently two grants underway and one pending approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The following outlines each grant:

Grant Number	Budgeted/Expended	Operating Dates	Match/Administration
HMIS (SC16B302002)	\$192,628 Expended \$146,976	June 2004 – May 2007	Match \$15,288 Administration \$3,436
HMIS Expansion (SC16B502002)	\$49,006 Expended \$2,424	July 2006-August 2009	Match \$ 0 Administration \$ 0
HMIS Renewal	\$128,420	Pending Approval	Match \$30,576 Administration \$6,116

HMIS is a computerized database which is designed to collect client-level information on the characteristics, service needs and gaps of adults and children experiencing homelessness. The system aggregates client –level data to generate an unduplicated count of clients served and services accessed. It is also provides referral information, shelter bed availability and manages agency operations. This tracking system for the homeless is used in the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH) region. This system is the only central point of entry for our homeless clients. The Homeless Management Information Systems is cited in the Blueprint to Address Homelessness as a needed resource.

These grants pay for user licenses and system support. In some cases, it also pays for computers and internet access. In addition, a System Administrator and Program Director are also funded under the grant.

Trinity Housing Corporation’s executive director and board have decided not to be the grantee for these grants. The Community Director met with the HUD representative to ensure that this would be appropriate. HUD officials indicated that it was important that these grant be taken and felt comfortable about the county administering the grants.

HUD officials stated that this transfer could not be done until an entity has agreed to the acceptance and not until HUD officials prepare the necessary paperwork to address the transfer. It was further stated that this transfer would not be official until February/March 2007.

C. Financial Impact

If HUD transfers the grants to Richland County, the match in the amount of \$37,609 would be needed and could be provided with CDBG funds. However, there is administration funds in the grants (in the amount \$9,552) for the community development's grant accountant and director positions who will oversee the grant.

D. Alternatives

1. Accept the request to become the grantee for the three HMIS grants and fund the match with Richland County operating funds
2. Accept the request to become the grantee for the three HMIS grants and fund the match with Richland County CDBG funds
3. Do not accept the request to become the grantee for the three HMIS grants and possibly lose approximately \$250,000 in grant funds to assist with the homelessness efforts for Richland County as well as the other counties involved in the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH).

E. Recommendation

Accept the request to become the grantee for the three HMIS grants in order to keep the current and the pending grant funds to assist with the homelessness efforts for Richland County as well as the other counties involved in the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH).

Recommended by: Sherry Wright Moore **Department:** Community Development
Date: November 14, 2006

F. Reviews

Grants

Reviewed by: Audrey Shifflett

Date: 11/20/2006

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This request is to get Council's approval of the concept of the County assuming these grants; the actual transferal of the grants from Trinity Housing Corporation must be approved by HUD (Spring 2007). If Council approves, Sherry Wright Moore can notify HUD that Richland County is willing to assume the grants. Administering the grants will require a percentage of the time of the accountant in the Community Development department and continuation

of the relationship with a consultant who currently carries out activities of the grants for Trinity Housing Corporation. Also, local HUD contacts have said that the match can be made with CDBG funds; this issue will need to be confirmed and worked out with national HUD authorities if the County is approved to administer these grants.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of Alternative 2 which would provide for the match from CDBG funds. If alternative 1 is approved, a budget amendment will be required.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/20/2006

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of Alternative 2, which would provide for the match from CDBG funds.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the County assuming the grantee role for the HMIS grants, with any matching funds to come from CDBG dollars.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Farmers' Market Independent Construction Manager

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to authorize staff to negotiate with Wilbur Smith Associates to act as an independent construction manager on behalf of Richland County for the construction phase of the County's wholesale portion of the South Carolina State Farmers' Market project.

B. Background / Discussion

As prescribed in the MOU between the State and Richland County, approximately 50 acres of the 196-acre new farmers' market site is owned by Richland County for the purpose of certain wholesale operations. The County has agreed to subdivide the wholesale portion of the market and make suitable parcels to select vendors pursuant to mutually agreeable vendor financing arrangements. At this time, Richland County has obtained relocation commitments from six vendors to locate operations within this 50-acre tract.

