



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|
| Damon Jeter | Gwendolyn Kennedy | Greg Pearce (Chair) | Jim Manning | Seth Rose |
| District 3 | District 7 | District 6 | District 8 | District 5 |

**MAY 24, 2011
6:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: April 26, 2011 [pages 4-7]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Clerk of Council Job Vacancy [pages 9-10]
3. Council Member Expense Account Policy Guidelines [pages 12-13]

4. Emergency Services Purchase Orders for 2011-2012 [pages 15-16]
5. Property Insurance for 2011-2012 [pages 18-19]
6. Purchase additional Shelving in Family Court, Civil Records, Criminal Records and Archives Room [pages 21-23]
7. Relocation of Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall [pages 25-27]
8. Renaissance Foundation MOU Extension [pages 29-36]
9. Revise Richland County Human Resources Guidelines for Exit Interviews [pages 38-41]
10. Volunteer Fire Operations Insurance [pages 43-44]

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

11. a. Sewer Tap Fee Assistance Program (Malinowski-November 2010)

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: April 26, 2011 [pages 4-7]

Reviews

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2011 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: L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.
Member: Damon Jeter
Member: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy
Member: Seth Rose

Absent: Jim Manning

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Bill Malinowski, Norman Jackson, Joyce Dickerson, Kelvin Washington, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Tamara King, Melinda Edwards, Valeria Jackson, Ebony Woods, Rodolfo Callwood, John Hixson, Dale Welch, David Chambers, Anna Fonseca, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:04 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 22, 2011 (Regular Session) – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to amend the agenda to take up Items #13 and 19 at the beginning of the meeting. The vote in favor of adopting the amended agenda was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Request to transfer the VAWA Criminal Domestic Violence grant from Court Administration to Solicitor's Office – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to transfer management of the CDV grant to the Solicitor’s Office.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Vote Federal Accessibility Grant to Election Commission – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to accept the HAVA grant in the amount of \$36,502.25.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mass Transit Funding – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Adopt the State's travel policy and per diem – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote in favor was unanimous.

CDBG and HOME Funding Process – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to revise the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME programs budgetary process for the upcoming FY 11-12 and subsequent funding years.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Central Services Mail and Print Operations Information – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Allow Support Services to continue to utilize the Pitney Bowes Purchase Power system to process mail in-house.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Codification of the 2008 edition of the National Electrical Code and the 2006 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Codify the 2008 National Electrical Code and the 2006 International Energy Conservation Code into the Richland County Code of Ordinances.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Contract Approval with Palmetto Posting, Inc. – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request for the County to enter into a contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc., at rate and cost estimates provided, for the purpose of posting of property in Richland County on which delinquent ad valorem property taxes are due.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Execution of an agreement naming Richland County as the Administering County for the 5th Circuit Public Defender – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Motion to Adhere to Grant Deadlines as stated in Grant Program Guidelines – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to neither accept nor review late or incomplete grant applications. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Organizationally place the County Assessor's Office under the County Administrator – Mr. Manning moved, seconded to Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Request the Richland County Legislative Delegation introduce legislation that would repeal the special legislation.

Mr. Rose made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. The motion failed.

The vote was in favor of forwarding a recommendation of Alternative #1.

Policy to Address Budgets of Newly Elected Officials – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #2: "Allow any new elected official a window of opportunity, one month for example, to review and analyze his or her budget and then report to the Council on the status of the budget and, with the concurrence of the Council, the elected official and the County Administrator, initiate a budget amendment if there are no alternatives."

Ms. Kennedy made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #3: "Continue the practice as it exists today, i.e. assume that a newly elected official must operate within the budget that has been adopted, with the Council dealing with individual elected official requests on a case by case basis."

Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Policy to Address Mid-Year Agency Budget Amendments – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Revision to Richland County Employee Handbook to Expand Groups Protected from Discrimination – Mr. Rose moved, seconded Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to expand the protected groups from discrimination." The vote in favor was unanimous.

Richland County Transportation Study Commission Funding – This item was received as information.

Temporary lease for the use of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar at Hamilton-Owens Airport – Mr. Rose moved, seconded Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to lease the Curtiss-Wright Hangar to the SCHAF based on the draft lease agreement.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

To adopt a public accommodations ordinance consistent with the City of Columbia – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Adopt the public accommodations ordinance.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

Use the Debt Collection Program to Recover Outstanding Debt – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to approve the use of the Setoff Debt Collection Program (GEAR) offered by the South Carolina Association of Counties to collect delinquent money owed to the County’s Community Development Department from beneficiaries of County HOME Investment Partnership Program and Community Development Block Grant.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Clarification of Budget Motion – This item was received as information.

