



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Paul Livingston
District 4

Greg Pearce
District 6

Joyce Dickerson, Chair
District 2

Mike Montgomery
District 8

Val Hutchinson
District 9

September 23, 2008

6:00 PM

REVISED

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

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

- A. July 22, 2008: Regular Meeting [Pages 3 – 6]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

- A. Request to approve salary adjustments to the Board of Voter Registration Office for 4 full-time appointed Board Members, and 1 full-time appointed Chairperson [Pages 7 – 13]
- B. Business License Amendments: [Pages 14 – 22]
1. An ordinance amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; Article I, In General; so as to address business revenues generated by interstate commerce
 2. An ordinance amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; Article I, In General; so as to address business revenues generated by interstate commerce so as to address rates set for landfills

- C. Sheriff: Request to approve a Project Lifesaver Program Enhancement grant (No personnel, no match) [Pages 23 – 24]
- D. Sheriff: Request to approve a catastrophic planner grant (1 FTE, no match) [Pages 25 – 27]
- E. Consideration of Alternate Work Schedules [Pages 28 – 42]
- F. An ordinance to amend the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 18, Offenses; Section 18-6, Smoking of Tobacco Products; so as to decrease the fine for an infraction [Pages 43 – 45]
- G. Policy regarding the use of carry over funds [Pages 46 – 47]
- H. Coroner: Request to approve the renewal of a contract with Professional Pathology Services [Pages 48 – 49]
- I. Contractual Matter: Retiree Payroll Deduction Insurance Vendors and Products, Employee Assistance Program (EAP) Services, and Flexible Spending Accounts (FSA) (*Eligible for discussion in executive session*) [Pages 50 – 52]

II. Items for Discussion / Information

There are no items for discussion / information.

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, JULY 22, 2008
5:00 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: Joyce Dickerson
Member: Valerie Hutchinson
Member: Paul Livingston
Member: Mike Montgomery
Member: L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.

ALSO PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Damon Jeter, Bill Malinowski, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Roxanne Matthews, Joe Cronin, Larry Smith, John Hixon, John Mincy, Lillian McBride, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 4:59 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 24, 2008 (Regular Session) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Pope stated there was an amendment to Item #15 that would be addressed when this item was taken up.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to adopt the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

An ordinance amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 2, Administration; Article VII, Boards, Commissions and Committees; Section 2-326, Boards and Commissions created and recognized; so as to create the Detention Center Commission and to provide for its membership, duties and powers – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for denial. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve a contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc. for the purpose of posting of properties on which delinquent ad valorem property taxes are due – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve a Memorandum of Understanding with Southeast Rural Community Outreach Ministries in regards to a \$250,000 allocation from the Local Hospitality Tax Revenue Fund during Fiscal Year 2008-09 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval, to request that the Council Chairman appoint at least two liaisons to serve on the committee and to use this MOU as a model for all Accommodations Tax and Hospitality Tax allocation requests. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a grant for a full-time Cold Case Investigator, equipment, and supplies (1 new position, no match required) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward to Council the Administrator's recommendation. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a Community Oriented Policing Universal Hiring Program grant (10 new positions and \$588,530 match required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward to Council the Administrator's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a grant for D.A.R.E. program supplies (No match or personnel required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a grant for a Marijuana Analysis Technician (1 new position, no match required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson,

to forward to Council the Administrator's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a grant from motorcycle safety and enforcement (2 new positions and \$43,595 match required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward to Council the Administrator's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a Sex Offender Registry Enhancement and Enforcement grant (1 new position and \$33,510 match required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward to Council the Administrator's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a School Resource Officer grant (Continuation of 1 position, no match) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to approve a grant for toxicology backlog reduction (No match or personnel required) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff—Request to negotiate and award a design-build contract for the design and construction of the new Region 7 Sheriff's Substation – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve salary adjustments to the Board of Voter Registration Office for 4 full-time appointed Board Members, and 1 full-time appointed Chairperson – A discussion took place.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to defer this item until the September committee meeting to obtain additional information. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Discussion regarding the use of carryover funds in annual budgets and millage levy calculations – The committee unanimously agreed to place this item on the September committee agenda for action.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by,

Joyce Dickerson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Salary adjustment for Board Members

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve salary adjustments to the Board of Voter Registration Office for 4 full-time appointed Board Members, and 1 full-time appointed Chairperson.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Board of Voter Registration Board Members express concerns to the County (County Council, County Administrator, and Human Resources Department) relating to salaries of the Board Members and Chairperson should be higher than the current salaries for full-time appointed officials. The Richland County Board Members continue to be a vital asset to Richland County and is highly recommended by the Governor of South Carolina and Richland County Senators to serve in this capacity to ensure proper registration of all Richland County voters in the correct precinct/district in compliance with Federal and state Election laws, and also having an enormous responsibility to the citizens of Richland County to conduct and carry out all elections (including but not limited to COUNCIL & SENATE) according to the Elections Laws of South Carolina. In the past, Board Members have not been compensated equally to the Richland County's Pay and Classification Plan or salaries adjustment. Board Members were overlooked each time a Pay and Classification Plan study was commissioned by the County.

There were two county salary adjustments (1997 and 2006) and at both times Board Members were omitted. The previous Board Chairperson submitted a request to the County Administrator for salary adjustment in September 1998 and the current Board Chairperson submitted a request in June 2006 but to no avail. There has not been any favorable action taken on this matter to ensure a competitive salary adjustment. The County Administrator, in his assessment, concluded that the Board of Voter Registration is excluded from the County Pay and Classification plan according to County Ordinance Section 2-262 which states "salaries of the following elected officials shall be excluded from the County's pay and classification plan: Auditor, Clerk of Court, Coroner, Probate Judge, Sheriff, and Treasurer." This County Ordinance Section 2-262 is not applicable to appointed Board Members.

In the most recent Pay and Classification Plan Study the Motor Voter Clerk was the only position that was eligible to receive a market adjustment. The table below shows the salary before and after the Class & Comp implementation study. Please note the Motor Voter Clerk's salary now exceed a full-time Board Member who supervise the Motor Voter Clerk position.

Job Title	Old grade	Old Pay Range Midpoint	New Pay Range Midpoint
Board Member	7N	\$27,138	\$27,138 (No Change)
Motor Voter Clerk	5N	\$21,673	\$27,357

As a result of the implementation of the Class & Comp Plan Study, the Motor voter Clerk salary exceeds and the Board Members salary lagging behind and needs to be reviewed to recognize the level of responsibility, to keep pace with the Motor Voter Clerk, and in recognition of their tenure with the County.

Recently, the Board Chairperson conducted a comparison study of Charleston County, and York County Voter Registration and Election, and Richland County Election Director and found these counties having the same job duties, and responsibility whether combined or separate, these counties salaries are far above the Richland County Board of Voter Registration salaries. The comparison was conducted on size of county populations with Richland County being the larger of the two counties. Source: The South Carolina Association of Counties Wage and Salary Report 2007 and 2008. Please note York County has not been updated and could be higher.

Location	Min	Mid	Max	Position
York County*	42,334	50,801	59,268	Asst Director
Charleston County	37,356	46,924	56,492	Senior Clerk
Richland County	21,044	27,357	33,670	Board Members
Richland County Election Commission	51,099	66,428	81,758	Election Director
Richland County Registration	27,316	39,159	51,002	Director/Chairperson

In comparison to other full-time Richland County Appointed Officials and other state offices full-time position in the Board of Registration and Election state offices with the same job duties and responsibilities whether combined or separate, the Board Members are lagging behind in salaries.

C. Financial Impact

Financial impact is what Council decides on what salary the Board Members and Chairperson should be set.

D. Alternatives

To approve the request for salary adjustment for Board Members and Chairperson it will keep the Board Members up with the competitive market on salaries so they will not lag behind other appointed officials and Voter Registration and Election Offices in the State.

If a salary adjustment is not recommended this will negate the retention and recruitment of talent pool for the Board of Voter Registration.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request for a salary adjustment for Board Members and Chairperson

Recommended by: Lillian McBride Department: Voter Registration Date: 7-8-2008

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 7/14/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion. Financial impact will varied based on Council decision. I would recommend that a recommendation be develop from the Human Resources Director.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 7-18-08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Councils discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 7-18-08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: County Council sets the salaries of Elected and Appointed Officials through policy. Elected and Appointed officials received a starting salary level of the past Elected or Appointed Official and they receive CPI increases every fiscal year based upon the figure given to the County by the Budget and Control Board. It is not within Administrations purview/authority to approve any other salary increase unless the Council amends or changes its past policy. If Council is inclined to approve this request I would recommend that a comprehensive study be performed by HR to assure equity with all Elected and Appointed Officials.