Richland County will fund the design and construction of the wholesale facilities through the issuance of County revenue bonds. To finance these bonds, Richland County will charge the wholesale vendor tenants negotiated lease fees/installment rates for the facilities provided by the County. Once the bonds have matured, the County intends to transfer ownership of the facilities to respective vendors for nominal fees, at which point the vendors will be responsible for subsequent County property taxes. The financing aspect of this project will occur in the first quarter of 2007 when the RFP is complete and a better understanding of the types and complexity of the wholesale facilities is gauged. Construction is tentatively scheduled to begin in early summer 2007, with a final completion date of August 2008.

Wilbur Smith Associates has been under contract with the County to provide various engineering and planning services, including master planning of the 50 acres; and development of an RFP solicitation for a design-build team. The cost of project management services provided by WSA will be rolled into the bond, which includes monies for the construction of the wholesale facilities.

At this time, staff is requesting the authority to negotiate with Wilbur Smith Associates to act as an independent construction manager on behalf of Richland County for the construction phase of the County's wholesale portion of the South Carolina State Farmers' Market project. These professional services will include construction management and owner's representation during the design-build process, through construction and into implementation. We recommend the construction manager be Wilbur Smith Associates due to their background, experience, and close association with this project, on both the State and County portions of the project. Using Wilbur Smith Associates for this next, and final phase of this project, would promote continuity within the project, and all associated participants, including the SC Department of Agriculture and the wholesale vendors.

The construction manager would coordinate and supervise the construction process from the conceptual development stage through final construction on behalf of the County, making sure that the project gets done on time and within budget. The construction manager would work with the County, engineers, architects, and others who are involved in the construction process. Given the designs for the buildings, roads, etc., the construction manager oversees the planning, scheduling, and implementation of the project to execute those designs. The construction manager directs and monitors the progress of construction activities, and oversees the delivery and use of materials, tools, and equipment, as well as the quality of construction, worker productivity, and safety. The construction manager continually tracks and controls construction costs to avoid cost overruns.

A construction manager is recommended for a project of this magnitude and complexity, so as to monitor and steer this project to completion on time and on budget.

C. Financial Impact

The cost for construction management services is unknown at this time. However, the cost of these services will be rolled into the bond, which includes monies for the construction of the wholesale facilities.

D. Alternatives

1. Authorize staff to negotiate with Wilbur Smith Associates to act as an independent construction manager on behalf of Richland County for the construction phase of the County's wholesale portion of the South Carolina State Farmers' Market project.
2. Do not authorize staff to negotiate with Wilbur Smith Associates or another firm to act as an independent construction manager on behalf of Richland County for the construction phase of the County's wholesale portion of the South Carolina State Farmers' Market project. By doing so, an on-site presence during construction will not be in place. The project could go awry in terms of cost overruns and missed deadlines without constant supervision. This alternative is not recommended.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council authorize staff to negotiate with Wilbur Smith Associates to act as an independent construction manager on behalf of Richland County for the construction phase of the County's wholesale portion of the South Carolina State Farmers' Market project.

Recommended by: Roxanne Matthews **Department:** Administration **Date:** 11/9/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

✓ Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommend Council denial

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 11/21/06

Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommend Council denial

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/20/06

✓ Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 11/22/06

✓ Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval...

Recommend Council denial

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Public Hearing and Resolution in Support of JEDA Bond Issue for Palmetto Health Alliance

A. Purpose

To finance the acquisition, by construction or purchase, of a building or buildings and other improvements on one or more parcels of land, and certain machinery, apparatus, equipment, office facilities and furnishings to be installed therein located in Richland County, South Carolina, to be used as a children's hospital, and to finance certain additions, expansions, enlargements and renovations to its existing hospital facilities located in Richland County, South Carolina and to pay costs of issuance and other expenses relating to the Bonds.

B. Background / Discussion

Palmetto Health Alliance is a South Carolina nonprofit corporation. The corporation leases and operates Palmetto Health Richland Memorial Hospital, Palmetto Health Baptist Medical Center – Columbia, and Palmetto Health Baptist Medical Center – Easley. Paul Duane is the contact. Federal and state law requires that a public hearing be held and a resolution in support of the bonds be adopted. Please call Paul Duane, Chief Financial Officer, at (803) 296-2112, or Tom Smith, Director of Finance, at (803) 296-2250 for more information.

C. Financial Impact

This is a conduit bond issue for JEDA. The County has no financial responsibility for payment of the Bonds.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the terms of the Resolution and hold a public hearing regarding the bonds.
2. Deny the request.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council hold the public hearing and adopt the Resolution as it has done for many other JEDA bond deals in the past.