Timeline for County Administrator’s Evaluation – The committee recommended to have the consultant distribute the evaluation forms to Council members at the May 3rd Council meeting. Council members should complete and return the evaluation forms to the consultant by the end of May. The consultant will tabulate the evaluations and report back to Council at the June 7th. Mini-conferences will be held with the Administrator to discuss the evaluation findings in June and October. A full evaluation will take place in December.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:54 p.m.

Submitted by,

L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Clerk of Council Job Vacancy [pages 9-10]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Clerk of Council Job Vacancy

A. Purpose

To request that County Council begin the process of a searching for a new Clerk of Council immediately.

B. Background / Discussion

At the April 19, 2011 Council meeting Council voted to amend the Consultant’s contract to create updated job descriptions for the three (3) current positions in the Clerk of Council’s Office..

At the May 3, 2011, Council meeting, Council Member Norman Jackson introduced the following motion: “Richland County Council has dismissed the Clerk of Council effective March 31, 2011 and so is currently without a Clerk. I motion to start the process for the search for a Clerk of Council immediately.”

C. Financial Impact

The only financial impact will be the costs associated with filling the position.

D. Alternatives

List the alternatives to the situation. There will always be at least two alternatives:

1. Approve the request to immediately start the process to fill the position of Clerk of Council
2. Do not approve the request to start the process to fill the position.
3. Maintain the two assistant positions.

E. Recommendation

Approve the request to immediately start the process to fill the position of Clerk of Council.

Recommended by: Councilman Norman Jackson Department: Council Date: May 5, 2011

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/9/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Position is currently funded and budget dollars are available

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is decision for the County Council.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 5-11-11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Council Member Expense Account Policy Guidelines [pages 12-13]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Council Member Expense Account Policy Guidelines

A. Purpose

The purpose of this item is to request the County Council's consideration of a motion made at the April 19, 2011, Council Meeting regarding a proposed amendment to the Council Member expense account policy guidelines.

B. Background / Discussion

At the April 19, 2011, Council Meeting, Council Members Damon Jeter, Paul Livingston and Kelvin Washington introduced the following motion:

“According to the Richland County Council’s Individual expense account policy guidelines, “The funds are intended to be used as a general government reimbursement expense fund. I make a motion that Council amend the policy, and direct the County Administrator to incorporate a credit card program for council members in the budget process. The program should provide each council member with a credit card. Members would be required to provide receipts associated with expenditures at the end of the month. In cases where the transaction involves a business that does not accept a credit card, Council members would be able to get a counter check processed at any Bank of America location. This would allow the council members to have more immediate access to funds rather than waiting on a check to be issued, and would provide the County a small savings from the cost of writing a check.”

C. Financial Impact

There would be no additional costs to the County by implementing the credit card program. Instead, there would likely be a small savings as a result of the County not having to write an individual check for each transaction. Implementation would also result in less paperwork and processing time relating to Council Member expenses.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion to move to amend the Council’s expense account policy by issuing each Council Member a credit card.
2. Do not approve the proposed amendment to the Council’s expense account policy and continue processing payments as in the past.

E. Recommendation

By: Motion by Council Members Jeter, Livingston and Washington

Date: April 19, 2011 Council Meeting

F. Reviews

(Please replace the appropriate box with a ✓ and then support your recommendation in the Comments section before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/4/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval would provide an easier access to funds however as with all processes there would be some associated risk accepted. I would encourage the approval to include clear guidelines on the allowable expenditures and reporting requirements inclusive of the needed supporting documents otherwise a risk accepted is the inability to substantiate an expenditure recorded.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date:5/4/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/5/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval due to the fact that the proposed credit card option would streamline Council Members' management of their expense accounts. The proposal would also save money by reducing paperwork and staff time involved in processing expenditures. I concur with the Finance Director, however, that guidelines to address allowable expenditures and reporting requirements should be developed.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Emergency Services Purchase Orders for 2011-2012 [pages 15-16]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Emergency Services Purchase Orders for 2011-2012 ESD 01052011

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council's approval to award purchase orders and contracts for services in the 2011-2012 budget year. These services are required for the operations of the Emergency Services Department. The purchase order and contract approvals are subject to Council's adoption of the 2011-2012 budget.