Please review the HR recommendations that were included in a study provided to Voter Registration. HRD RECOMMENDATION

1. County determine what is the objective relative to the salaries for Chairperson and Board Members.
2. County Determine the internal salary hierarchy equity for the Chairperson of Voter Registration versus other Appointed Officials.
3. County determine the internal salary equity for the positions in the Voter Registration department.
4. County determine how salaries for appointed and elected officials will be evaluated and/or determined in the future.
5. County make decision(s) in consideration of long term and consequences if changing the process to establish salaries for appointed officials.
6. Consider authorizing a review or study, involving the appropriate stakeholders, on the feasibility of combining the offices of Voter Registration and Election Commission. Based on the fact it appears all large SC counties with the exception of Richland County have already combined these two offices.

South Carolina Association of Counties
ANNUAL WAGE AND SALARY SURVEY REPORT
 Survey Group: 1

Job Title: REGISTRATION/ELECTIONS DIRECTOR

Job Code: 360

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
ABBEVILLE	40.0	1	27,354	41,032	34,193	50%
AIKEN	40.0	1	42,297	59,216	50,756	40%
ANDERSON	37.5	1	33,740	53,937	43,838	59%
BAMBERG	35.0	1	29,912	41,142	35,527	37%
BARNWELL	35.0	1	23,485	32,879	28,182	40%
BEAUFORT	40.0	1			70,000	
BERKELEY	37.5	1	41,375	66,200	53,787	60%
CALHOUN	35.0	1			30,334	
CHARLESTON	40.0	1			83,574	
CHESTER	37.5	1	22,196	31,074	26,635	39%
CHESTERFIELD	37.5	1	25,822	36,150	30,986	39%
COLLETON	40.0	1			43,467	
DARLINGTON	37.5	1	33,072	46,300	39,686	39%
DORCHESTER	40.0	1	47,582	71,374	59,478	50%
FAIRFIELD	35.0	1	30,427	42,598	36,512	40%
FLORENCE	40.0	1			60,000	
GEORGETOWN	37.5	1	34,487	51,731	43,109	50%
GREENVILLE	37.5	1	50,455	76,972	63,713	52%
GREENWOOD	40.0	1	41,288	50,627	45,957	22%
HAMPTON	40.0	1	32,076	48,115	40,095	50%
HORRY	40.0	1	53,887	80,830	67,358	49%
JASPER	40.0	1	39,473	59,209	49,341	49%
KERSHAW	37.5	1	25,641	35,896	30,768	39%
LANCASTER	37.5	1	24,163	38,297	31,230	58%
LAURENS	40.0	1	41,777	46,276	44,026	10%
LEE	35.0	1	25,000	35,000	30,000	40%
LEXINGTON	40.0	1	45,317	63,444	54,380	40%
MARION	0.0		23,665	32,105	27,885	35%
MARLBORO	37.5	1	19,232	25,000	22,116	29%
MCCORMICK	40.0	1			26,516	
NEWBERRY	40.0	1	27,390	38,346	32,868	40%
OCONEE	37.5	1	36,198	54,296	45,247	49%
PICKENS	37.5	1	41,021	61,531	51,276	49%
SALUDA	37.5	1	23,150	36,076	29,613	55%
SPARTANBURG	37.5	1			56,650	
SUMTER	37.5	1	39,001	54,601	46,801	39%
YORK	40.0	1	46,627	65,278	55,952	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			19,232	25,000	22,116	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			53,887	80,830	83,574	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			34,237	49,184	43,833	42%

**South Carolina Association of Counties
ANNUAL WAGE AND SALARY SURVEY REPORT
Survey Group: 1**

Job Title: REGISTRATION/ELECTIONS ASST DIRECTOR

Job Code: 361

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	1	34,741	48,638	41,689	40%
ANDERSON	37.5	1	24,653	39,411	32,032	59%
DARLINGTON	37.5	1	24,933	34,907	29,920	40%
DORCHESTER	40.0	1	27,821	41,730	34,775	49%
FLORENCE	37.5	2	26,625	39,454	33,039	48%
GREENWOOD	37.5	1	30,617	37,502	34,059	22%
LEXINGTON	40.0	1	33,409	46,772	40,090	39%
MARLBORO	37.5	1			20,900	
NEWBERRY	40.0	1	20,044	28,062	24,053	40%
SPARTANBURG	37.5	1	34,378	52,371	43,374	52%
SUMTER	37.5	2	19,509	27,313	23,411	40%
YORK	40.0	1	42,334	59,268	50,801	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			19,509	27,313	20,900	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			42,334	59,268	50,801	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			29,005	41,402	34,011	42%

Job Title: REGISTRATION/ELECTIONS CLERK

Job Code: 365

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	1	22,650	31,711	27,180	40%
ANDERSON	37.5	1	16,653	26,622	21,637	59%
BARNWELL	30.0	1			9,320	
BEAUFORT	40.0	4	23,218	32,505	27,861	39%
BERKELEY	37.5	3	17,504	31,402	24,453	79%
CHARLESTON	37.5	6			31,696	
CHEROKEE	40.0	1			26,176	
CHESTER	37.5	1	19,496	26,670	23,083	36%
COLLETON	40.0	1	21,798	30,701	26,249	40%
DORCHESTER	40.0	2	20,761	31,140	25,950	49%
FAIRFIELD	35.0	1	18,353	25,696	22,024	40%
FLORENCE	37.5	1	19,378	28,583	23,980	47%
GEORGETOWN	37.5	1	20,167	30,250	25,208	49%
GREENVILLE	37.5	2	22,846	38,268	30,557	67%
GREENWOOD	37.5	1	24,481	29,972	27,226	22%
LANCASTER	37.5	1	21,000	29,697	25,348	41%
LAURENS	40.0	1	22,217	25,495	23,856	14%
LEXINGTON	40.0	1	24,903	34,864	29,883	39%
MARION	0.0		16,131	21,496	18,813	33%
MCCORMICK	40.0	1			24,327	
OCONEE	37.5	1	22,558	33,857	28,207	50%
ORANGEBURG	37.5	3	21,793	34,410	28,101	57%
PICKENS	37.5	1	20,454	30,682	25,568	50%
SPARTANBURG	37.5	1	19,143	29,161	24,152	52%
SUMTER	37.5	1	18,343	25,680	22,011	39%
UNION	40.0	1			23,178	
YORK	40.0	1	26,591	37,228	31,909	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			16,131	21,496	9,320	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			26,591	38,268	31,909	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			20,929	30,276	25,109	44%

South Carolina Association of Counties
ANNUAL WAGE AND SALARY SURVEY REPORT
 Survey Group: 1

Job Title: REGISTRATION/ELECTIONS SENIOR CLERK

Job Code: 368

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	1	20,669	28,937	24,803	40%
ANDERSON	37.5	3	18,012	32,391	25,201	79%
BEAUFORT	40.0	1	26,045	36,464	31,254	40%
BERKELEY	37.5	1	25,992	41,587	33,789	59%
CHARLESTON	37.5	1			34,195	
FLORENCE	37.5	1	23,724	35,106	29,415	47%
GREENVILLE	37.5	2	28,023	44,008	36,015	57%
KERSHAW	37.5	1	24,641	34,498	29,569	40%
LEXINGTON	40.0	1	28,305	39,627	33,966	40%
SPARTANBURG	37.5	4	24,431	37,219	30,825	52%
YORK	40.0	1	26,591	37,228	31,909	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			18,012	28,937	24,803	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			28,305	44,008	36,015	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			24,643	36,706	30,994	49%

Job Title: REGISTRATION DIRECTOR

Job Code: 370

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
CLARENDON	37.5	1	28,780	40,291	34,535	39%
DILLON	37.5	1			26,259	
EDGEFIELD	35.0	1	30,443	42,621	36,532	40%
RICHLAND	37.5	1	27,316	51,002	39,159	86%
WILLIAMSBURG	40.0	1	31,625	39,321	35,473	24%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			27,316	39,321	26,259	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			31,625	51,002	39,159	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			29,541	43,308	34,391	47%

