



# **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

**NOVEMBER 22, 2011  
5:00 PM**

**2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Regular Session: October 25, 2011 (pages 5-7)

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

### **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

2. Action to Make Certain Department Heads with Contractual Responsibility At Will Employment Status (Possible Executive Session Item) (pages 9-11)
3. County Council Shirts (pages 13-16)

4. Approval of Competitive 2010 Local Emergency Management Performance Funds Grant (pages 18-19)
5. Payment Procedures for County Grant Programs (pages 21-24)
6. Special DUI Prosecutor Grant (pages 26-28)
7. VOTE Federal Accessibility Grants for the Election Commission (pages 30-31)
8. CDBG Allocation of Funds Decker Boulevard Specific (pages 33-36)
9. Resolution to Distribute \$5,281.78 in Federal Forestry Funds (pages 38-41)
10. Professional Services Property Acquisition adjacent to Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport (pages 43-50)
11. Extend Maintenance on the Assessor's UNISYS System through 2015 (pages 52-53)
12. Increase RCSD Deputy Current Pay (pages 55-63)
13. Responses from RFP to Medicare Retiree Group Health Insurance Benefit Services (Possible Executive Session Item) (pages 65-67)

**ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED**

14. a. Based on the new sewer planned for the lower Richland County area and the possibility of assistance being provided to Low/Middle income households (LMIH) I move that staff create an ordinance that sets forth criteria for qualifications to received assistance and that it will apply equally to all LMIH throughout Richland County (Malinowski, November 2010)
- b. To donate the Woodrow Wilson Home and Hampton-Preston Mansion to a non-profit organization that can handle its historic value and solicit funding from a larger area of funders or create such an organization and turn over all title and responsibility (Jackson, May 2011)
- c. That a policy be created regarding how to deal with approved grants prior to budget time and again at budget time when grants have been reduced or eliminated. When the grant ends Richland County will not provide additional funds in that agency's budget and they will have to absorb it if they want to keep it (Malinowski, November 2011)

**ADJOURNMENT**



# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Regular Session: October 25, 2011 (pages 5-7)

**Reviews**

# MINUTES OF



## RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 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: Jim Manning  
Member: Seth Rose

**ALSO PRESENT:** Bill Malinowski, Valerie Hutchinson, Norman Jackson, Joyce Dickerson, Kelvin Washington, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Sara Salley, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Tamara King, Daniel Driggers, Dale Welch, Buddy Atkins, Geo Price, Valeria Jackson, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:05 p.m.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**September 27, 2011 (Regular Session)** – Mr. Manning 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 Ms. Kennedy, to adopt the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

## ITEMS FOR ACTION

**Internal Auditor Engagement** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to appoint Mr. Manning to the Audit Committee until a citizen is appointed to the committee; areas of concentration to include performance and accountability; a RFP sub-committee made up of the Chair of Rules and Appointments Committee, Chair of Economic Development Committee and Vice Chair of Council will write, post and review all audit services RFP responses making sure recommendations go to full Council; the selected Auditor will report directly to the full Council; and the Audit Committee will perform audits on the following departments: Administration, Planning Department, Department of Public Works, Finance Department, Building Inspection and Procurement Department.

Mr. Rose made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward Mr. Manning's motion to Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Action to Make Certain Department Heads with Contractual Responsibility on At Will Employment Status** – A discussion took place.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to table this item. The motion failed.

Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to defer this item until the November Committee meeting. The vote was in favor.

**CDBG Allocation of Funds** – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to allocate and expend the CBDG funds that were awarded to the County. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**AT&T Leased Line Connections—Countywide** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to continue leasing the lines from AT&T for an amount not to exceed \$243,000. This will allow the County to maintain phone and data services to all sites. " The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Microsoft Licensing—Countywide** – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to purchase Microsoft Software Assurance from vendor CompuCom Systems, Inc. on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$131,566. This will allow the County to maintain Microsoft Copyright compliance." The vote in favor was unanimous.

**FY11-12 HUD Annual Action Plan Approval** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to approve the HUD approved FY 11-12 Annual Action Plan in its entirety." The vote in favor was unanimous.

Richland County Council

**Mass Transit Fee: Commercial Vehicles** – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Criminal Domestic Violence Court Grant Match** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve moving match grant funds in order to fully fund the Criminal Domestic Violence grant positions.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Hispanic Outreach Grant Match** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve moving match funds in order to fully fund the Hispanic Outreach grant position.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Historic Preservation Special Project** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to allocate \$20,000 of RCCC funds for the special project to move and stabilize the cabin at Kensington Manor.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Hospitality Tax—Round Two Funding Recommendations** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the funding recommendations as submitted by the Hospitality Tax Advisory Committee.” The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Hospitality Tax County Promotions Grant Program Change** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the recommendations presented by the Hospitality Tax Committee.” A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Retention Schedule for Detention Center Records** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: “Approve the request to establish retention schedules for housing journals and classification files to store these records for five years and then destroy.” A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:49 p.m.

Submitted by,

L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Action to Make Certain Department Heads with Contractual Responsibility At Will Employment Status (Possible Executive Session Item) (pages 9-11)

**Reviews**



## **Richland County Council Request of Action**

**Subject:** Action to Make Certain Department Heads with Contractual Responsibility on At Will Employment Status

### **A. Purpose**

The goal is to increase the level of accountability of Department Heads who deal with contracts that have direct contact with the public and those who have financial impact on the County. (If there is a problem relating to fairness, Mr. Jackson is willing to include all Department Heads and let the Committee sort this out.) This action is aimed to make Department Heads who have responsibility relating to contractual matters more responsive and responsible to the citizens of Richland County.

### **B. Background / Discussion**

Council Member Jackson is seeking to increase the level of accountability Department Heads who have contract responsibilities. Mr. Jackson is seeking to ensure these Department Heads are more responsive to the citizens of Richland County. Mr. Jackson has attempted to address his concern through the County Administrator. However, Mr. Jackson was informed that current County policies don't permit his concerns to be adequately addressed. Mr. Jackson said he does not think the issue is that anyone is breaking the procurement rules. His effort is to improve accountability of Department Heads and their responsiveness to the citizens of Richland County.