A. Background / Discussion

Each division in the Emergency Services Department uses vendors to provide service for operations. It is necessary to renew agreements and have them in place July 1, 2011, so that service will not be interrupted at the start of the new budget year. The implementation of the purchase orders and contracts are subject to available funding in the budget County Council approves for year 2011 / 2012. Purchase orders and contracts that exceed, or may exceed \$100,000 during the year are:

| VENDOR | SERVICE | ESTIMATED AMOUNT |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| City of Columbia | EMS/ESD Diesel & Gasoline | \$342,000 |
| Phillips Medical | Annual Service, EKG Monitors | \$ 72,000 |
| Motorola | EMS/Radio Service | \$ 94,000 |
| Motorola | ETS/911 Equip.Service Agreement | \$240,000 |
| Motorola | FIRE Radio Service | \$186,000 |
| Motorola | ADMIN/ETS Radio Service | \$ 41,000 |

B. Financial Impact

Funding is included in the 2011 / 2012 budget request presented to Council. The purchase orders and contracts will be activated July 1, 2011, if funding has been approved in the budget.

C. Alternatives

1. Approve the purchase orders and contracts to have uninterrupted service beginning July 1, 2011.
2. Do not approve the purchase orders and contracts.

D. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the purchase orders and contracts for services, contingent on the 2011-2012 budget, so there will not be an interruption of these mission essential services at the beginning of the new budget year.

Report by Michael A. Byrd, Director of Emergency Services. May 6, 2011

F. Reviews

(Please ***SIGN*** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/18/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/18/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the renewal of the contracts outlined above. Funding has been included in the FY 12 budget proposal, and approval of the contracts will be contingent on the Council's final adoption of the budget.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Property Insurance for 2011-2012 [pages 18-19]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: PROPERTY INSURANCE for 2011-2012

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the purchase of property insurance for 2011-2012.

B. Background / Discussion

The County received three proposals for its 2011-2012 property insurance. Arthur J. Gallagher Risk Management of Greenville, S.C. submitted the proposal that is in the best interest of the County.

C. Financial Impact

The projected premium is \$ 170,269 which is within the proposed budget and is a reduction of this year's cost of \$ 191,300.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request.
2. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

The proposal is recommended.

Recommended by: David Chambers, Risk Management, May 9, 2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/9/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The amount is included in the recommended budget

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of a contract with Arthur J. Gallagher for property insurance for FY 12. Gallagher offered the most comprehensive coverage of the three proposals that were received. Funding has been included in the FY 12 proposed budget.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Purchase additional Shelving in Family Court, Civil Records, Criminal Records and Archives Room [pages 21-23]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of Additional Shelving in Family Court, Civil Records, Criminal Records and Archives Room

A. Purpose

Clerk of Court (Family Court) department is requesting Richland County Council to approve the use of \$79,000.00 for the purchase of additional shelving in Family Court, Civil Records, Criminal Records and the Archive Rooms. In addition, On Base software will be purchased in order to scan documents in Family Court.

B. Background / Discussion

We are constantly thinking of ways to help our department operate more efficiently. The supervisors and I met to discuss the most critical needs of the different areas. After many needs were expressed it was decided that the insufficient amount of space for filing documents and scanning of documents were the greatest need. We all agreed additional funds would best serve our departments with the purchase of additional shelving and On Base software for scanning.

Family Court will receive a greater amount of additional shelving to accommodate the transfer of divorce files to better serve the customers. The transfer of divorce files to Family Court from Clerk of Court filing space will add to the efficiency to our office procedures. Currently both offices are entering a divorce case which causes inefficient use of manpower. The case originates in Family Court and is stored in Clerk's office filing space because of lack of filing space in Family Court.

It is projected there will be an average of 20 percent increase of cases in the Civil Department because of a high volume of foreclosures and judgment cases being filed. Additionally, there will be an average increase of 15 percent in Criminal Court because of the increase of crimes and the backlog of cases. These cases will have to be filed and currently files are stacked on the floor because there is no shelf space left. Family Court has had an increase of cases and there is not adequate shelf space. We are currently using old mail boxes to store files because of the lack of shelving to store the files. There is also an urgent need for a secured locked storage cabinet for guns and knives' evidence that is stored by the Clerk's office.

Family Court is **not** presently scanning any documents. We have consulted with IT about purchasing the On Base program for use in Family Court. This technology will enhance the procedures that are currently being used. The technology will bring our services to the citizens of Richland County into the twenty first century. It is my understanding that many departments in the county are presently using On Base.