Job Title: REGISTRATION CLERK

Job Code: 372

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
ALLENDALE	17.5	1	5,000	8,000	6,500	60%
CHESTERFIELD	37.5	1	16,403	22,965	19,684	40%
CLARENDON	37.5	1	17,871	25,018	21,444	39%
DILLON	37.5	2			19,991	
EDGEFIELD	35.0	1	17,375	24,325	20,850	40%
HAMPTON	40.0	2	21,034	31,553	26,293	50%
JASPER	0.0		8,540	10,932	9,736	28%
RICHLAND	37.5	1	21,044	33,670	27,357	59%
WILLIAMSBURG	40.0	1	21,095	26,228	23,661	24%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			5,000	8,000	6,500	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			21,095	33,670	27,357	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			16,045	22,836	19,501	42%

**South Carolina Association of Counties
ANNUAL WAGE AND SALARY SURVEY REPORT
Survey Group: 1**

Job Title: **REGISTRATION SENIOR CLERK**

Job Code: **373**

<u>County</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Staff Totals</u>	<u>Pay Range</u>		<u>Actual or Mid-Point</u>	<u>Percent Spread</u>
			<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>		
ALLENDALE	17.5	1	6,000	9,000	7,500	50%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			6,000	9,000	7,500	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			6,000	9,000	7,500	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			6,000	9,000	7,500	50%

Job Title: **ELECTIONS DIRECTOR**

Job Code: **377**

<u>County</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Staff Totals</u>	<u>Pay Range</u>		<u>Actual or Mid-Point</u>	<u>Percent Spread</u>
			<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>		
CHEROKEE	0.0	1			12,315	
DORCHESTER	20.0	1	27,821	41,730	34,775	49%
MCCORMICK	0.0	5			2,341	
RICHLAND	3,705.0	1	51,099	81,758	66,428	59%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			27,821	41,730	2,341	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			51,099	81,758	66,428	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			39,460	61,744	28,964	54%

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Business Service Center: Landfills and Interstate Commerce

A. Purpose

At the Council meeting of Tuesday, September 9, 2008, Council referred the proposed Landfill rate amendment (waiting for third reading) and the proposed Interstate Commerce amendment (waiting for third reading) to the business license ordinance to the A&F Committee for consideration as part of a recommended discussion on business license rates.

B. Background / Discussion

Timing of rate changes

Any business license rate changes must be effective on the first day of any calendar year, as this marks the start of the business license year.

Any business license rate changes that are effective January 1, 2009 will impact the current fiscal year, as the bulk of business license revenues are collected between January and June of each year.

Interstate Commerce

Much of the reason for the most significant increases in business license fees paid by businesses is the result of the removal of the interstate commerce exemption, not the rates themselves. Approximately 122 businesses, or 1.5% of businesses with County business licenses, were impacted by the removal of the interstate commerce exemption. There is a proposed ordinance amendment which would help mitigate the impact of this exemption removal.

This impact of the interstate commerce exemption removal can be seen by comparing the fees paid on the total amount of gross revenue reported for each year.

- The total revenue in 2007 generated by 122 businesses claiming the interstate commerce deduction was almost \$5.4 billion.
- 85%, or \$4.6 billion, of this revenue was deducted in 2007 for interstate commerce.
- The total business license fees paid by these businesses in 2007 was \$423,241 (based on the new rate structure).

- The total revenue in 2008 generated by these businesses was \$4.8 billion. (Much of this reduction in total revenue is a result of improved revenue reporting, i.e., reporting revenue generated only at Richland County locations.)
- 0% of this revenue was deducted in 2008 for interstate commerce.
- The total fees paid by these businesses in 2008 was \$3 million (also based, of course, on the new rate structure).

Maintaining equity among businesses of the same kind, one doing business outside South Carolina, and one doing business within South Carolina, is a concern. If both businesses, using wholesalers in this example, gross \$50 million, the business doing that amount of business outside of South Carolina would, if the interstate commerce exemption is reinstated, be required to pay \$20.00. The same kind of business, doing all work exclusively within South Carolina, would be required pay \$27,768.00.

While some relief may be granted to businesses engaging in interstate commerce, it is recommended that that relief be considered in light of equity issues with the same kinds of businesses doing business within South Carolina.

The ordinance amendment offering mitigation for the impact to the removal of the interstate commerce exemption is included at the end of this Council Request of Action.

Full reinstatement of the interstate commerce exemption is projected to cost the County \$2.5 million. These funds are included in this fiscal year’s budget.

Business license rate changes

The business license rates adopted by County Council are compared below with business license rates with two comparable counties, Charleston and Sumter Counties, and Richland County’s municipalities.

The rate comparisons for the rates associated with Rate Classes 1 – 7 are shown below.

Percentage Comparison of Rates

Richland County's Rates Compared to Others' Rates		Charleston County	Sumter County	Arcadia Lakes	Blythewood	Forest Acres	Irmo
Rate Class 1	On the first \$2,000	-33%	-20%	-50%	-50%	-76%	-9%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-13%	0%	150%	-9%	-33%	14%
Rate Class 2	On the first \$2,000	-36%	-25%	-44%	-50%	-75%	2%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-21%	-15%	100%	-8%	-31%	25%
Rate Class 3	On the first \$2,000	-38%	-29%	-38%	-50%	-74%	-5%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-27%	-25%	71%	-48%	-29%	28%
Rate Class 4	On the first \$2,000	-39%	-31%	-31%	-50%	-73%	-4%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-32%	-32%	53%	-7%	-28%	31%
Rate Class 5	On the first \$2,000	-40%	-33%	-25%	-50%	-71%	-32%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-35%	-36%	40%	-7%	-26%	33%
Rate Class 6	On the first \$2,000	-41%	-35%	-19%	-50%	-70%	-41%
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-38%	-40%	30%	-6%	-25%	36%
Rate Class 7	On the first \$2,000	-42%	-36%	-13%	-50%	-70%	varies
	Every \$1,000 thereafter	-40%	-43%	23%	-6%	-24%	

The rate comparisons for the rates associated with Rate Class 8 are shown on the following page.

Percentage Comparison of Rates

Richland County's Rates Compared to Others' Rates

Rate Class 8	Charleston County	Sumter County	Arcadia Lakes	Blythewood	Forest Acres	Irmo
Contractors (in RC work) On first \$2,000	11%	0%	25%	25%	25%	3%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	-33%	18%	43%	0%	67%	20%
Junk/Scrap Dealers On first \$2,000	100%	150%	150%	-33%	-33%	355%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	-12%	-21%	-96%	-40%	-40%	70%
Vending Machines On first \$2,000	100%	100%	150%	122%	900%	700%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	0%	-40%	173%	25%	-40%	#DIV/0!
Pawn Brokers On first \$2,000	0%	0%	25%	-75%	-75%	-9%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	0%	-40%	30%	-40%	-40%	36%
Consumer Lending On first \$2,000	-9%	0%	25%	-23%	-55%	-9%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	-38%	-40%	30%	-6%	-25%	36%
Carnivals/Circuses On first \$2,000	0%	-50%	25%	-75%	-75%	75%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	233%	100%	488%	100%	100%	405%
Peddlers, Solicitors, etc. On first \$2,000	0%	43%	25%	25%	0%	-9%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	-90%	100%	245%	245%	100%	355%
Auto/Motor Veh. Dealers On first \$2,000	0%	40%	-13%	-13%	-59%	59%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	7%	88%	275%	275%	0%	70%
Drinking Places On first \$2,000	0%	0%	25%	-83%	-83%	14%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	0%	-70%	275%	-40%	-40%	36%
Sexually Oriented Business first \$2,000	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	-80%
Every \$1,000 thereafter						#DIV/0!
Billiard/Pool Rooms On first \$2,000	0%	0%	25%	-67%	-67%	900%
Every \$1,000 thereafter	0%	-40%	76%	-25%	-25%	#DIV/0!

An ordinance amendment offering a new rate for landfill businesses is attached.

C. Financial Impact

Projected Financial Impact for Interstate Commerce Recommendation

Interstate Commerce Revenues (in millions)	Discount on BL Fee	# of businesses	Total \$ Lost to County
Less than \$1	0%	63	0.00
1.00 – 4.99	5%	18	6,108.06
5.00 – 9.99	10%	0	8,230.73
10.00 – 14.99	15%	8	6,478.40
15.00 – 19.99	20%	3	11,425.92
20.00 – 24.99	25%	2	7,930.88
25.00 – 29.99	30%	1	6,249.18
30.00 – 34.99	35%	1	10,468.43
35.00 – 39.99	40%	4	39,592.48
40.00 – 44.99	45%	2	25,747.56
45.00 or greater	50%	6	176,701.90
Totals		108	298,933.53

The projected cost to the County with the recommended reduction in the landfill rate is: **\$193,828.50.**

D. Alternatives

1. Maintain the rates at their current levels with the exception of the proposed landfill rate amendment.
2. Adopt the proposed amendment creating a discount for businesses claiming interstate commerce.
3. Revise business license rates to be effective January 1, 2010.