Recommended by: Staff

Department: Administration

Date: Nov. 13, 2006

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/22/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval contingent upon Bond Counsel's review and approval. Bond Counsel will provide input prior to the Committee meeting.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

**A RESOLUTION OF THE
RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

**A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ISSUANCE BY THE
SOUTH CAROLINA JOBS-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY OF ITS NOT EXCEEDING \$140,000,000
HOSPITAL IMPROVEMENT REVENUE BONDS, IN ONE OR
MORE SERIES, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE
41, CHAPTER 43, OF THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH
CAROLINA 1976, AS AMENDED.**

WHEREAS, the South Carolina Jobs-Economic Development Authority (the "Authority") is authorized and empowered under and pursuant to the provisions of Title 41, Chapter 43, of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended (the "Act"), to utilize any of its program funds to establish loan programs for the purpose of reducing the cost of capital to business enterprises which meet the eligibility requirements of Section 41-43-150 of the Act and for other purposes described in Section 41-43-160 of the Act and thus provide maximum opportunities for the creation and retention of jobs and improvement of the standard of living of the citizens of the State of South Carolina; and

WHEREAS, the Authority is further authorized by Section 41-43-110 of the Act to issue revenue bonds payable by the Authority solely from a revenue producing source and secured by a pledge of said revenues in order to provide funds for any purpose authorized by the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Authority and Palmetto Health Alliance, a South Carolina nonprofit corporation (the "Corporation"), entered into an Inducement Agreement (the "Inducement Agreement"), pursuant to which and in order to implement the public purposes enumerated in the Act, and in furtherance thereof to comply with the undertakings of the Authority pursuant to the Inducement Agreement, the Authority proposes, subject to such approval of the State Budget and Control Board of South Carolina and Richland County, South Carolina (the "County") as may be required by law, to issue not exceeding \$140,000,000 aggregate principal amount of its Hospital Improvement Revenue Bonds (Palmetto Health Alliance), in one or more series (the "Bonds"), under and pursuant to Section 41-43-110 of the Act to (i) finance the costs of the acquisition of buildings or other improvements, machinery, equipment, office furnishings and other depreciable assets, constituting hospital facilities (the "Project") located in Richland and Pickens Counties, South Carolina (collectively, the "Counties"), (ii) pay a portion of the interest on the Bonds, if deemed necessary or advisable by the Corporation, (iii) fund a debt service reserve fund for the benefit of the holders of the Bonds, if deemed necessary or advisable by the Corporation, (iv) provide working capital, if deemed necessary or advisable by the Corporation and (v) pay certain costs of issuance with respect to the Bonds; and

WHEREAS, the Corporation is projecting that the assistance of the Authority by the issuance of the Bonds will result in the maintenance of permanent employment in the Counties and adjacent areas for approximately 7,100 people and in the creation of 109 new jobs in the counties and

adjacent areas within 12 months after completion of the Project, and will stimulate the economy of the County and surrounding areas by increased payrolls, capital investment and tax revenues; and

WHEREAS, the County Council of the County (the "County Council") and the Authority have on this date jointly held a public hearing, duly noticed by publication in newspapers having general circulation in the County, not less than 15 days prior to the date hereof, at which all interested persons have been given a reasonable opportunity to express their views;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Council of Richland County, South Carolina, as follows:

It is hereby found, determined and declared that the Project is anticipated to subserve the purposes of the Act and to benefit the general public welfare of Richland County by maintaining services, employment, or other public benefits not otherwise provided locally.

The County Council supports the Authority in its determination to issue the Bonds to finance the costs related to the Project.

The amount of Bonds required to undertake the Project is not exceeding \$140,000,000.

The Project will not give rise to a pecuniary liability of Richland County or a charge against its general credit or taxing power.

All orders and resolutions and parts thereof in conflict herewith are to the extent of such conflict hereby repealed, and this resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its adoption.

Adopted this ___ day of December, 2006.

Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair
Richland County Council

(SEAL)

Attest: _____
Michelle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

CERTIFICATE AS TO EXCERPTS OF MINUTES

I, the undersigned, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Clerk to County Council of Richland County, South Carolina (the "County"), do hereby certify;

1. I am duly qualified and acting Clerk to County Council of the County ("County Council").
2. Attached hereto are excerpts of the minutes of the meetings of the County Council on December __, 2006 (the "Meetings").
3. I have compared the copies of the minutes of the Meetings with the official minutes records in my official custody and the excerpts are true, correct and complete transcripts from the original minutes records insofar as they relate to the Bonds (as defined herein).
4. At a meeting of the County Council duly called and held on December __, 2006 at which a quorum was present and acting throughout, a public hearing, duly noticed, was held jointly by the County Council and the South Carolina Jobs-Economic Development Authority (the "Authority") in connection with the issuance of its not exceeding \$140,000,000 aggregate principal amount Hospital Improvement Revenue Bonds (Palmetto Health Alliance) in one or more series (the "Bonds"). No individual in attendance at the public hearing spoke in opposition to the issuance of the Bonds. At a meeting of the County Council duly called and held on December __, 2006 at which a quorum was present and acting throughout, the resolution in support of the issuance by the Authority of the Bonds was approved by the County Council.
5. (a) As required by Section 30-4-80 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended (the "Code"), the notices of call for the Meetings were posted on a bulletin board at the office or meeting place of the County Council at least 24 hours prior to the Meetings and furnished to area newspapers and radio and television stations one week prior to the Meetings, and (b) as required by Section 30-4-60 of the Code, the Meetings were open to the public except those portions allowed to be held in closed session under Section 30-4-70 of the Code.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ____ day of December, 2006.

Michielle Cannon-Finch, Clerk to County
Council of Richland County, South Carolina

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Industrial Park Account: Budget Amendment

A. Purpose

Council is requested to appropriate \$50,000 via a budget amendment for the Industrial Park Account.

B. Background/Discussion

Council appropriated \$110,000 for the Industrial Park account during the FY 06-07 budget process, with \$60,000 appropriated for KOLORPRO, and \$50,000 appropriated for a one-time capital expenditure for the USC Incubator. Council only appropriated \$110,000 during the budget process since these were the requests received and approved by Council. Also, during budget adoption, the unaudited fund balance accounting for the Industrial Park account wasn't available.

As of October 25, 2006, the unaudited fund balance of the Industrial Park account is \$464,102. Council is being requested to appropriate \$50,000 from the unaudited fund balance, since there are currently no appropriated funds remaining in this account, although funds exist.

At the October 17, 2006 Economic Development Committee meeting, members recommended funding the Richland County Small Business Development Program, in conjunction with the SC Export Consortium, \$5,750. Also, a survey needs to be completed on the Richland Northeast Industrial Park, with estimates for this service averaging \$40,000. Therefore, \$45,750.00 will be requested as forthcoming from this account, but no funds are currently available to pay these amounts.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request. An unaudited fund balance of \$464,102 exists in the Industrial Park account, but needs to be appropriated for economic development specific uses. Funds appropriated via this request but not spent during FY 06-07 will carryover into next year's Industrial Park account.

D. Alternatives

1. Appropriate \$50,000 via a budget amendment for the Industrial Park Account.
2. Do not appropriate \$50,000 via a budget amendment for the Industrial Park Account.

E. Recommendation

Administration recommends appropriating \$50,000 via a budget amendment for the Industrial Park Account for economic development specific uses.

Recommended by: Staff

Department: Administration

Date: Nov. 14, 2006

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/21/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: All alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/22/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval of this request will require a budget amendment; therefore, first reading approval is recommended.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Finance and Human Resource Software System

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to give permission to negotiate with the vendor who was selected for providing the most responsive proposal for an integrated Finance and Human Resource software system. The successful vendor is Sungard Bi-Tech.

After negotiations have been completed, the negotiated terms will be brought to Council for approval.

B. Background / Discussion

The current Finance and Human Resource software system has been used by Richland County for over ten years. It has been plagued with problems since its implementation. There are frequent out-of-balance conditions that must be researched and reconciled. It does not handle sales tax very well. The interface between Procurement and Accounts Payable is problematic. The year-end process does not smoothly handle encumbrances. Extracting information for audit reports is difficult, which adds complexity to the external audit. And it is not very helpful in generating the CAFR.

In May 2003, a Request for Information was published and the County received many responses. During the course of the next year, many of those vendors came to Richland County to give a demonstration of their software. Knowledge gained from the demos and from the RFI process was used to create a Request for Proposal, which was published in July 2004.

Six sub-committees were created to evaluate the 19 written proposals that were received. The sub-committees had four members each and were comprised of expert staff members from the following departments: Finance, Budget, Procurement, HR, Treasurer, Planning, Public Works, GIS, and IT.