C. Financial Impact

Most recently the Clerk of Court decided to cash in a Certificate of Deposit and the interest earned was \$79,000.00. A check was turned into the RC Treasurer and has been deposited in the General Fund. Therefore, there will be no financial impact to the county.

Listed below is a list and cost of items that need to be purchased:

| Item | Cost | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| Cabinet | Weapons storage cabinet for Evidence Room (2) | \$2,300.00 |
| Shelving | Shelving for postal tubs in Archive Room | 8,975.00 |
| Shelving | Shelving for Files in Old Traffic Court Room (Civil Records) | 7,020.00 |
| Shelving (Mobile) | Hi density mobile Filing system for Family Court | 22,500.00 |
| Office Furniture | 4 Workstations for Family Court | |
| | 7,150.00 | |
| Shelving | Shelving for Files in Telephone Area | 6,840.00 |
| Software | On Base Program (3year contract) with 3 scanners/ Family Court | 22,900.00 |
| Total | 77,685.00 | |

D. Alternatives

1. Request that Council approve the request to address the critical need for additional shelving in order to use vertical space because floor space in Civil, Criminal, and Family Court records is inadequate. We are presently using mail buckets to store files which is unacceptable. The rapidly increasing amount of files we are receiving on a daily basis makes it difficult to maintain efficiency. We are storing files on G1, 2nd floor, 4th floor, in Archives room and anywhere space can be found in the Courthouse. This makes it difficult to serve the public when you may have to go outside of the Clerk's office or Family Court to retrieve files.
2. Request that County Council approve the request to purchase On Base software in Family Court to bring the technology up to date to provide quicker services to the citizens.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve this request from Clerk of Court and Family Court to provide professional and expedient services to citizens of Richland County.

Recommended By:

Department:

Date:

Jeanette W. McBride

Clerk of Court

April 11, 2011

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/16/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a funding decision for Council and is appropriate to allocate the funds through a budget amendment. Another alternative would be to consider the request as a part of the FY12 budget discussions.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Budget and funding decision for Council.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The use of those funds is solely within the discretion of the Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 5-19-11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend denial based on the fact that the request is a budget amendment and the request is in conflict with a principle of the County's financial policy.

If however the Committee and Council approve this request the financial impact would be zero because unbudgeted revenue has been added to the fund balance.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Relocation of Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall [pages 25-27]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Relocation of Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall

A. Purpose

The purpose of this item is to request the County Council's consideration of a motion made at the April 19, 2011, Council Meeting regarding the relocation of the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall.

B. Background / Discussion

At the April 19, 2011, Council Meeting, Council Member Jim Manning introduced the following motion:

“Council endorses moving the Sheriff Department's Region Two Office to Decker Mall and that the remaining bond dollars be designated as renovation monies for the County's Decker property.”

In September of 2010, the County Council approved a bond issue in the amount of \$9 million for various capital improvement projects, including the relocation of the Health Department from its current location at 2020 Hampton Street. It was subsequently determined by staff that the former Decker Mall on Decker Boulevard would be an ideal location for the Health Department and would allow for the future co-location of the Department of Social Services with the Health Department.

The Council later decided not to relocate the Health Department but to leave it at its current Hampton Street location. The Council proceeded, however, with the purchase of the Decker Mall, with a directive to the staff to develop a list of candidates that could be relocated to that site.

After consideration of several potential tenants for the Decker Mall facility, Administration is recommending that Central Court, currently located at 1400 Huger Street, be moved to Decker. This will allow for the eventual sale of the Huger Street property, as has been previously discussed with the Council.

Council Member Manning's motion to relocate the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation, currently housed at Columbia Mall on Two Notch Road, would result in a very compatible co-location of Traffic Court functions and a Sheriff's Substation. The Sheriff has endorsed the relocation of the Region Two Substation.

With respect to the funding, \$2 million of the \$9 million bond will be used for the purchase of Decker Mall, with \$7 million remaining. On April 5, 2011, the Council approved a motion from the Recreation Ad Hoc Committee to appropriate up to \$5 million of the remaining bond funds for the Regional Sports Complex, which could be offset with funding from the Hospitality Tax or the General Fund. Since then, the County Administrator has developed an alternative funding plan for the Sports Complex, which will de-obligate the \$5 million in bond funds for use on other capital

projects. The alternative funding plan for the Regional Sports Complex is being considered as part of the FY 12 budget for the Hospitality Tax Fund.