E. Recommendation

Council is recommended to give third reading approval to the proposed business license ordinance amendment which changes the rate for landfills and to give third reading approval to the proposed business license ordinance amendment which provides a discount for businesses claiming interstate commerce.

Recommended by: Pam Davis, Director, Business Service Center **Date:** 09/09/08

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/12/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Based on the ROA, approval as submitted would require a budget amendment with the identification of an additional funding source for approximately \$500,000.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: September 17, 2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Matthews

Date: September 17, 2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision of Council. It should be noted, however, that if third reading is given to the proposed ordinance amendments regarding the landfill rate and interstate commerce, there are corresponding FY 09 budget implications of approximately \$500,000.

Proposed Ordinance for Interstate Commerce Mitigation

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-08HR**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES;
CHAPTER 16, LICENSES AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS;
ARTICLE I, IN GENERAL; SO AS TO ADDRESS BUSINESS REVENUES
GENERATED BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE.**

WHEREAS, interstate commerce is defined as the trading in goods and commodities between citizens or businesses of different states; and

WHEREAS, revenues generated by interstate commerce can be required to be reported for business license purposes pursuant to and in keeping with the 1977 US Supreme Court decision in *Complete Auto Transit, Inc. v. Brady*; and

WHEREAS, business license fees are charged for the privilege of doing business within the jurisdiction, and the value of the privilege is measured by the businesses' gross receipts; and

WHEREAS, Richland County's business license ordinance included an exemption from business license fees for revenues generated by interstate commerce exemption starting from the ordinance's initial approval in 1987; and

WHEREAS, in July 2007 Richland County Council exercised its right to remove that exemption from the business license ordinance in order to update the ordinance to reflect the Supreme Court decision and to standardize the ordinance with cities' and counties' ordinances across the state; and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council recognizes that businesses located within its jurisdiction contribute to the economic and financial health of the Richland County community, and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council wishes to enhance the economic environment in which these businesses operate, and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council, in the spirit of promoting interstate commerce and bolstering the economic wellbeing of businesses located within unincorporated Richland County, is exercising its right to provide a discount on business license fees to businesses within Richland County engaged in interstate commerce for their economic benefit;

NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to the authority by the Constitution of the State of South Carolina and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ENACTED BY RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL:

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; Article I, In General; Business License Fee Schedule, is hereby amended by the addition of the following language:

(4) **Interstate Commerce Declining Rates**

These declining rates apply in all classes for gross revenues generated by interstate commerce, i.e., the sale of goods across South Carolina state lines, for which a business license was not paid for and obtained in another jurisdiction outside South Carolina.

<u>Interstate Commerce Revenue</u> (in millions)	<u>Discount on the</u> <u>Business License Fee</u>
1.00 – 4.99	5%
5.00 – 9.99	10%
10.00 – 14.99	15%
15.00 – 19.99	20%
20.00 – 24.99	25%
25.00 – 29.99	30%
30.00 – 34.99	35%
35.00 – 39.99	40%
40.00 – 44.99	45%
45.00 or greater	50%

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this article shall be deemed unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This amendment shall be effective on and after January 1, 2009.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Joseph McEachern, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2008

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading:
Second Reading:
Public Hearing:
Third Reading:

Proposed Ordinance for Change in Landfill Rate

**STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-07HR**

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 16, LICENSES AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS; ARTICLE I, IN GENERAL; SO AS TO ADDRESS RATES SET FOR LANDFILLS.

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council has discretion to assign business license rates for businesses, and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council wishes to exercise this discretion to address the rates set for landfills;

NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to the authority by the Constitution of the State of South Carolina and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ENACTED BY RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL:

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; Article I, In General, Business License Fee Schedule, Paragraph (5), Rate Class 8.02; is hereby amended by the deletion of the language contained therein and the substitution of the following language:

Business License Fee Schedule

(5) **Class 8 Rates**

<u>Rate</u>	<u>NAICS #</u>	<u>Business Type</u>	
8.02	5622	Waste Treatment and Disposal	
		First \$2,000	\$50.00
		Each additional \$1,000	\$2.00

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this article shall be deemed unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This amendment shall be effective on and after January 1, 2009.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Joseph McEachern, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2008

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading:
Second Reading:
Public Hearing:
Third Reading:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Project Lifesaver Program Enhancement/No Personnel/No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is being requested to approve a grant proposal that was not included in the Grant Budget Request for 2008-2009.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department has applied for a grant from the Alzheimer's Foundation of America to provide additional materials to Project Lifesaver. This program allows for the electronic tracking of individuals known to be "at risk wanderers".

C. Financial Impact

Grant Program	Costs	Match
Project Lifesaver Program Enhancement	\$5,000	
Total Grant Budget Request	\$5,000	\$0

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to fund this program to provide supplies for the enhancement to Project Lifesaver in Richland County.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to approve a grant for Project Lifesaver materials.

Recommended by: Dan Johnson

Department: Sheriff

Date: 7/14/2008

F. Reviews

Grants

Reviewed by: Audrey Shifflett

Date: 9/10/2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This opportunity became available after the FY 09 budget process. This grant requires no FTE's and no match.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/11/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 9-11-08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 9-11-08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval...

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Catastrophic Planner/Personnel/No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is being requested to approve a grant proposal that was not included in the Grant Budget Request for 2008-2009.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department has been requested by the SC State Law Enforcement Division to apply for a grant program to fund a Catastrophic Planner for the Midlands Region. The salary, fringe benefits, mileage and operating costs will be provided by the grant. No match is required. The grant period is twelve months in length.

C. Financial Impact

Grant Program	Costs	Match
Catastrophic Planner	\$75,000	0
<u>Total Grant Budget Request</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>	<u>0</u>

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to fund this program to increase coordination of homeland security planning in Richland County and the Midlands Region.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to approve grant Catastrophic Planning activities.

Recommended by: Dan Johnson

Department: Sheriff

Date: 7/14/2008

F. Reviews

Grants

Reviewed by: Audrey Shifflett

Date: 9/10/2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This opportunity became available after the FY 09 budget process. This grant requires 1 FTE and no match. There is no federal obligation to continue this position beyond the end of the grant period.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/16/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: As stated approval requires no immediate County funds. Grant award includes twelve months of funding. Continuation of the position beyond the twelve month period will require the identification of another funding source for partial funding in FY10 and full funding for subsequent years of approximately \$60k. We will provide an updated personnel liability summary to include this request in order to show the total outstanding liability based on current grant awards.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 9-19-09

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 9-19-09

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval **contingent upon the Sheriff's Department either refusing to continue this function after the grant ends or if they decide to retain this function they will have to do so by absorbing the position into an existing vacant position on the position control therefore minimizing the impact on the General Fund Budget.**

**Richmond County
2009 Budget - Personnel Liability**

		Grant End										Totals	
PROJECT NAME	FTE	Date	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13						
CURRENT GRANTS													
Community Dev Block Grant	6	Sep-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUD Home Investment	1	Sep-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal Domestic Violence CourtYr 8	1	Sep-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Emergency Management (EMPG)	1	Mar-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School Resource Officer	1	Jun-09	-	44,143	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic Outreach Advocacy	1	Sep-09	-	-	56,146	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,143
Domestic Violence Improvement	2	Jul-09	-	-	68,087	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56,146
SRO Gang Investigator	1	Sep-08	-	51,380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68,087
Forensic Science Improvement	1	Sep-08	-	48,116	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51,380
Traffic Unit Expansion	2	Sep-08	-	90,674	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48,116
DNA Casework Backlog	2	Sep-09	-	-	116,989	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,674
Current Grants Totals	19		-	234,313	241,222	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	116,989
NEW GRANT REQUESTS													
Homeland Security-Catastrophic Planner	1	Nov-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solving Cold Cases w/DNA	1	Apr-10	-	-	49,760	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49,760
JAG Crime Scene Unit Enhancement	2	Jun-09	-	99,520	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99,520
Marijuana Analysis Technician	1	Sep-09	-	-	46,469	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46,469
VAWA Sexual Assault Investigator	1	Sep-09	-	-	49,760	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49,760
COPS Universal Hiring Program	12	Sep-11	-	-	-	-	-	563,983	-	-	-	-	563,983
Motorcycle Safety Enforcement	2	Sep-09	-	-	84,761	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84,761
Catastrophic Planner	1	Jul-10	-	-	58,615	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58,615
New Grant Requests Totals	21		-	99,520	289,365	-	-	563,983	-	-	-	-	952,868
GRAND TOTAL LIABILITY	40		-	333,833	530,587	-	-	563,983	-	-	-	-	1,428,403

NOTES:

Funding is presented in *first* FULL year of County responsibility. Amounts are intended to show the incremental impact to the County operating budget and not cumulative funding requirements. End dates are in anticipation of FY09 requests being funded.
* Temporary positions will not be picked up by County.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Four Day Work Week

A. Purpose

Council is requested to consider a motion to discuss the feasibility of four-day work weeks.