Mr. Jackson is seeking to remove the grievance rights of Department Heads who have contractual responsibility. That would enable the County Administrator to take disciplinary action without such Department Heads having rights of the grievance process. Mr. Jackson believes this would increase the level of accountability and responsiveness of the Department Heads who have contractual responsibility.

### **C. Financial Impact**

Revision to the County's Employee Handbook and revision to the County's HR Guidelines. Informing the Department Heads of the changes approved by the County Council.

### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approved the amendment to the County's Employee Handbook and HR Guidelines.
2. Not approve the amendments to the County's Employee Handbook and HR Guidelines.

### **E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that County Council approve option # 1.

Recommended by: Council Member Norman Jackson

Date:

## F. Reviews

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

### Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/16/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision for Council. Since the recommendation includes a change to the employee handbook, I would recommend that the HR Director be included for comment.

### Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 9/17/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision for County Council.

### Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Human Resources supports appropriate accountability for all levels of the County's workforce. As it relates to this specific proposal, Human Resources foresees some potential legal hurdles if all department heads are not included and/or clear business reasons are not used to identify which departments will be included or excluded. Therefore Human Resources suggests there be clear bona fide business reason(s) communicated to department heads so it is full understanding of the reason for the policy change and which department heads are affected. Because this change would remove an existing right, to file a grievance, the specific language in the proposed policy change should be reviewed and coordinated with Legal Department's input.

### Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 9/21/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Legal comments provided in separate Attorney-Client Memo for Council/Committee Members and Authorized Staff

### Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 9/22/11

Recommend Council approval

✓ Recommend Council denial

Item# 2

Attachment number 1  
Page 2 of 3

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend denial for reasons specified in the County Attorney's written opinion, which has been provided under separate cover.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

County Council Shirts (pages 13-16)

**Reviews**



November 14, 2011

Richland County Office of Public Information

To: Members of Richland County Council  
From: Stephany Snowden  
Re: Proposed County Council Shirt Design

Dear members of Richland County Council, as requested, please see three recommended designs for the proposed County Council shirts.

**Design A** – Reflects the design on a dark background and white lettering

**Design B** – Reflects the design on a light background and dark lettering

**Design C** - Reflects the design on a medium background and dark lettering

**Follow Up**

Once Council has designated a design and style of shirt, PIO will follow up with a ROA with finalized costs. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me at (803) 576-2065.

Thank you very much

  
Stephany Snowden

A



# COUNTY COUNCIL

Item# 3

Attachment number 1  
Page 2 of 4

B



COUNTY COUNCIL

*Bringing Citizens and  
Government Together*

C



# Richland County Council

Item# 3

Attachment number 1  
Page 4 of 4



# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Approval of Competitive 2010 Local Emergency Management Performance Funds Grant (pages 18-19)

**Reviews**

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Approval of Competitive 2010 Local Emergency Management Performance Funds Grant

### **A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to approve the LEMPG Grant Solicitation for the Emergency Services Department of up to \$21,000. The purpose of the project is to create a weather station system for the Emergency Management Division. No funds are needed.

### **B. Background / Discussion**

Richland County has applied for “left over” funds in the Competitive 2010 Local Emergency Management Performance Fund grant in the amount of \$21,000. If awarded, the funds will assist Emergency Services in establishing a system of weather reporting stations at locations throughout the County. These weather stations will form a data collection system that will be used to track weather conditions, in forecasting, and will provide “real time” weather information for incident management. The grant request is \$21,000 however a partial grant award is possible.

The system measures and records wind speed and direction, air temperature and relative humidity, barometric pressure, solar radiation, and rain. This timely information is critical to events including hazardous material, nuclear plant and storm events. The data will also be accessible by the South Carolina Emergency Management Division, school districts and other agencies that make decisions based on weather conditions.

These funds require no new cash match.

### **C. Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact. The match requirement will be met as in-kind services using \$21,000 of existing employee salaries.

### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to accept the LEMPG grant, if awarded.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

### **E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to accept up to \$21,000 for the LEMPG grant, if awarded.

Recommended by: Michael A. Byrd      Department: Emergency Services      Date: 10/27/11

### **F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 10/27/11

 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

**Procurement**Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 10/28/11

 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

**Grants**Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 10/28/2011

 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: 11/14/11

 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval. The County's match will be met with in-kind services; no cash layout will be required of the County.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Payment Procedures for County Grant Programs (pages 21-24)

**Reviews**

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Payment Procedures for County Grant Programs

**A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to consider the following motion to standardize the payment processes for all County grant programs. Currently the County has grant programs that pay organizations on the front end as well as on a reimbursement basis.

**B. Background / Discussion**

The following motion was made by Council member Kelvin Washington at the October 18, 2011 Council Meeting:

*Richland County should standardize the reimbursement practices for all County grant programs to allow grantees to draw down grant funds up front. Currently, County grant programs are administered in different ways – some allowing up front drawdowns, others are on a reimbursement basis. All grantees are held responsible for spending and reporting on County funds according to program grant guidelines, rules and regulations. Grantees who do not follow these rules and regulations jeopardize receiving funds from the County in the future.*

Per Mr. Washington, all County-run grant programs should allow for up-front payments to accommodate those organizations that do not have funds available to pay for items and wait for reimbursement from the County.

Currently, County grant programs pay out grant funds in different ways as outlined below. Some require proof of payment or proof of price while others allow for the grantee to be paid up-front and provide proof of purchase and receipts after the fact.