In conclusion, the staff recommends approval of Council Member Manning's motion to relocate the Sheriff's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall and to use the remaining \$7 million in bond funds to pay for the renovation of the facility. As part of the staff's endorsement of this motion, it is recommended that the Council approve the relocation of Central Court to Decker as well.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County would be the renovation costs for the Decker Mall facility, up to \$7 million. These funds are already available through the bond that was issued in 2010.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion to relocate the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall and use up to \$7 million of the remaining 2010 bond issue to renovate the facility.
2. Approve the motion to relocate the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall, as well as the County's Central Court, and use up to \$7 million of the remaining 2010 bond issue to renovate the facility.
3. Do not approve the motion to relocate either the Sheriff's Substation or Central Court to Decker Mall and direct the staff to develop other alternatives for use of the site.

E. Recommendation

By: Motion by Council Member Manning Date: April 19, 2011 Council Meeting

F. Reviews

(Please replace the appropriate box with a ✓ and then support your recommendation in the Comments section before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 5/5/11

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is Council discretion and is a strategic planning decision for the County with several complications; therefore, I would recommend that Council make the decision considering all the long term factors. I have listed some below and have discussed others with Administration that will be included in Administration's comments:

- ✓ No cost plan for the renovation of Decker facility or the retrofit(start up equipment, etc) required for Region 2 is included so I would recommend the development and review prior to approval to evaluate if this can be accommodated with the bond funds.

- √ It is not stated in the ROA if the expansion of Region 2 would require recurring funding of additional positions, equipment, capital, etc but I would recommend that the amount be determined prior to approval with a funding plan.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

√ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The relocation of the Sheriff's Region Two Substation is within Council's discretion. However, prior to approving the relocation I would recommend that the lease on the current space be reviewed to insure that when the move does occur, that the county is not subject to any damages for violating the terms of that lease. In addition, I would concur with the comments of Finance that the county obtain a cost analysis prior to making a final decision.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date:

√ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The original capital improvement plan submitted to and approved by the Council included the relocation of the Health Department to Decker Mall and, in turn, the relocation of some of the functions at the Judicial Center to the vacated Health Department Building to help relieve the overcrowding at the Judicial Center.

The Council has more recently, however, decided against the Health Department's relocation. The relocation of the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation and the County's Central Court is, in the professional opinion of Administration, the next best alternative for Decker. Alternative 2, therefore, is recommended, i.e., approve the motion to relocate the Sheriff's Department's Region Two Substation to Decker Mall, as well as the County's Central Court, and use up to \$7 million of the remaining 2010 bond issue to renovate the facility.

An alternative plan, to either relocate some of the existing functions at the Judicial Center or to acquire a new courthouse facility (estimated cost between \$75 million and \$150 million), will have to be addressed in the future.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Renaissance Foundation MOU Extension [pages 29-36]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Renaissance Foundation MOU Extension

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the MOU extension for the Renaissance Foundation that includes previously approved funding through FY14 and current reporting guidelines.

B. Background / Discussion

The current Renaissance Foundation MOU, written in November of 2006, expires on June 30, 2011. The attached changes update the document for their funding allocation that was extended through FY14 by Council in June 2009 (\$100,000 per year for FY12 through FY14).

The attached MOU also includes updates to reflect the current reporting structure that was approved by Council in September of 2010. These changes will require the Renaissance Foundation to submit mid-year and year-end reports just as all other H-Tax and A-Tax grantees are required to submit.

As with the current MOU, the Renaissance Foundation must submit a budget and impact on tourism statement so that staff may compare future expenditure reports to the Renaissance Foundation's budget ensuring that all activity is going according to plan and aligns with County and State Hospitality Tax regulations. These items must be submitted prior to receiving funds in FY12. A timeline is also requested in order to track progress during this multi-year period.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the MOU extension for the Renaissance Foundation.
2. Do not approve the MOU extension.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the MOU extension for the Renaissance Foundation's funding through FY14 that incorporates current reporting guidelines.

Recommended by: Sara Salley

Department: Admin

Date: May 10, 2011

F. Reviews

(Please ***SIGN*** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: May 19, 2011

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that Council approve the attached MOU extension for the Renaissance Foundation's funding through FY14, which incorporates current reporting guidelines.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
) BETWEEN THE RENAISSANCE
) FOUNDATION AND RICHLAND COUNTY,
COUNTY OF RICHLAND) SOUTH CAROLINA

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING is made and entered into this 14th day of ~~November~~, ~~2006~~2011, by and between the Renaissance Foundation and Richland County, South Carolina.