B. Background / Discussion

During the council meeting on July 15, 2008, Councilman Damon Jeter made a motion for council to consider the feasibility of the county moving to a four-day work week.

In the face of rising fuel and energy prices, many public and private sector entities have chosen to adopt a four-day workweek. In a survey undertaken by the SC Association of Counties, none of the 39 counties that responded to the survey had implemented a countywide four-day work week, and only 11 counties had implemented four-day weeks in isolated departments, generally for public works, roads and drainage functions. Additional information on alternate work schedules from existing county departments, SC Counties, SC Municipalities, and private sector companies is attached. Recently, the State of Utah became the first state to adopt a statewide Four Day Work Week for state agencies.

There are various examples of alternate work schedules that have been applied in jurisdictions throughout the United States. In general, the most popular have been either the standard or staggered four-day work week.

- Standard Four Day Work Week – Service hours are extended for four days per week, while affected offices would then be closed one day per week, usually on Friday.
- Staggered Four Day Work Week – Building offices would remain open for extended hours five days per week, however employees would work staggered four day workweeks.

Other options that the county must consider, should it choose to pursue a four-day work week, would include:

- Application: Countywide (Applicable to all eligible departments, excluding emergency services) vs. Limited (Department-by-department application)
- Participation: Mandatory vs. Optional

While the four day work week has become increasingly popular in recent years, it is worth noting that there are several potential drawbacks:

- In a standard four-day work week, there will be fewer days in which government services will be available to the public.

- In a staggered work week, there is a possibility of fewer staff available during critical days and times.
- Staggered four-day work weeks may actually increase the cost of operations due to longer service hours five days per week.
- Problems may arise with departments that regularly deal with state agencies or other organizations that do not operate on the same schedule.
- Impacts on employees who use child care services.
- Possible impacts on holiday schedules, as well as sick and vacation time.
- Customer/citizen convenience or availability of County services.

Given the complexity and implications of any possible changes to the county's operating schedule, it is recommended that council direct the County Administrator to work with the Human Resources Director to review the options for an alternate work schedule, and for the administrator to report his recommendations back to council during the FY 2009-10 Budget process.

C. Financial Impact

N/A – To be determined.

D. Alternatives

1. Direct the County Administrator to work with the Human Resources Director to review the options for an alternate work schedule. The administrator will report his recommendations back to council during the FY 2009-10 Budget process.
2. Proceed with discussion of schedule changes without the input of the Administrator and HR Director.
3. Receive this item as information only, and do not pursue further discussion of alternate work schedules.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that council direct the County Administrator to work with the Human Resources Director to review the options for an alternate work schedule, and for the administrator to report his recommendations back to council during the FY 2009-10 Budget process.

Recommended by: J. Milton Pope **Department:** Administration **Date:** 09/09/2008

F. Reviews

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna
 Recommend Council approval

Date: 9/10/2008
 Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: HR has sent a draft Alternative Work Schedule Guideline (AWS) to Department Heads for their input. In addition, you will find an attachment to this ROA showing departments that are using an AWS now.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/15/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 9/16/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 9/16/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Departments with Alternative Work Schedules (AWS)
August 2008

Soil and Water

Hugh Caldwell—Soil and Water Dept., 9.5 hrs/day Mon-Thurs

Jim Wilson—Environment Program Manager, 5 days 8.5hr/day 1st wk, 2nd week 4 days 8 hrs/day Mon-Thurs

Utilities

41 hrs (Mon-Fri) one week & 34 hrs (Mon-Thurs) the 2nd week to total of 75 hrs work week. Positions that do so are the following:

Director of Utilities

Deputy Director

Associate Engineer II

Associate Engineer

Utilities Coordinator II

Superintendent of operations

Pretreatment Coordinator

Lab Technician

Utilities Maintenance Technician

Superintendent of Maintenance

Public Works

Road and Drainage Division (approx.49) 4 days/ wk 9 ¼ hrs/ day

Engineering Division (approx 7) 4 days/wk 9 ¼ hrs/ day

CASA

CASA Supervisor - Has been on alternative work schedule for the past 6 months working 37.5 hrs Mon-Thurs. May return soon to regular schedule.

The above scheduled are approved by County Administration.

County Administrator Signature

Date

SC Counties

6/23/2008

Four-Day Work Week

County	4-Day Work Week	Comments	Respondent
Abbeville	No	We are looking into this possibility.	Lynn Sopolosky, Clerk to Council
Aiken	Road Maintenance	We have done a four day week in Road Maintenance for a number of years to save gas. We have looked at several other operations, but have not made the transition as of yet.	Clay Killian, County Administrator
Allendale	No		JoAnn Hill, Asst. County Administrator
Anderson	Road Maintenance	The Road Maintenance Department has been on 4-day schedules for a while now. We have two crews, one that works Mon-Thurs and one that works Tues-Friday. We are discussing the possibility of more departments going to 4-day.	Gina Humphreys, Finance Division Director
Bamberg	No		Rose Dobson, County Administrator
Barnwell	No		Pickens Williams, County Administrator
Beaufort	No		Leonita Turner, HR Director
Berkeley	No	We have had to cut back on frequency of road scraping. We're considering.	Lee Prickett, County Administrator
Calhoun	No		Keith Bustraan, Deputy County Administrator
Charleston	No		Doris Pearson, Clerk to Council
Cherokee	No		Carlisle Roddey, County Supervisor
Chester	No		
Chesterfield	No	We have discussed the possibility.	Bill Houser, Clarendon County
Clarendon	No		Doug Burns, County Administrator
Colleton	No		JaNet Bishop, Clerk to Council
Darlington	No		
Dillon			
Dorchester	Roads, drainage and stormwater	Dorchester County has a four day work week for Roads and Drainage Crews and Stormwater only, but this was our practice prior to the higher fuel prices. Over past four years, we have been updating our fleet with V-6 vehicles, light trucks and smaller cars, instead of V-8 in all operating and administrative departments, except the Sheriff's Office that still has V-8 Ford Crown Victoria patrol cars. The Sheriff has some new V-6 vehicles. All of our new V-6 sedans can use flex fuel.	Jason Ward, County Administrator
Edgefield	Road Maintenance	Our road maintenance crew has gone to a 4-day work week. All other offices are still 5-day.	John Pettigrew, County Administrator
Fairfield	No	We are hoping, but nothing yet.	Phil Hinely, County Administrator
Florence	No	Haven't considered it officially, but may if gas continues to rise toward \$5/gal.	Richard Starks, County Administrator
Georgetown	No	A couple of departments, though, have flexible schedules.	Beth Goodale, Asst. to the County Administrator
Greenville	No		Sandra Yudice, Asst. to the County Administrator
Greenwood	Public Works & Road Crew	Our Public Works – Road Crew has been on a 4-Day Work week approximately 2 years due to the increase in gas. We are currently reviewing other departments that may benefit.	Thessa Smith, Deputy County Manager
Hampton	Public Works	The public works department is on a 4-day work week.	Sabrina Graham, County Administrator
Horry	No		Anne Wright, Asst. County Administrator