Based on the recommendations that came from the sub-committees, five vendors were elevated to the Department Head committee. The top five vendors were invited to give week-long demos. The Department Head committee had four members and was comprised of the following department heads:

- Finance – Daniel Driggers,
- Human Resources – Dwight Hanna
- Procurement – Rodolfo Callwood
- IT – Janet Claggett

From the demos from the five finalists, two vendors were selected for an even deeper review and evaluation. The Department Head committee and selected staff experts made site visits

to current clients of the top two vendors. After the site visits, the Department Head committee believed that additional information was still needed before a final decision could be made.

To gain the additional information, the Department Head committee visited the corporate headquarters of the top two vendors. Following the visit to headquarters, the Department Head committee ranked the top two vendors in the following order:

1. Sungard Bi-Tech
2. Lawson

It is worth noting that the selected vendor provides the Finance/HR software for the following South Carolina local governments: City of Columbia, City of Charleston, County of Charleston, and County of Berkeley.

C. Financial Impact

There would not be any financial impact to approve negotiations. However, negotiations would hopefully lead to mutually agreeable terms which would eventually result in a financial impact. The financial impact would be brought to Council after negotiations have been completed.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve negotiations with the #1 vendor, Sungard Bi-Tech.
2. Require negotiations with the #2 vendor, Lawson.
3. Do not approve negotiations.

Option 3 would cause Richland County to remain on the current Finance/HR system for the foreseeable future. .

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve negotiations with the #1 vendor, Sungard Bi-Tech.

Recommended by: Janet Claggett **Department:** IT **Date:** 11/20/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/20/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This item was included in the FY 07 budget.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 11/21/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/22/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: All of the alternatives are legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/22/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that staff be authorized to negotiate with Sungard Bi-Tech. The terms of the final agreement will be brought back to the Council for approval. Funding has been included in the FY 07 budget for this purchase.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Microsoft Licensing - Countywide

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve an extension to the “Software Assurance” purchase on the Microsoft Enterprise Agreement for licenses owned by the County.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Wide Area Network and Local Area Networks (WAN/LAN) currently consist of 40 servers and approximately 1100 PCs.

In order to comply with federal copyright law, Richland County must have Microsoft licenses for all County servers and all County PCs. Licensing is required for operating systems as well as software applications (such as MS Office).

In the last few years, Microsoft modified its licensing requirements, and it has been increasing its enforcement efforts. Richland County received the same “Microsoft letter” that our neighboring counties received, which outlines a mandatory copyright compliance program. If Richland County were to decide not to participate in the copyright compliance program, the County would put itself at risk for fines and penalties of up to \$150,000 per incident.

Five years ago, the IT Department included a budget request to begin a three year Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft to bring the County into full copyright compliance. During the initial three year period, we were able to achieve compliance with Microsoft’s copyright policies. The County now owns the software license for Microsoft OS and Office products used by County employees. To ensure this software remains current, the County will need to make an annual purchase of “Software Assurance”. This renewal will ensure our licensed products are current to 06/30/07.

To remain in compliance with Federal Copyright laws we must continue our Microsoft Enterprise Agreement through the purchase of Software Assurance. Software Assurance is a maintenance agreement that allows the County to use the latest versions of Microsoft software products as they are made available. This will keep the software technology at Richland County current. The Council is requested to approve the purchase of a Microsoft “Software Assurance” from the vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$117,393.

C. Financial Impact

There are sufficient funds in the account 1870.5471 designated for this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to purchase Microsoft Software Assurance from vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$117,393. This will allow the county to maintain Microsoft Copyright compliance.
2. Do not approve the request. This would mean that the County chooses to stop participating in the copyright compliance program.

E. Recommendation

Recommended by: Janet Claggett Department: Information Technology
Date: 11/21/2006.

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase Microsoft Software Assurance from vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$117,393.

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/21/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 11/21/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 11/22/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval in order that the County can remain in compliance with Federal Copyright laws. Funds have been budgeted for this purpose.