WHEREAS, Richland County has imposed a local hospitality tax, as provided in §§6-1-700 et seq., S.C. Code 1976, as amended, the funds from which must be used in accordance with State law; and

WHEREAS, the Renaissance Foundation is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization under the United States Internal Revenue Code, was created to provide cultural diversity, outreach, resources, partnerships and initiatives within the community in order to bridge the gaps of disparities and to provide a platform to address these issues; and

WHEREAS, Renaissance Foundation plans to open the Bethel Cultural Arts Center at the site of historic Bethel AME Church, which will include a museum and performing arts facility that will enhance Columbia's City Center's inventory of venues by offering a variety of events that will attract a diverse audience to the museum and performing arts venue; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council recognizes the positive contributions the Renaissance Foundation can make toward improving the lives of citizens in Richland County and attracting tourism to Richland County, and desires to take full advantage of these contributions; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council, in exchange for the aforementioned contributions and services to the community, has determined that it is appropriate to award the

sum of One Hundred Thousand (\$100,000.00) Dollars per year to the Renaissance Foundation for fiscal year ~~2006~~2011/~~2007-2012~~ through fiscal year ~~2010~~2013/~~2011~~2014, from the Local Hospitality Tax Revenue Fund. The allocation of funds from 2011/2012 through fiscal year 2013/2014 are contingent upon the Richland County Council appropriating the funds for each fiscal year in its budget and determining that there have been sufficient hospitality tax revenues received during the fiscal year to make the appropriations.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits, covenants and agreements described herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

- 1) The Renaissance Foundation will continue to work towards the establishing the Bethel Cultural Arts Center;
- 2) Richland County agrees to award the Renaissance Foundation the sum of One Hundred Thousand (\$100,000.00) Dollars for each of the fiscal years ~~2006~~2011/~~2007-2012~~ through ~~2010~~2013/~~2011~~2014, which shall equal a total award of ~~Five-Three~~ Hundred Thousand (~~\$500~~300,000.00) Dollars over ~~five-three~~ years, subject to conditions as outlined in paragraph ~~6-five~~ (65) below. Such funds are to be used as program operating funds and shall only be applied towards tourism related activities, as in accordance with §6-1-730, S.C. Code 1976, as amended.
- 3) The parties understand that the Renaissance Foundation shall submit a budget, timeline, and statement of tourism impact for the complete Three Hundred Thousand (\$300,000.00) Dollar award by July 31, 2011 or before disbursement of any funds
- ~~3)4)~~ The Renaissance Foundation shall request disbursement of approved funding by

~~submitting a Payment Request Form to the Grants Manager writing to the Richland County Budget Department~~ on a quarterly basis, with the quarters being July-September, October-December, January-March and April-June. ~~Each Such requestsrequest~~ shall include a balance sheet and detailed list of expenditures summary as of the end of the preceding for the quarter. The requests for disbursement should be mailed to: Sara Salley, Grants Manager, Richland County ~~Budget Department Administration, Hospitality Tax Disbursements,~~ P.O. Box 192, Columbia, SC 29202;

4)5) ~~The parties hereto understand that the funding for this award is for fiscal years 20062011/2007-2012 through 20102013/2011-2014 only, and that the appropriations herein agreed to shall be subject to the availability of funds for Richland County during each fiscal year;~~

5)6) ~~The parties understand that the Renaissance Foundation shall submit a budget plan for the complete Five Hundred Thousand (\$500,000.00) Dollar award, which must be approved by Richland County Council before disbursement of any funds. Yearly allocations of Local Hospitality Tax funds are to be expended between July 1 and June 30;~~

6)7) ~~The parties understand the Renaissance Foundation shall submit a mid-year report and required attachments no later than January 31 of each year, and an annual final report and required attachments no later than July 31 of each year. of expenditures and the impact on tourism for the preceding calendar year and a plan for the upcoming calendar year to the County Administrator on or before March 1 of each year.~~ The parties further understand that it is the intent of Richland

County to conduct a yearly review of the recipient agency herein to determine whether to continue funding of the recipient agency and at what level, contingent on the availability of funds in successive fiscal years;

7)8) The parties understand that Richland County strongly encourages the Renaissance Foundation to seek funding from the City of Columbia and any other governmental or private entity in an amount greater than or equal to the amount awarded herein and that such matching funding is vital to the success of the Renaissance Foundation;