County	4-Day Work Week	Comments	Respondent
Jasper	Engineering Services	Our Engineering Services Division (public works, roads and bridges, mosquito control, etc.) is the only group that is currently working a 4-day work week. This 4-day work week was established some time ago to save money. It was not done recently as a response to the relatively recent increase in fuel prices. The county will, however, be looking at the idea of going to 4-day work weeks in other departments as a result of the price of fuel for the employee, but no schedules have been	Andy Fulghum, County Administrator
Kershaw	No		Bobby Boland, County Administrator
Lancaster	Appraisers	We are looking at it on a department by department basis. Right now the appraisers in the Assessor's Office will be starting on Monday (split between half working Monday to Thursday and half working Tuesday through Friday) and our Roads and Bridges equipment operators may be going to a straight Monday through Thursday schedule in the near future.	Steve Willis, County Administrator
Laurens	No		Ernie Segars, County Administrator
Lee			
Lexington	Public Works	We have a few work groups that were already scheduled to work 4 ten hour work days prior to the gas price increases - Public Works is an example. (The PW operations are scheduled for five days per week, but the crews are staggered throughout the week so that we have the needed coverage for five days.) We are carefully thinking through what the supervision and operational considerations are of making what would be a significant change in our operations if we considered a 4 ten hour work days for other departments. I have not heard any discussion of closing administrative offices for one week day, so, among other things, the challenge of stretching the office staff out for longer hours over 5 days could be a challenge.	Katherine Hubbard, County Administrator
Marion			
Marlboro			
McCormick	No		Bruce Cooley, County Administrator
Newberry	No		Wayne Adams, County Administrator
Oconee	Roads and bridges field staff	Our roads and bridges field staff went to four 10-hour-days about 3 months ago more for productivity, but fuel was in the mix. The whole county went to four ten-hour-days a couple of years ago, but it was stopped because they did not see significant savings on the county side. Public also complained	Dale Surret, County Administrator
Orangeburg			
Pickens	No		Ralph Guarino, Finance Director
Richland	No		Tony McDonald, Deputy County Administrator
Saluda	No		Sandra Padgett, County Director
Spartanburg	Public Works, Bldg Codes	Our Public Works and Building Codes went to working four 10 hour-days a few months ago. We are studying the advantages and disadvantages in other areas. But we are actively pursuing that possibility -	Glenn Breed, County Administrator
Sumter	No		Pam Craven, Finance Director
Union	No		Donnie Betenbaugh, County Supervisor
Williamsburg	No	We have thought about, but no action yet.	Jackie Hallies, Personnel Manager

County	4-Day Work Week	Comments	Respondent
York	No	The idea has been broached by the Council but we have not converted to a 4 day work week.	Anna Wilson, Asst. County Manager
39 Respondents (85%)	No: 28 (74%)		
	Isolated Depts.: 11 (26%)		

MASC Info

Name	City	Response
Max Alderman	Bennetsville	We have not considered changes in the workweek. The most significant users, such as police, utility, and public works, provide service 24/7 or on customary/set schedules. We've restricted vehicle usage and as cost continue to increase, I anticipate more restrictions. Changing the work week is not a good option for us.
David Huntley	Chesterfield	We have not. But it does make me wonder how much could be saved if USA=Today went to a 4 day week...
	Summerville	We have not considered this at Summerville.
Bill Taylor	Cheraw	Doesn't make any sense for us in Cheraw either.
Riley Steve	Hilton Head	We've offered flex schedules for years and some employees work a four-day schedule, but we keep the doors open 5 days a week and have no plans to change that.
Mac Burdette	Mount Pleasant	I will submit a comprehensive fuel conservation plan on Wednesday, June 18, that affects all departments of the Town, and it encompasses everything from prohibition of idling vehicles, a requirement to keep strict mileage and fuel usage logs, the purchase of more fuel efficient vehicles and equipment, restrictions on non-essential use of Fire Department trucks, charging for vehicle use when police offices contract for off-duty assignments, as well as more long term approaches that will take at least six months to research and document benefit. Our goal is to reduce fuel costs in FY 2009 by \$300,000.
Dave Krumwide	McCormick	I don't see how cities and towns can do it. We are her to serve the public and their problems continue seven days a week.
Tom Shearin	Florence	Sure...we have not considered the 4-day work week but are doing other things.
Heather H. Fields	Ware Shoals	Several of our departments like Public Works, Water, and Sewer are working four 10hr shifts to help cut fuel costs and power costs. Hope this helps.
Tom Leath		We have some public works crews working a 4 day week, because we can not do street repairs, garbage collection etc on a Friday during the summer. Others work more traditional schedules. We have not considered changing schedules because of gas prices because in the end, we still have to deliver the service and we do not have enough folks in various offices to offer flex time.
Mark Scott		Sure. He might want to call the SCAQMD. I'm sure he can google a phone number. Or he can call me.--Reba, we are not planning to do this. Some of our PW staff already work 4/10 because it works with trash routes. Majority of other City staff work schedules and cannot be easily changed. The remaining few of us City Hall types would miss being at work on Fridays...where the City manager would have to be anyway...answering telephones... When I was in California, the Southern California Air Quality District made us all go to a 9/80 schedule..working 8.5 hours per day for 9 days, with alternate Fridays off. After awhile, they canned it. They found people used their cars even more on their days off, so it saved nothing in terms of air quality, nor would it have saved gasoline. However, almost all L County cities stayed with the 9/80 plan jus the same...even though it was a disaster from a public service standpoint.(How do you explain which Friday you are closed?) I hope we stay with 5/40 schedule for a long time!

Alesia's AWS Research

Company	Location	Policy
Advocare	<i>Cleveland, OH</i>	Advocare Inc is a Cleveland workers' comp firm with 85 employees that encourages flex-time arrangements, including four-day weeks and in certain cases the option of working from home. It also gives \$25 gas cards to employees as incentives to participate in the company wellness program.
BaptistWorx	<i>Kentucky</i>	We have offered employees 4-day work weeks. It does reduce his/her hours to 36-38 hours/week; however, this loss is offset by saving on fuel costs.
Barfield Murphy Shank & Smith CPA firm	<i>Birmingham, AL</i>	we are on a 4-day work week. Our staff alternates every other Friday off work. BMSS employees also have the ability to work remotely (at home). Everyone has access via laptop or link to secure server where employees can view all files, programs, and softwares just like in their office. We also have a personal valet
Bon Secours Richmond Health System	<i>Richmond, VA</i>	The hospital offers these alternative work arrangements to full- and part-time employees: flex-time, compressed work schedules, job sharing, telecommuting, and a formal phased retirement program. The phased retirement program allows those age 65+ to work up to 24 hours per week and also receive a pension benefit. Full-time employees are eligible to move to part-time work on a permanent and temporary basis.
American Red Cross, GHAC	<i>Houston, TX</i>	Telecommuting: employee who does work at home at least two days a week on a computer that is linked to their office. flextime: flexible working hours during the workweek. Sometimes based on established a mandatory core hours (ex. 9 to 3) with flexible start and end times. compressed week: employee works longer hours in a day but fewer days in the week, i.e. 4-10's, where an employee works 10 hours per day, 4 days per week, 9-80's, where an employee works 9 hours per day, and every other week earns an additional day off. job sharing: Two or more employees split a 40-hour workweek job, sharing in the tasks and responsibilities. Of course many of these can be mixed and matched for tailor-made flexibility!
<<<<listed below are participating companies>>>>		
BP America		
Brown & Gay Engineers, Inc.- Gold Sponsor		
Central Houston, inc		

City of Houston - Public Works & Engineering Department		
Continental Airlines		
Direct Energy- Silver Sponsor		
El Paso Corporation - Gold Sponsor		
Goodwill Industries of Houston		

Greater Houston Partnership		
HAM-TMC Library		
Hexion Specialty Chemicals, Inc.		
Houston Airport System		
Houston Hope		
Houston Rockets		
Houston TranStar-Gold Sponsor		
Houston Trust Company		
Houston-Galveston Area Council-Gold Sponsor		
HR Houston- Gold Sponsor		
JPMorgan Chase-Gold Sponsor		
Kelly Services		
LifeGift Organ Donation Center		
Linebarger ,Goggan Blair & Sampson, LLP		
Kingwood Urgent Center		
LoanXM, LLC		
McDonald's USA ,		
NASA Johnson Space Center		
PKF Texas-Platinum Sponsor		
Port of Houston Authority- Silver Sponsor		
PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP		
Reliant Energy, Inc		

Rice University		
S&B Infrastructure, Ltd- Gold Sponsor		
Shell Information Technology, Inc.		
Shell Oil Company		
SilverOak Financial Group, Ltd. LLC		
South Main Alliance- Gold Sponsor		
Texas Department of Transportation- Gold Sponsor		
Texas Transportation Institute- Gold Sponsor		
Tri-County Black Chamber of Commerce		