**Current Grant Payment Policies:**

Grant Program	Up-Front	Reimbursement	Combination
Administration Grants (A-Tax, H-Tax, Discretionary)	<b>X</b>		
Community Development		<b>X</b>	
Conservation Commission			<b>X</b>
Neighborhood Improvement		<b>X</b>	

**Administration Grants (A-Tax, H-Tax, Discretionary Grants)** - Grantees may request payment in advance of spending funds. The grantees are required to submit invoices and proof of payment for all expenses with their Mid-Year (January of each year) and Final reports (July of each year). For grants \$25,000 and above, payments are released per quarter. Because some grantees do not have start-up funds, payments are not based on reimbursements, but rather these grantees are provided with funds up-front. By providing funds to the grantee in advance of the grantee spending funds, the County does run the risk that the grantee may not follow the rules and spend funds on ineligible items. In this case, the County works with the organization to solve the issue by deducting funds from the grantee’s next payment request or invoicing the organization to repay the funds. Organizations that do not follow grant guidelines and requirements run the risk of not being funded in the future.

**Community Development Grants** – These grants are reimbursable only as required by HUD. Federal funds are used for these grants which makes them HUD sub-recipients and subject to all HUD guidelines and requirements. Failure to follow those guidelines make the County non-compliant and at risk for losing

all HUD and potential future federal funding. Community Development grantees are required to follow the guidelines below:

1. A fully executed contract or written agreement. (HUD requirement; defines the scope of the project, defines responsibilities of each involved party, specifies the funding amount and may address timing of the project)
2. An established purchase order not to exceed the amount specified in the agreement. (Richland County Requirement)
3. An invoice or request for funds. (HUD and Richland County requirements)
4. Documented expenditures equal to the invoice amount (HUD and Richland County requirements; proof of monies expended and purpose(s) of expenditure; documentation that any reimbursed expenditure relates to the designated project)
5. Approval signature of Grant Manager or Coordinator. (HUD; proves that the manager/coordinator is aware of the expenditure and approves the expenditure)
6. Grants Accountant reviews documents for accuracy of charges and eligibility of expenses, initials and dates documents. (Departmental; an additional validation of the expenditure and that the expenditure conforms to HUD program regulations)
7. Grant Accountant codes invoice for payment, providing purchase order number, GL and JL codes. Accountant then scans invoice and supporting documents, retains an electronic copy, and emails to Richland County Finance for payment. (HUD requires copies of documents as support for CD Draw down from HUD and Richland County Finance requires coding and emailing of documents.)

**Conservation Grants** – The Community Conservation and Historic Preservation programs are advertised as reimbursement grants. Costs incurred will be reimbursed through invoice to the RCCC as work is completed and approved. Reimbursements will not be allowed for work completed prior to the grant award. Grant recipients submit a grant payment request form along with the invoice(s) and/or receipts. Once the request is approved, it is submitted to the Finance Department. In Conservation’s case, reimbursement does not strictly mean that the grantee must have spent the money first. Frequently, grantees submit their proof of cost – an invoice from the contractor – rather than proof of payment. Conservation accepts these invoices because the majority of the grantees are non-profits and are not able to pay upfront such large bills totaling thousands of dollars. This method allows the contractors to be paid in a more timely fashion and does not strain the grantee’s cash flow situation. Smaller expenses for materials and salary are reimbursed upon submission of receipts, cancelled checks or personnel time sheets.

**Neighborhood Grants** - These matching grants are reimbursable only. The award maximum is \$1,500. Receipts must accompany the neighborhood’s reimbursement request. Neighborhood Improvement cannot give funds out ahead of time/without receipts because there is no recourse if the community does not comply with the terms that the money was to be expended for or if no projects occur at all. Without the reimbursement policy, the County would be writing checks and hoping recipients “play by the rules.” Neighborhood associations are not required to maintain or provide financial reports. Also, the receipts that the neighborhoods provide the County are also given to the Finance Dept. so Finance will know it is a valid request for the check.

### **C. Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the motion to allow all County grantees to draw down grant funds up front.
2. Do not approve the motion.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the motion to allow all County grantees to draw down grant funds up front.

Recommended by: Kelvin Washington Department: Council Date: 11/2/11

**F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/7/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision for Council related to financial accountability for the use of funds. Therefore I would recommend that if approved, the County include clear guidelines on responsibilities for reviewing compliance to ensure funds are spent according to agreements.

Since the departments responsible for the grant programs are commenting after Finance, I would encourage the departments to comment on the reason that the current program guidelines were established as noted in an effort to not lose the committee/departments insight.

**Procurement**

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 11/7/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: A policy decision at Council discretion; my understanding of the grants process is that the granting agencies reimburse funds after determining that the funds have been utilized in accordance with their guidelines.

**Community Development**

Reviewed by: Valeria Jackson Date:  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:  
This will not be allowed under HUD regulations. All of the CD Department funding (with exception of HOME match) is HUD funding. Even HOME Match has to follow this same rule. HUD Grantees who do not follow these rules and regulations jeopardize receiving funds from the County in current and future years. This would be an unacceptable method of disbursement under HUD federal regulations.

**Conservation Commission**

Reviewed by: Dr. James Atkins Date: 11/16/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This recommendation pertains only to the RC Conservation Commission grants.

### Planning and Development Services

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 11/14/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: My recommendation of denial is based on Ms. Valeria Jackson's comments regarding HUD regulations.

### Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 11/14/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Funds distributed by Community Development must follow HUD regulations therefore if Council chooses to allow up-front payments for grant funds, this department should be excluded from such ruling. As for grants managed by Administration, up-front payments are allowed as some organizations do not have the funds to spend then wait for grant reimbursement. Grant expenditures are reviewed through mid-year and final reports to ensure funds are spent correctly.

### Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This recommendation is limited to grants managed by Administration. As to those grants involving HUD funds, based on Ms. Jackson's comments I would recommend that they be excluded from consideration for up-front funding.

### Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/15/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Grant funds are currently disbursed in a combination of methods for various reasons, as indicated above. Requiring all grants to be paid to the recipients up front would diminish the control that the County now has with respect to the accountability of the recipients and their compliance with the terms under which the funds were awarded. It is recommended, therefore, that the existing procedures remain in place.



# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Special DUI Prosecutor Grant (pages 26-28)

**Reviews**

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Special DUI Prosecutor Grant

**A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to approve a no-match grant in the amount of \$75,000 from the Office of Highway Safety of the South Carolina Department of Public Safety. This grant project is 100% federal money and requires no matching funds.

**B. Background / Discussion**

The Richland County Solicitor’s Office received the 2012 Special DUI Prosecutor Grant on a non-competitive basis (allocation) as part of a state-wide initiative to increase convictions of pending DUI cases in Magistrate Courts. While General Sessions’s level cases are allowed under the program, the emphasis is on prosecution in Magistrate and Municipal Courts. The goal of this project is that the DUI prosecutor will reduce the number of pending DUI cases in the judicial circuits by at least 10% in FFY 2012 over the number of pending cases in 2011. In addition, dismissals of DUI cases should not occur without the input from and notification to the arresting office/agency.

Funds can be used for in the Solicitors Office to include salary and fringe for a specialized prosecutor, supplies, computer equipment and employee training.

Grant Award:	\$75,000
Specialized DUI Prosecutor:	\$75,000
Required Match	<u>\$0</u>
Total:	\$75,000

**C. Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to accept the Office of Highway Safety with no match required.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to accept the State Office of Victim Assistance funds and approve the matching funds required as outlined by the funding agency.

Recommended by: John Stuart    Department: Solicitor’s Office    Date: November 8, 2011

## F. Reviews

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

### Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/8/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

### Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 11/9/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

### Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 11/14/11

✓ 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: Sparty Hammett

Date: 11/14/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the request to accept the Office of Highway Safety grant with no match required.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY  
P. O. BOX 1993  
BLYTHEWOOD, SOUTH CAROLINA 29016

**DUI PROSECUTOR GRANT AWARD**

Subgrantee: Fifth Circuit Solicitor's Office

Grant Period: 10/1/2011 – 9/30/2012

Date of Award: October 1, 2011

Amount of Award: \$75,000

Grant Number: 2JCS1221

In accordance with the provisions of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, 72 Stat. 885, as amended, CFDA No. 20.601, the S. C. Department of Public Safety hereby awards to the foregoing Subgrantee, a grant in the amount shown above for the continuation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Special DUI Prosecutor and within the purposes and categories authorized for the Highway Safety grants.

**The grant shall become effective as of the date of the award, contingent upon the return of the original of this form to the Office of Highway Safety, signed by the Subgrantee in the space provided below.** This award must be accepted within 30 days, and such progress and other reports required by the S. C. Department of Public Safety must be submitted to the Office of Highway Safety in accordance with regulations.



Phil Riley, Director  
Office of Highway Safety



Ed Harmon, Assistant Director  
Office of Highway Safety

Acceptance of Grant Award:

  
Signature of Solicitor

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

VOTE Federal Accessibility Grants for the Election Commission (pages 30-31)

**Reviews**

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** VOTE Federal Accessibility Grants for the Election Commission

### **A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to accept two grants, if awarded, totaling \$50,224.00 from the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) Health & Human Services (HHS) Voting Access For Individuals with Disabilities (VOTE).

### **B. Background / Discussion**

The Richland County Election Commission has two grant opportunities that will assist the County serve voters with disabilities through HAVA, a United States federal law which was signed into law in 2002. HAVA mandates that all states and localities upgrade many aspects of their election procedures and provides grants to eligible jurisdictions to make those improvements. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to make payments to state and local governments for making polling places, including the path of travel, entrances, exits, and voting areas of each polling facility accessible to individuals with disabilities, including the blind and visually impaired, in a manner that provides the same opportunity for access and participation as for other voters.

The first grant of \$1,224 was awarded to the Commission by HAVA for funds that will cover the cost of repairs for existing ADA voting machines (parts and shipping). There is no match required for this reimbursement grant.

For the second grant, the Commission will apply for \$49,000 to HAVA to purchase 14 new ADA voting machines. This grant, if awarded, will be paid upon reimbursement and has no match requirement.

### **C. Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

### **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to accept the HAVA grants in the amount of \$50,224, if awarded.
2. Do not approve.

### **E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to accept the HAVA grants.

Recommended by: Garry Baum

Department: Elections

Date: 11/7/2011

Item# 7

Attachment number 1  
Page 1 of 2

**F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/7/11  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
Comments regarding recommendation:

**Procurement**

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 11/8/11  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
Comments regarding recommendation:

**Grants**

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 11/9/11  
✓ 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: J. Milton Pope Date: 11-14-11  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
Comments regarding recommendation:

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

CDBG Allocation of Funds Decker Boulevard Specific (pages 33-36)

**Reviews**



# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** CDBG Allocation of Funds  
Decker Boulevard Specific

## **A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to approve the coordination of efforts between the Planning and Development Services Department and the Community Development Office toward the allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding for several neighborhood improvement projects based upon the Decker Boulevard Master Plan goals, objectives, and recommendations. The CDBG allocation totals \$300,000.00 and no match is required.

## **B. Background / Discussion**

The Decker Boulevard Master plan area is comprised of 731 acres, including properties within approximately ¼ mile of each side of Decker Boulevard as well as the greater Woodfield Park neighborhood area. The study area is roughly bordered by Percival Road, I-77, and Fort Jackson to the south and east; Forest Acres and the Trenholm Road corridor to the west; and Two Notch Road and the Columbia Place Mall to the north.