8)9) This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for fiscal years ~~2006~~2011/2007-2012 through ~~2010~~2013/2011-2014 provided the Renaissance Foundation continues to carry out its above-stated mission and uses the award for tourism related activities. If at any time Richland County Council finds that the awarded funds are not being used in accordance with Local Hospitality Tax requirements, as provided in applicable State law and the Richland County Code, Chapter 23, Article 6, Richland County may terminate this Memorandum of Understanding in writing shall immediately terminate. If at any time Richland County Council finds that the awarded funds are not being used in accordance with Local Hospitality Tax requirements, as provided in applicable state law and the Richland County Code, Chapter 23, Article 6, the County shall advise the Renaissance Foundation in writing of the basis of its finding that the awarded funds are not being used in accordance with the aforementioned statute and applicable law. Upon receipt of written notice, the Renaissance Foundation shall have thirty days to provide a written response and to provide an accounting

herein;

~~9~~10) The parties hereto expressly agree that the tendering of this award by Richland County and the acceptance thereof by the Renaissance Foundation in no way creates any agency relationship between the parties or any relationship which would subject Richland County to any liability for any acts or omissions of the recipient entity or entities. The Renaissance Foundation shall indemnify and hold harmless Richland County, its parent, subsidiaries and affiliates and all their respective directors, council members, officers, agents and employees (hereafter collectively referred to as the "Indemnatee") from liability, damages, losses, costs, expenses, demands, claims, suits, actions and causes of action on account of illness, personal injury or death to employees or any other persons, damage to property of Richland County or others or other loss or liability arising from or in connection with the Renaissance Foundation's performance of any services funded by this award. Further, the Renaissance Foundation, at its own expense, shall defend any demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action brought against the Indemnatee where such demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action arises from any cause for which the Indemnatee may be entitled to be indemnified and held harmless pursuant to this agreement, arising from or in connection with such demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action; provided, however, that the Indemnatee shall be entitled to participate in such defense;

~~10~~11) Any such employees, volunteers or persons authorized to conduct or carry out the mission of the Renaissance Foundation shall be the sole responsibility of the Renaissance Foundation, which shall ensure that such persons comply with all

applicable laws, rules, regulations or decisions of any federal, state, county or municipal governmental authority (including all requirements of state, federal or other grant authorities to ensure a drug-free workplace).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE THE UNDERSIGNED have this ~~14th~~ ____ day of ~~November~~ _____, ~~2006~~2011, set our hand and seal hereon.

RENAISSANCE FOUNDATION

WITNESSES:

Executive Director

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

WITNESSES:

Chairman

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Revise Richland County Human Resources Guidelines for Exit Interviews [pages 38-41]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Revise Richland County Human Resources Guidelines for Exit Interviews

Purpose

Motion by Manning - Move that RICHLAND COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES GUIDELINES TITLE: Voluntary Resignation **Number:** 5.16 **EFFECTIVE DATE:** 8/1/2009; Section entitled **Exit Interview** be revised to include wording which stipulates all employees who resign be provided with an Exit Interview Form and that a one-on-one discussion upon termination (voluntary or involuntary) be conducted by his/her Supervisor or Department Head, or Human Resources. Additionally, that wording be added to specify that once performed, management will evaluate the contents of the exit interview form to determine if any management action need to take place or investigate issues provided in the documentation. Finally, that if an employee refuses to participate, that information is documented to explain the absence of a completed form.

Background / Discussion

Origin of Issue:

Council Member Manning

Lead Department:

Human Resources Department

What are the Key Issues (Precipitation of Project):

Council Member Manning has requested Exit Interviews for be provided to all employees upon terminations (both voluntary and involuntary).

Date Ready for Implementation:

Upon Council approval

Multiple Year Project:

No

Estimated Work Hours for Completion:

There were 241 terminations for calendar year 2010. The proposed process will require an estimated 1 hour per exit interview (an estimated 241 additional hours per year by departments) as well as 25 hours to develop a program and/or choose a vendor. Up to 20 hours per month of time relating to the gathering and organizing interview data, analysis of input from interviews, development of recommendations, approval of recommendations, report of data collected and actions approved, and implementation of actions approved. The exact amount of time will vary depending on the number of terminations, input provided in the terminations, and actions approved for implementation relating to the interviews.