Company	Location	Policy
Community Council of Greater Dallas	<i>Dallas, TX</i>	In addition to our on-going flexibility policies that allow staff to work from home and vary their hours, we have just instituted a compressed 4-day work week. Most of the employees who must or want to be in the office to perform their work are allowed to compress their full time total of 37.5 hrs per week into four days. All employees, including entry-level workers and hourly employees, are eligible to work a compressed work week. (The only exception is our 2-1-1 call specialists who will continue working 7 1/2 hr. shifts five days a week. Compressing their work into four days is too stressful emotionally for them. They have to deal with difficult callers, and sometimes people who are in crisis situations, i.e. suicide callers).
Everburn Manufacturing	<i>Lexington, Kentucky</i>	Our Company has decided to change our production schedule from Monday through Friday 8 hours a day to a Tuesday through Friday schedule working 10 hours a day. This will help employees save on gas cost by not driving to work one day a week and also save on child care cost.
Getronics USA, Inc	<i>National</i>	We have also started a program to all as many employees the options of either a 9/80 or 4/10 work week (for employees waiting to become teleworkers), when business needs are not affected.
Pitney Bowes		Pitney Bowes has employees working a wide range of formal and informal flexible work arrangements. These vary in availability and scope based primarily on business need. The following are among the types of flexible arrangements offered and support: Flex Time Staggered Hours, Summer Hours, Compressed Work Weeks (4/10s and 9/80s), Telecommuting/Teleworking
Universities Hospitals	<i>Cleveland, OH</i>	UH also provides discount bus cards that employees can purchase using pre-tax earning through payroll deduction and several flex-time options, including 3 and 4 day work weeks.
	<i>Utah</i>	Utah this summer will become what experts say is the first state to institute a mandatory four-day work week for most state employees, joining local governments across the nation that are altering schedules to save money, energy and resources
Coca-Cola Bottling Company	<i>Philadelphia</i>	Teamsters Local 830-This agreement allows a specified number of employees each to be scheduled for a three-day week (three consecutive 13.3 hour days); a four-day week (four consecutive 10 hour days); or a traditional five-day week (five consecutive eight-hour days).
Intalco Aluminum Corp	<i>Ferndale, Washington</i>	Teamsters Local 231 bargained: Members may work 8-hour, 10-hour or 12-hour days

St. Luke's Hospital	<i>Newburgh, New York</i>	Teamsters Local 445-negotiated a compressed "flex work week" schedule under which full time employees work a regular work week of 37 ½ hours each. Some nurses at the hospital also work according to the "Baylor" plan, under which their entire schedule consists of two twelve-hour shifts every weekend.
Probate Court Clerk Chris Thomas	<i>Shelby County, Tennessee</i>	Thomas' 10-person office, which processes documents such as wills and estates, trusts and name changes, will remain open five days a but with extended hours, Thomas said. Employees will work from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., with a 40-min lunch break to meet the 37.5-hour a week requirement.
Amerisure Insurance Company's	<i>Detroit, Michigan</i>	all employees have some flexibility in their schedules, even those staffing call centers. They can choose the hours they work between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., which lets them, for instance, pick up or drop off their kids during the day.
	<i>New Mexico</i>	New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson (D) has ordered each state agency to adopt a policy for telecommuting and alternate work schedules by Sept. 1. part of Richardson's plan to consider alternate work schedules could include allowing employees to telecommute from satellite offices throughout the state, said the governor's spokeswoman, Caitlin Kelleher
Florida attorney general's office	<i>Florida</i>	started offering four-day workweeks to about 500 employees last month, 100 of whom have joined the summertime program
The SC Depart of Transportation	<i>SC</i>	introduced a summer pilot program June 16, and about 11 percent of the department's employees have enrolled.
	<i>Little Rock, AK</i>	Richard Weiss, director of the state Department of Finance and Administration, said the state has allowed agencies to change working hours for employees as long as all workers still work at least an eight-hour day. Any changes from the five-day, 40-hour work week must be approved by the governor. Beebe said he had allowed some state agencies to give their employees four-day work weeks, as long as they could stagger their staff to be open during business hours. He said several agencies had applied for the waiver to the governor's office. Some work units in the Department of Human Services county offices have offered employees four- day weeks as long as it meant the office was still open five days a week. "A four-day workweek (cannot) mean closing the office down for the day or restricting access to services," department spokeswoman Julie Munsell said. Also, maintenance workers for the Arkansas Department of Highway and Transportation work on a four-day schedule during the summer to take advantage of long daylight hours.
Environmental Protection Agency	<i>Boston, Mass.</i>	http://www.flra.gov/fsip/finalact/04fs_084.html

Gov. Bill Richardson	<i>Sante Fem, New Mexico</i>	Gov. Bill Richardson has given a green light to compressed work weeks and telecommuting by state employees to help them cope with the high cost of gasoline. Each agency must formulate policies related to the Telework and Alternative Work Schedules and Program and submit them to Personnel Director Perez on or before Sept. 1, 2008. Agencies considering moving to a four day work week, must first identify how the change will still enable them to maintain operational needs, service delivery requirements, program goals and back up coverage in the event of an emergency. It is voluntary for employees to consider this program, although, it is strongly encouraged. They must meet requirements, including completion of their probationary period and successful job performance (certain positions will not be eligible.) Economic development Secretary Fred Mondragon announced his department will be moving to a four day compressed work schedule. The department hopes to implement the pilot program by the beginning of Aug.
Federal Railroad Administration		FRA employees may participate in Flexible Work Schedule and Compressed Work Schedule programs. Flexible Work Schedules refer to work schedules whereby employees can vary starting times and ending times within flexible time bands. Compressed Work Schedules enable full-time employees to complete the basic work requirements of 80 hours in fewer than 10 full work days. For example, Compressed Work Schedules refer to fixed work schedules that allow employees to work 4 10-hour days a week (4-10 work schedule) or allow employees to work eight nine-hour days and one eight-hour day during a biweekly pay period (5/4-9 work schedule). Participation in these programs is subject to supervisory approval.
U.S. Government Accountability Office	<i>Seattle, WA</i>	They have to put in 80 hours of work every two weeks. But they can configure those hours pretty much how they'd like, with the exception of the one day a week their managers require all employees to be at the office at the same time. Plus, they can work from home for some of the week, or they can work compressed weeks so that they can take every fifth or 10th day off and still log their 80 hours. Those policies are why that GAO office is among the recipients of the Alfred P. Sloan awards for excellence in workplace flexibility given by the Families and Work Institute (FWI) every year.
Amerisure Insurance Company's	<i>Detroit</i>	all employees have some flexibility in their schedules, even those staffing call centers. They can choose the hours they work between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., which lets them, for instance, pick up or drop off their kids during the day.
BAE Systems Electronics and Integrated Solutions		a defense and aerospace company with offices in Lexington and Nashua. They've been on a compressed workweek that gives them every other Friday off since 1997.

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Amendment to Smoking Ban Ordinance

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to amend the fine enacted in Ordinance 033-08HR (Smoking Ban) to conform to a recent SC Supreme Court Case.

B. Background / Discussion

On September 8, 2008, the SC Supreme Court decided Beachfront Entertainment, Inc. d/b/a Bert's Bar, John Elder, Mary Lynn Sheppard, and Cole Charles v. Town of Sullivan's Island, which dealt with the Town's smoking ban ordinance. In that case, the Court decided that the civil fine attached to a smoking ordinance could only be as great as the fines established in the Clean Indoor Air Act, which max out at \$25. Thus, the County's fine of \$500 is now in contradiction to State Law.

It is now requested that County Council reduce the fine for an infraction of the Smoking Ban Ordinance to \$25 to bring the ordinance in compliance with State Law.

C. Financial Impact

There is no known financial impact associated with this request beyond reduction in potential fines paid to the County.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve a reduction of the fine to \$25 and be in compliance with State Law.
2. Do not approve a reduction of the fine.

E. Recommendation

Reduce the fine to \$25 to be in compliance with State Law.

Recommended by: Elizabeth A. McLean **Department:** Legal **Date:** 9/19/2008

F. Reviews

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 9/19/2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-08HR

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 18, OFFENSES; SECTION 18-6, SMOKING OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS; SO AS TO DECREASE THE FINE FOR AN INFRACTION.