In FY11, November 22, 2010, Neighborhood Improvement, Community Development and Richland County Conservation Commission signed a memorandum of understanding for the utilization of \$300,000 of Community Development's CDBG funding that was awarded to Decker Boulevard after it was designated S/B. Community Development receives more than 30% of federal grant money to use in an area designated as slum and blight. Decker Boulevard became qualified as a redevelopment area and was awarded the grant funds to be expended by September 30, 2012. In FY11, staff did not complete the task of expending the money as the agreement stated and an estimated total of \$150,000 was removed from the Decker Master Plan fund and used for the completion of a sewer project in Bookert Heights. As of July 2011, Neighborhood Improvement received a new allocation of \$150,000 from Community Development to bring their total sum awarded back up to \$300,000 for Decker Blvd eligible projects. CDBG Funding Priorities:

### **1. Installation of Woodfield Park Community Neighborhood Identification Signs (\$75,000):**

Tasks:

- Staff has contracted with AOS to complete the installation of neighborhood branding and identification signage throughout the Greater Woodfield Neighborhood area for a total of seven (7) signs.

**2. Installation of Corridor Identification/Neighborhood Branding Signage (\$80,000):**

Tasks:

- Staff has completed the design and identified AOS to construct four (4) gateway entrance signs to be located at the corner of (1) Trenholm Ext and (2) Decker Boulevard (Taco Bell/Dent Middle School Properties) and at (3) Decker and Percival Road (SCDOT right-away). • Staff designed /advised on the construction of five (5) identifying markers in the form of an “I” (pillar sign monument) to be placed at the corner of O’Neil/Decker (2); Brookfield/Decker (2); Old Percival/Decker (1).
- Staff has identified the property owners for each parcel where a sign will be constructed and has begun the surveying and easement development process.
- Staff has worked with the County Attorney to develop a quick claim deed for the Taco Bell parcel and to develop an easement agreement for the Dent Middle School Property.

**3. Installation of Banner Signs (\$6,500):**

Tasks:

- Staff worked with the consultant to design thirty (30) new light pole banner signs to be placed along Decker Boulevard.

**4. Appraisal (\$2,500):**

Tasks:

- Staff requested quotes from qualifying consultants to conduct an appraisal on the property located at 2765 Decker Boulevard to determine the property value of this parcel and with the intent to pursue possible demolition, purchase and rehabilitation of this property.

**5. Implementation of Commercial Façade Improvement Program (\$136,000):**

The purpose of the program is to provide financial incentive to existing business owners located within the Decker Boulevard Commercial Redevelopment District and to provide an opportunity to upgrade the exterior of their building. The program is designed to retain and attract businesses, strengthen the Decker Boulevard Commercial District, increase utilization of buildings, restore economic vitality and enhance property values. This fund shall not be available to businesses along commercial corridors within the unincorporated areas of the County.

Tasks:

- Developed Program Guidelines
- Developed the Application Process
- Identified a Funding Source for the grant
- Determined up to \$10,000 per applicant

**C. Financial Impact**

Seven (7) Woodfield Park Neighborhood Signs:	\$75,000.00
Four (3) Gateway Entrance Signs:	\$50,000.00
Five (5) Identifying markers:	\$30,000.00
Thirty (30) Light Pole Banners:	\$ 6,500.00
Façade Grant:	\$136,000.00
Appraisal:	\$ 2,500.00
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$300,000.00</b>

**C. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the expenditure of CDBG funds for the Decker Blvd. Master Plan in the amount of \$300,000.00.

Recommended by: Planning and Development Services Date:

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/10/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
 Comments regarding recommendation:

**Community Development**

Reviewed by: Valeria Jackson Date: 11/10/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
 Comments regarding recommendation:

**Procurement**

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 11/14/11  
 Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
 Comments regarding recommendation:

**Grants**

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 11/14/11  
 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: Sparty Hammett

Date: 11/17/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Resolution to Distribute \$5,281.78 in Federal Forestry Funds (pages 38-41)

**Reviews**

## **Richland County Council Request of Action**

Subject: Resolution to Distribute \$5,281.78 in Federal Forestry Funds

### **A. Purpose**

The Richland County Treasurer has received a check from the Office of the State Treasurer for Federal Forestry Funds. These funds are generated based on a portion of the net proceeds generated by the sale of forest products extracted from Fort Jackson and other military installations located within Richland County. The total amount of forestry funds available for allocation by County Council is \$5,281.78.

### **B. Background / Discussion**

The Richland County Treasurer currently has a total of \$5,281.78 in Federal Forestry Fund monies. These funds were received from the Office of the State Treasurer as payment based on a portion of the net proceeds generated by the sale of forest products extracted from Fort Jackson and other military installations located within Richland County.

Pursuant to Title 10, Section 2665 (E)(2), “the amount paid to a State pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the military installation or facility is situated.”

Since the South Carolina Legislature has not enacted, to date, any law prescribing how these funds are to be allocated, the specific amounts to be allocated for the benefit of public schools and public roads of Richland County are at the discretion of Richland County Council.

The last time that Richland County Council allocated military forestry funds was in April of 2009. The resolution passed in 2009 allocated a total amount of \$54,100.30 of which 50% was apportioned to Richland School District One, Richland School District Two, and Richland-Lexington School District Five (according to the respective student population of each district). The remaining 50% was transferred to the General Fund of Richland County to be used for the construction of new roads and/or improvement of public roads within the county.

The resolution currently before Council uses the same 50/50 allocation ratio used in 2009; however, Council may adjust these proportions at its discretion.

### **C. Financial Impact**

A total of \$5,281.78 will be divided according to a ratio set forth by Council for the benefit of public schools and public roads. There are no costs to the County associated with this request.







COUNTY OF RICHLAND  
OFFICE OF COUNTY TREASURER



DAVID A. ADAMS  
COUNTY TREASURER

P.O. BOX 11947  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 576-2275  
TDD (803) 748-4999

17 October 2011

To: Tony McDonald, Assistant County Administrator  
From: David A. Adams, Richland County Treasurer  
RE: Distribution of Federal Forestry Funds

Please note that the Treasury has received a check for Federal Forestry Funds in the amount of \$5,281.78. These are not funds received annually.

According to Title 10, Section 2665 (E) the United States Code of Laws, these funds may only be used for County public roads and schools.

I believe that these funds were last allocated by resolution of Richland County Council in April 2009.