Columbia City Ballet
P. O. Box 11898
Columbia, SC 29211
November 22, 2006

Dear Richland County Council:

In the event of a surplus, we would like to formally **request your consideration in re-evaluating our funding level and providing \$5,000 in emergency funds.**

We would like to remind you of the benefits we bring to unincorporated Richland County:

Outreach to Unincorporated Richland County

- Performances at the Department of Juvenile Justice
- More than 20,000 school children from unincorporated Richland County each year attend Educational Outreach Programs designed specifically for them: this season *Jack Frost* and *Pocahontas*
- School Workshops: Dancers, William Starret and Barry Sparks visited in schools and taught dance. The students toured the ballet studios and performed at an Educational Outreach performance.
- The majority of our grant partnerships are with schools in unincorporated Richland County
- We provide more than 6,000 complimentary tickets to other charities to help them with their fundraising efforts

Financial Benefits to Unincorporated Richland County

- Most of our staff and dancers live and spend their salaries in unincorporated Richland County (2006-2007 salaries equal \$729,550)
- Many of our purchases to produce our ballets (costumes, sets, etc.) are made from vendors in unincorporated Richland County (2006-2007 production expenditures equal \$264,899)
- We project to spend \$13,894 on our tour buses, which are rented from vendors in unincorporated Richland County
- Many attendees spend money at restaurants, hotels, and gas stations in unincorporated Richland County

We were very fortunate to have had BlueCross BlueShield contribute matching funds to our recent fundraising campaign. In that campaign, we received \$125,000 from both BlueCross BlueShield and many corporations and individuals in the community that were new funds (not already budgeted as a part of our 06-07 budget). We currently have funds that will take us through the month of December. We are challenged to complete the season, which ends in March. **Based on our current challenge to make it through this season, we are requesting \$5,000 in emergency funds.**

Richland County Council

November 22, 2007
Page Two

We truly appreciate all the work you do on behalf of the community. Many, many thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "William Starrett". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'W' and 'S'.

William Starrett
Executive and Artistic Director

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Funding for All-American Community Idol / Columbia Festival for the Arts

A. Purpose

Richland County Council is requested to appropriate \$159,000 to the Cultural Council of Richland and Lexington Counties for the purpose of producing/marketing the All American Community Idol Contest, and to provide support to the Columbia Festival of the Arts. The Festival is anticipated to attract several hundred thousand visitors to the Midlands in the spring of 2007.

B. Background / Discussion

The Columbia Festival of the Arts is a ten day event that will showcase more than 30 cultural attractions and organizations. The festival will feature some of our area's most inspiring and talented visual and performing artists.

The All American Community Idol Contest is the perfect way for Richland County to join the Columbia Festival of Arts in celebrating the wonderful talent we have in this community.

- The Idol contest would include preliminary auditions at five County venues to be determined by County Council. Possible audition locations would be:
 - Meadowfield or Killian Park
 - Hopkins Park
 - Columbia Place Mall
 - Pinehurst Park
- The All American Community Idol contest would be professionally produced by Executive Producer Dick Goodwin
- A finale would take place at the Township Auditorium on May 4, 2007. Twelve finalists, chosen by the judges from the preliminary auditions would perform before 3 celebrity judges...with 2 or 3 finalists named. Each finalist would receive a cash prize, with the winner guaranteed an on air appearance on the nationally syndicated Fox American Idol television show.
- The promotional appeal for the contest is phenomenal. Aside from the significant promotions by the Idol show's television affiliate, WACH, the concert will be promoted as part of the Columbia Festival of the Arts.

C. Financial Impact

The USC (Darla Moore) School of Business will evaluate the economic impact of the festival and provide quantitative data on attendance and the impact on hospitality-related businesses.

The total request to the county is for \$159,000, and is broken down below. Since this event is geared toward bringing tourists into the county, the most likely funding source would be Hospitality Tax dollars.

Competition Related Expenses

Tents, piano, lights, sound, chairs	\$32,000
Judges and musical accompaniment	\$8,000
Prizes	\$4,000
Township rental and production	\$6,000
Producer for 5 months (12/1-5/4)	\$25,000
Signage and banners	\$4,000
Advertising	\$35,000
Sponsorship, promotion and management (CFA)	\$50,000
Less ticket sales	(5,000)
TOTAL	\$159,000

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to allocate \$158,000 to the Cultural Council to produce All American Community Idol and support the Columbia Festival of the Arts.
2. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

This request is at Council's discretion.

Recommended by: Hon. Kit Smith, Richland County Council
Cultural Council of Richland and Lexington Counties

Date: November 20, 2006

This request was received after the agenda deadline, and was added to the agenda with the consent of the Chair of the A&F Committee.