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution of the State of South Carolina and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ENACTED BY RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL:

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 18, Offenses; Section 18-6. Smoking of Tobacco Products; Subsection (h)(3); is hereby amended to read as follows:

(3) An infraction is punishable by a fine of twenty-five dollars (\$25). Each day on which a violation of this Section occurs shall be considered a separate and distinct infraction. A violation of this Section is furthermore declared to be a public nuisance.

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances Repealed. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after _____ 2008.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Joseph McEachern, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2008

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading: September 16, 2008
Second Reading:
Public Hearing:
Third Reading:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Carry Forward Funds Policy

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present for the Committee, and potentially Council's consideration, a policy on the use of "carry forward funds" by Richland County (the "County"), school districts, and millage agencies.

B. Background/Purpose

The process undertaken annually by the County Auditor to levy appropriate millage to fund approved budgets for the County, school districts and millage agencies requires that the County Auditor estimate the actual value of a mill taking into account a number of factors, including a factor for uncollectible taxes. From time to time, the millage levied will result in the collection of more revenue than was reflected in the approved budget. This non-recurring revenue has been known as "Carry Forward Funds." Based on past practices, the County Auditor would take into account such Carry Forward Funds and reduce the number of mills accordingly. Under the restrictions imposed by Act 388 non-planned reductions in operations millage can have a negative impact on the ability of governing bodies to increase millage in future years.

As proposed, the policy would provide a mechanism through which the Carry Forward Funds can be used to reduce the tax burden on taxpayers without artificially lowering operating millage. The policy will allow the County, school districts and millage agencies to transfer Carry Forward Funds resulting from operating millage into a capital projects account to be used to fund capital projects which would otherwise be funded from debt. If the County, school districts or millage agencies do not have any current capital needs, the Carry Forward Funds may be transferred into a debt service account or sinking fund, at the direction of the appropriate governing body.

Proposed Policy:

Carry Forward Funds shall mean the amount of funds resulting from a levy of operating millage in excess of the budgeted amount of revenue. Each year the amount of Carry Forward Funds available to the County, a school district or millage agency may, at the direction of the appropriate governing body, be transferred into a capital projects account to be used to fund capital projects which would otherwise be funded from debt. If the County, school districts or millage agencies do not have any current capital needs, the Carry Forward Funds may be transferred into a debt service account or sinking fund, at the direction of the appropriate governing body.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County, school districts and millage agencies will be in one of the following forms:

(1) Amounts available for capital projects without the necessity of borrowing will be increased; or

(2) If the County, school districts and millage agencies do not have annual capital needs, debt service millage would be reduced.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve and adopt the policy.
2. Do not approve the policy.
3. Propose amendments to the policy.

E. Recommendation

This is a policy decision of county council.

Recommended by: J. Milton Pope **Department:** Administration **Date:** 09/18/2008

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Request for approval to renew contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC for FY '08-'09

A. Purpose:

Council is requested to approve the renewal of the contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC to perform autopsies and postmortem examination for the Coroner's Office for FY '08-'09 and the encumbrance of funds for these services.

B. Background/Discussion:

The contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC went into effect in July 1992 with the option to renew each year. This pathology group is the only group that can meet the specifications of the Coroner's Office to perform autopsy services. Therefore, it is requested that the contract be approved as a sole-source service provided to the county. The contract should provide for autopsy services by this group at a cost of \$850.00 per autopsy and \$100.00 per forensic consult exam.

C. Financial Impact:

Based on the prior year and estimates, I would request an initial amount of \$270,000.00 be approved for autopsy and forensic consult exam services for FY '08-'09. It is possible that this amount will not be sufficient and will have to be increased during the year.

D. Alternatives:

1. Approve the request to renew the contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC and to encumber initial funds of \$270,000.00 for autopsy and exam services by Professional Pathology Services, PC. Approval of this request to renew the contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC and to encumber the funds requested will allow autopsies and forensic consult exams to be done and payment for these services without interruption.
2. Do not approve. If this request is not approved, autopsies and forensic consult exams will not be done and/or payment for autopsy services will be delayed.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request for the renewal of the contract with Professional Pathology Services, PC and that funds be encumbered in the amount of \$270,000.00 for autopsy services.

Recommended by: Coroner Gary Watts **Department:** Coroner **Date:** 6/25/08

F. Reviews

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 9/22/2008

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Professional Pathology Services, PC has a Medical Doctor who is a Forensic Pathologist and a Richland County Medical Examiner and who is licensed as an Anatomic and Forensic Pathologist and member of the American Board of Medical Specialist and South Carolina Medical Examiners and affiliated with Palmetto Health Richland and Palmetto Health Baptist.

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 9-22-09

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval...funds are budgeted.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: RFP for Employee and Retiree Payroll Deduction Insurance Vendors and Products, EAP (Employee Assistance Program) Services and Flexible Spending Accounts (FSAs)

A. Purpose

One objective was to benchmark County benefits and plans with the market to determine if the County is competitive and/or needs to make strategic adjustments to reduce insurance increase trends. Another objective was to leverage the market to secure competitively priced responses from qualified vendors that could maintain a high level of employee customer service satisfaction. In addition, the County wanted to provide interested vendors an opportunity to respond to the RFP. The RFP also incorporated changes Council approved to the retiree insurance plan, such as adding Medicare Advantage and HSAs (Health Savings Accounts). The products and services included in the RFP were all insurance products currently on payroll deduction, Flexible Spending Accounts (FSA) and Employee Assistance Programs (EAP). Propose County insurance plan recommendations for the period January 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009.

B. Background / Discussion

Origin of Issue:

Administration and Human Resources

Lead Department:

Human Resources

What are the Key Issues (Precipitation of Project):

- Projected cost escalation trend for health insurance.
- Utilize the market to secure quality and cost competitive proposals for employee and retiree insurance and EAP and FSA services from qualified vendors.
- GASB 45 accounting requirements becoming effective for Richland County this FY.
- Anticipation of possible changes to retiree health insurance plan or benefits.
- Multi-year agreements expired for life and dental insurance.
- Leverage Richland County's positive claim trend over past 5 years.
- Provide opportunity for vendors to compete for Richland County business.
- Need to benchmark employee and retiree insurance products and vendors.

Date Ready for Implementation:

Upon Council approval – needs be approved by October 7, 2008 in order to become effective on January 1, 2009.

Multiple Year Project:

Yes

Process to Date:

- Selected a consultant to assist the County throughout the RFP process.
- Developed an RFP
- Consultant coordinated communicating RFP to interested vendors.
- Consultant collected responses to RFP from vendors.
- Consultant compiled data and analyzed responses from vendors.
- Consultant evaluated vendors' ability to deliver services and responses to the RFP. Evaluation included a review of vendor networks, network discounts, potential disruption to employees and retirees if the County changed vendors, cost, cost comparison, ability to deliver services, and vendor financial rating.
- Consultant reported to the County on responses to RFP and financial status of vendors.
- RFP has been conducted and results reported to the County.
- HRD is ready to share results with Council.

Process Plan for Future Action:

- Present recommendations to Council and request Council's approval.
- Coordinate with Procurement and consultant to properly inform vendors that responded to RFP.
- Coordinate with Procurement and Legal to secure multi year agreements and finalize contracts as authorized by Council.
- Coordinate with Finance to prepare for any changes necessary to payroll deductions.
- Consider incorporating value added wellness incentives to encourage employees to be healthier with an added goal of reducing claim costs, within approved budget limits.
- Develop transition, education, and implementation plan for employees and retirees.
- Train HRD Staff on changes approved by Council: (Medicare, Medicare Advantage, Medicare Supplement, HSAs, and HRAs).
- Present information to employees and retirees.
- Offer Open Enrollment for employees and retirees where they can make changes.
- New plan year starts January 1, 2009

C. Financial Impact

Due to involvement of contractual matters that have not yet been decided and therefore need to be kept confidential at this time, a detailed financial overview will be presented in Executive Session to Council.

HRD projects the overall costs will be within budget amounts approved by Council for FY 2008-2009.

D. Alternatives

1. Leave current insurance plans as they are.
2. Implement all changes as recommended.

3. Implement some of the changes as recommended.

E. Recommendation

The consultant has provided a draft recommendation letter. Because the recommendation will be used to determine which vendors the County will attempt to negotiate a contract with, the recommendation letter will also be presented to Council during Executive Session.

F. Reviews

This item is a contractual matter and is eligible to be discussed in executive session. It is recommended that additional information and/or recommendations be provided during executive session.