Please contact me with any questions or clarifications.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Professional Services Property Acquisition adjacent to Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport (pages 43-50)

**Reviews**

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Professional Services / Property acquisition adjacent to Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport

### A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a contract for professional services with LPA Group of Columbia, SC for the acquisition of two properties adjacent to the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB). A copy of the Work Authorization for these services is attached.

### B. Background / Discussion

There are two pieces of property adjacent to the airport that are desired for acquisition. One will require subdivision of less than one half of an acre from a larger parcel in order to support the future extension of Taxiway ‘A’. The other is a 5.71 acre parcel which is undeveloped, currently on the market and available for purchase. The following parcel numbers are affected:

R13705-16-02	<0.5 acre
R13705-16-01	5.71 acre

The parcel with the TMS reference R13705-16-02 is required in order to progress with the design, permitting, and construction of a project to extend Taxiway ‘A’. This project will provide an important safety enhancement to the airport by permitting a perpendicular intersection of Taxiway ‘A’ with Runway 13/31. The Environmental Assessment (EA) for this project has been prepared and approved by the staff of the FAA. The FAA will participate in this project by funding 95% of the cost. These funds have been provided in the most recently issued Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant.

The parcel with the TMS reference R13705-16-01 is currently on the market. It is undeveloped and heavily wooded. In addition to a significant drainage course, it also contains low grade wetlands. The intention for this property follows:

- To ensure no incompatible adjacent development to the airport.
- To remove existing tree penetrations to the airport airspace transition surfaces.
- To eventually relocate existing stormwater management facilities and permit additional airside development.

The Richland County Airport Commission has voted to recommend purchase of this property to the Richland County Council. The FAA will participate in this project by funding 95% of the cost. However, these funds have not yet been provided. The County will be required to pay the money up front and then will be eligible for reimbursement next year through our next Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant. The FAA staff has provided verbal agreement to this. This property acquisition is also reflected in our Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP).

The Federal Aviation Administration has an extensive checklist of requirements (in excess of 20 items) associated with property acquisition. This work authorization (WA) will complete many

of these administrative requirements for the acquisition of these two properties which have not yet been completed.

The South Carolina Aeronautics Commission, which normally participates in airport development projects with 2.5% grant matching funds, does not participate in property acquisition projects, so five percent of the cost will ultimately be borne by Richland County.

Additionally, 95% of the actual property purchase price will be available for funding through the AIP.

**C. Financial Impact**

The initial funding for this project will be as follows:

Federal (FAA)	\$22,887	AIP Grant 17 -2011
Local (RC)	\$32,587*	Available from capital rollover funds in the airport budget
Total	\$55,474	

\* \$27,290 of this amount will be available for future reimbursement from the FAA.

**D. Alternatives**

The alternatives available to County Council follow:

1. Approve the request to authorize executing a contract for Property Acquisition professional services. This will permit the eventual acquisition of property that will enhance the safety and development of the airport.
2. Do not approve the request to authorize executing a contract for Property Acquisition professional services. This will not permit the development of the project for the extension of Taxiway 'A' nor preclude incompatible adjacent development to the airport.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to authorize executing a contract with LPA Group for property acquisition professional services.

Recommended by:	Department:	Date:
Christopher S. Eversmann, PE, CM	Airport	November 8, 2011

**F. Reviews**

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

## Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/15/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is an allocation of funds that is at council discretion. The unspent budget funds rolled over from the prior year based upon previous commitments to other projects however the reallocation of funds to alternative projects is an appropriate management decision. If not approved, the unspent funds would remain in the Airport Fund at the end of the fiscal year for appropriation in subsequent periods for Airport related projects.

## Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 11/15/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This request is at the discretion of the Council; LPA doesn't have a current agreement to allow for purchase of real estate and I'm not sure that they are licensed as an Real Estate agency or a brokerage firm.

## Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 11/17/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

While the FAA has provided verbal approval to allow this expense to be reimbursed from next grant awarded, the County should request that the FAA provide this approval in writing. Council should also be aware that FAA grants are federal funds that are dependent on availability through the federal budget process.

## Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The decision regarding the award of this contract to LPA is within the legal authority and discretion of the Council. However, if the county is going to substantially rely on potential federal funds to pay for the cost of this project, I concur with the recommendation that we make every effort to secure the FAA commitment in writing prior to entering into the proposed agreement.

## Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/17/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval based on the fact that the proposed property purchases are an integral part of the Airport's capital improvement program and based on the commitment that the FAA will fund 95 percent of the acquisition cost, as well as 95 percent of the consulting services being requested in this ROA. I concur, however, with the Grants Manager and County Attorney that the FAA's commitment to the project should be obtained in writing before we proceed.

**RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**Work Authorization for Professional Services**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Project Identification No.)

**No. 29 (Twenty-Nine)**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Work Authorization No.)

It is agreed to undertake the following work in accordance with the provisions of our Prime Agreement for Professional Services dated February 1, 2007.

**A. Description of Assignment:**

The CONSULTANT shall provide special professional services, as described in Attachments A and B for the 2011 Property Acquisition Project at **Jim Hamilton – L.B. Owens Airport**, herein after referred to as the **PROJECT**.

**Special Services:**

1. The CONSULTANT shall provide Property Acquisition Assistance services in accordance with Exhibit "B", Section II of the Prime Agreement and Attachment B.