Process to Date:

Over the past couple years, Richland County Human Resources has conducted research, found best practices, and/or identified best practices in the area of Exit Interviews as below:

1. Researched the options of internal vs. external interviews
2. Conducted an analysis of the most effective type of exit interviews
3. Analyzed a few vendors for cost options
4. Determined that the most effective methods of conducted exit interviews, according to the research, are to:
 - a. Gathering and collating the data in a structured manner.
 - b. Aggregating the results for the organization as a whole
 - c. Analyzing the findings to identify consistent trends, patterns and themes
 - d. Using the results to determine and implement strategies to increase retention and reduce turnover.
5. Research shows that third party vendors generally yield more reliable and honest results, because terminated employees are more likely to provide reliable, candid, and accurate assessments to a third party rather than directly to their employer.
6. Determined that a well-orchestrated plan of exit surveys, in combination with other HR initiatives related to maximizing employee attitudes and behavior, has the potential to become a valuable tool to help reduce turnover and increase employee satisfaction and commitment.
7. Best practices report exit interviews are more effective when combined with employee climate surveys that take the pulse of employees that have decided to stay with the organization. This provides the employer to identify why employees are deciding to stay, while exit interviews provide information only about employees that have already left the organization. In addition, employee climate surveys can be used to cross check employee input from exit surveys.
8. Research shows the relationship between employees and their supervisors plays a significant role in whether employees decide to leave an employer.
9. Best practices state that if exit interviews are conducted by supervisors, they will need comprehensive training in an effort to mitigate inconsistencies in the presentation of questions, enhance the reliability of collected input, and help ensure the process is effective.
10. Best practices also state that exit survey information must be used otherwise, the process will lose creditability and employees will be less likely to share input and/or provide candid comments upon termination.
11. Research shows that a properly done exit survey process is very time intensive. Human Resources concluded that we did not have the resources and/or time to develop and implement an exit survey process. In addition, because of budgetary situation over the past few years Human Resources did not request additional funding to expand the exit interview process.
12. Best practices state a process should be established to address logistics such as development of forms, who will get survey input of exit interviews, who will decide and make recommendations based on the input and who will approve actions from the recommendations.

Process Plan for Future Action:

- Choose a method or process for conducting interviews
- Choose a vendor (if necessary)
- Implement new process
- Develop monthly reporting process

Reference:

A. Financial Impact

1. Cost of exit interview software, if purchased.
2. Cost of time involving supervisors, managers, and department heads conducting interviews.
3. Cost of time involving the collection and analysis of exit interview data.

B. Alternatives

1. Approve the proposed plan
2. Do not approve the proposed plan

C. Recommendation

Human Resources prepared this action under the direction of the County Administrator. It is important to note that Richland County currently has a voluntary exit interview process in place now. Any employee, supervisor, and/or department head that desires an exit interview be done currently has that option. A successful exit interview process will require the cooperation of employees, supervisors, and management. An exit interview process that is not properly executed will likely compound existing issues. Human Resources supports expanding the current voluntary exit interview process, provided the process is properly planned, supported with adequate resources, careful analysis of data done that enable accurate identification of turnover reasons, recommendations developed using the data analysis, and implementation of actions approved to mitigate undesirable turnover.

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/12/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision for Council. While I do support the continued improvement of our County processes it is unclear to me from the ROA what is the recommendation being made and what if any cost will be based on the approval. It seems like the recommendation is to expand the current process but has several contingencies including but not limited to "...supported with adequate resources" but the level or cost of those resources are not identified. Does this mean additional personnel? I would recommend that the county determine the associated recurring cost of any decision and identify a funding source prior to approval.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: See process to date and recommendations under "C".

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/19/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The concerns of the Finance Director have been noted; however, in discussion with the Human Resources Director, it was confirmed that no additional personnel or funding would be required to implement the proposed change to the exit interview process. Approval of Council Member Manning's motion, therefore, is recommended.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Volunteer Fire Operations Insurance [pages 43-44]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: VOLUNTEER FIRE OPERATIONS INSURANCE

A. Purpose

The request is to approve the purchase of volunteer fire operations insurance for 2011-2012.

B. Background / Discussion

This will be a renewal of the insurance policy with Selective Insurance. The broker and company are located in Charlotte, NC. This specialty policy covers liability and property.

C. Financial Impact

The projected premium is \$101,646, which is within the proposed budget and is a 4 % reduction of this year's cost.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request.
2. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

The proposal is recommended.

Recommended by: David Chambers, Risk Management, May 12, 2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/12/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Based on Risk Manager recommendation and funds are included in the recommended budget.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/12/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/13/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the renewal of the volunteer fire operations insurance policy with Selective Insurance. Funding is included in the proposed FY 12 budget.

Items Pending Analysis

Subject

a. Sewer Tap Fee Assistance Program (Malinowski-November 2010)

Reviews