**B. Basis of Compensation/Period of Services:**

The CONSULTANT shall be paid the following:

1. For SPECIAL SERVICES (Property Acquisition Assistance) as outlined in Section A-1 above, the OWNER shall pay the CONSULTANT the lump sum subconsultant cost of **Forty Six Thousand Two Hundred Twenty Eight Dollars and No Cents (\$46,228.00)** plus a lump sum project management and subconsultant administrative fee of **Nine Thousand Two Hundred Forty Six Dollars and No Cents (\$9,246.00)** for a total lump sum amount of **Fifty Five Thousand Four Hundred Seventy Four Dollars and No Cents (\$55,474.00)** as shown in Attachment A.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Agreed as to scope of services and budget:

For: **RICHLAND COUNTY, SC**

For: **THE LPA GROUP INCORPORATED**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments: A - Fee Proposal  
B – Property Acquisition Assistance Scope of Work  
C – Scope of Work Sketch

**ATTACHMENT A  
FEE PROPOSAL  
2011 PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROJECT  
JIM HAMILTON - L.B. OWENS AIRPORT**

	<b>TAXIWAY A EXT PARCEL (+0.5 Ac.)</b>	<b>PLOWDEN ROAD PARCEL (+5.71 Ac.)</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>
	TMS R13705-16-02	TMS R13705-16-01	
<u>Project Tasks</u>			
LPA Project Management/Coordination	\$4,458	\$4,788	\$9,246
THC Project Management/Coordination/Expenses	\$8,429	\$8,429	\$16,858
Title Research	\$0	\$550	\$550
Boundary Survey	\$1,100	\$2,200	\$3,300
Environmental Phase 1	\$2,750	\$2,750	\$5,500
Appraisal	\$6,600	\$6,600	\$13,200
Review Appraisal	\$3,410	\$3,410	\$6,820
	\$26,747	\$28,727	\$55,474
<b>TOTAL PROJECT</b>	<b>\$26,747</b>	<b>\$28,727</b>	<b>\$55,474</b>
<b>FAA ELIGIBLE</b>	<b>\$26,747</b>	<b>\$28,727</b>	<b>\$55,474</b>
<b>FAA SHARE in AIP #17-2011</b>	<b>\$22,887</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$22,887</b>
<b>STATE SHARE</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>LOCAL SHARE</b>	<b>\$3,860</b>	<b>\$28,727</b>	<b>\$32,586</b>

10/11/2011



**ATTACHMENT B  
PROPERTY ACQUISITION ASSISTANCE SCOPE OF WORK**

The **CONSULTANT** will provide project management of all the steps required and in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act of 1970, as amended, and all Federal Aviation Administrations (FAA) advisory circulars and orders, to acquire property identified by the County. Said services include managing sub-consultant companies, interviewing affected property owners, appraisals, review appraisals, phase I environmental analysis and reporting, title examinations, real estate closings of the subject property, recording the deed at the County Courthouse for the benefit of the County, and attending miscellaneous meetings with the County representatives and FAA personnel as necessary. There are two (2) parcels of land described as follows:

<b>Tax #</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Acreage</b>
R13705-16-02	Columbia Gardens LTD	4000 Plowden Rd	“Taxiway A Extension Parcel”	±0.5 Acres
R13705-16-01	VIP Developers Inc	3800 Plowden Rd	“Plowden Road Parcel”	±5.71 Acres



# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Extend Maintenance on the Assessor's UNISYS System through 2015 (pages 52-53)

**Reviews**

## Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Extend Maintenance on the Assessor's UNISYS System through 2015

### A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a Purchase Order to POTOMAC SYSTEMS INC. (TIP CAPITAL) to extend Maintenance on the Assessor's UNISYS Server Operating System and Software through the calendar year 2015.

### A. Background / Discussion

The Assessor's UNISYS Server currently supports the software and users needed to operate the Assessor's department that serves the citizens of Richland County. The current UNISYS Libra 400 Midrange Server is 4 years old and heading into the 5<sup>th</sup> and final year of the current Maintenance Lease Agreement. POTOMAC SYSTEMS INC. is the integrator that sold the UNISYS system to the RC Assessor and is using TIP CAPITAL to underwrite the lease agreement to extend the Maintenance. The new lease agreement will buy out the remaining year and add an additional 3 years of Maintenance coverage. This lease agreement will get the Assessor through the end of life of the UNISYS Libra 400 Server and Software which will then be replaced by new Hardware and Software. The Maintenance agreement ensures the current system will get priority 2hr response times and after hours support when needed.

Without a Maintenance agreement, the RC Assessor would have to pay for any and all upgrades and updates to the OS and Software. Any and all support calls would have to be paid for on a case by case basis at whatever the current rate may be at the time and could potentially put the County at risk of the System being non-operational for an extended period.

The Assessor will undergo another reassessment in 2014. During this process the Assessor expects more than 10,000 appeals which will make the current UNISYS System even more mission critical than it usually is.

POTOMAC Systems Inc. is a UNISYS authorized service, sales, and support center and pricing for Maintenance is set by UNISYS not the authorized support center.

### B. Financial Impact

There are sufficient funds in the account 1100187000.541800 designated for this request for the current fiscal year. Approval of this request will ensure the funds are available through 2015.

### C. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to extend the lease agreement with POTOMAC Systems for an amount not to exceed \$255,000 over the next four years. This will provide the necessary support to allow the Assessor's Office to maintain normal uninterrupted business through 2015.

2. Do not approve the request. This would put the Assessor's Office at risk of being down and non-operational not only during normal business but during a critical reassessment and appeals process.

**D. Recommendation**

Recommended by: John Cloyd Department: Assessor  
Date: 11/08/2011

Recommended by: Janet Claggett Department: Information Technology  
Date: 11/08/2011

Approve the request to extend the lease agreement with POTOMAC Systems for an amount not to exceed \$255,000 over the next four years. This will provide the necessary support to allow the Assessor's Office to maintain normal uninterrupted business through 2015

**F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/8/11  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
Comments regarding recommendation:

**Procurement**

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 11/10/11  
✓ 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: 11/10/11  
✓ Recommend Council approval  Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the extended lease agreement.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Increase RCSD Deputy Current Pay (pages 55-63)

**Reviews**

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Increase RCSD Deputy Current Pay

## **A. Purpose**

In order to ensure that Richland County can better recruit and retain qualified Sheriff's Deputies in this region, I hereby move that the Council increase the current pay for deputies commensurate with the pay for deputies employed by the City of Columbia and Lexington County. [Manning, Jackson] Forwarded to the A&F Committee.

## **B. Background / Discussion**

The Richland County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) is the largest department in Richland County Government. It is also the largest Sheriff's department in the state according to information reported in the South Carolina Association of Counties 2011 Wage and Salary Survey.

Below are the pay ranges reported by the Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) and the South Carolina Association of Counties (SCAC) for the Uniform Patrol Officer (Deputy for Richland County) job classification for the three local governments;

<u>Local Government</u>	<u>Minimum Annual Wage</u>	<u>Maximum Annual Wage</u>
City of Columbia	\$29,864	\$47,781
Lexington County	\$35,048	\$49,068
Richland County	\$28,407	\$45,453

The County will need to increase the pay range to LH (\$34,562-\$55,301) to be competitive with the current minimum wage of Lexington County. Richland County's pay range for law enforcement is LI which has a minimum wage of \$37,008.

It is important to note, the minimum annual wage reported may or may not be the pay rate for some, any, or all new hires. Depending on various circumstances (i.e. the relevant experience, education, and/or certification of the applicant) new hires may be started above the minimum of the pay range.

## **C. Financial Impact**

Richland County does not have information on the exact annual wages for each Uniform Patrol Officer with the City of Columbia or Lexington County. In addition, it is an established common acceptable compensation practice to use pay ranges for analyzing and comparing this type of data. Therefore, this ROA uses the minimum annual wage for comparison purposes. Implementation of the new minimum pay range for the Deputy Sheriff position during the current fiscal year would require the use of General Fund balance.

## **D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to increase the Deputy Sheriff job minimum starting wages during the current fiscal year (this would require the use of general fund balance).

2. Approve the request to increase the Deputy Sheriff job minimum starting wages for FY13 with funding to be identified during the budget process.
3. Do not approve the request.

**E. Recommendation**

In order to ensure that Richland County can better recruit and retain qualified Sheriff’s Deputies in this region, I hereby move that the Council increase the current pay for deputies commensurate with the pay for deputies employed by the City of Columbia and Lexington County. [Manning, Jackson] Forwarded to the A&F Committee.

Increasing the current pay (range) for Richland County Deputy Sheriff’s commensurate with pay for Lexington County and the City of Columbia would result in a LH pay grade classification for the Deputy Sheriff job.

Recommended by: County Council Department: Date: November 8, 2011

**F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/10/11  
 Recommend Council approval ✓ Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
 Comments regarding recommendation:

**Recommendation is not based on the merit of the request but based on the council approval below on October 4<sup>th</sup> to direct staff to complete a countywide study. Therefore we would recommend that this request be included in the countywide process.**

**Approval as stated should include a financial impact to determine the cost and a budget amendment.**

**Increase Detention Center Officers’ Starting Salaries:** Council directed staff to conduct a County-wide compensation study to include all County employees. County Administration will attempt to identify funding in FY 12 to complete the study and have the results available for the FY 13 budget process. The compensation study should be completed within 90 days from issuance of the Notice to Proceed (NTP).

**Human Resources**

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna Date:  
 Recommend Council approval ✓ Recommend Council denial  
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)  
 Comments regarding recommendation: Human Resources supports competitive total compensation (pay and benefits) for all employees including those of the RCSD. Successful recruiting and especially retention are intricate and dynamic functions that



can't be completely achieved with a quick, single, and isolated solution. In order to be effective, recruiting and retention require careful coordination between the two functions, proper planning, adequate resources, and a consistent commitment to stick to the plan long term to avoid unintended consequences or eventually falling back into the same situation.

Turnover is a very complex issue and survey after survey have shown that while pay is a factor, often pay does not rank (by employees) first or even second as the reason that employees leave an employer. It is important to note there are many reasons for employee turnover (i.e. ineffective supervisors, lack of recognition or appreciation, employee-supervisor conflicts, perception of unfairness, company policies, workload, internal pay equity, childcare, work-family life balance, work environment, inadequate or ineffective communications, leadership, training, promotion opportunities, benefits, family obligations, etc.). Human Resources anticipates it will become even more difficult to recruit and retain the best employees once the economy begins to improve in South Carolina. Therefore, if there are multiple reasons for turnover and employees consistently don't rank pay as the top reason for leaving an employer, it is unlikely that increasing pay alone will address retention in a comprehensive manner. Consequently, in order to effectively and strategically address recruiting and retention, the County must consider many other factors and utilize other strategies in addition to pay increases.

Human Resources highly recommends considering the potential consequences of increasing the pay of only some Deputy Officers (those earning less than the proposed minimum) be very carefully considered to avoid creating other issues and/or contributing to turnover. There are some potential negative consequences of increasing the pay range of a single group of employees which should not be overlooked. Internal equity and wage compression should be two primary considerations whenever implementing a pay plan change.

- For example, if the County only increases the pay of some Deputy Officers below the new minimum that will result in many Deputy Officers with a pay rate at or near other Deputy Officers who have been with the County much longer. To make this point clearer, a newly hired Deputy Officer could be paid the same as a Deputy Officer with many years seniority who has earned pay increases over the years through merit pay (PEP). Obviously, this could cause some resentment and even contribute to turnover.
- In addition, if the implementation plan does not include increasing the pay of the supervisors of Deputy Officers there could be some wage compression and/or the perception of pay inequity by those supervisors at the RCSD who work in positions other than Deputy Officer.
- Another consideration is several Richland County law enforcement jobs that currently have a pay range higher than the Deputy position will have an equal or lower pay range if the County increases the Deputy pay range to LH. The reality or perception of pay inequity could also become an issue in other County departments, especially considering the fact there have been no pay increases for employees in a couple years. This is more likely to occur in other public safety departments.

In summary, it must be understood that increasing the minimum pay range will likely instantly help with recruiting for the Deputy position. However, this will result in the need for the County to consider increases to other positions in order to maintain internal equity. Also, increasing the pay will not address those retention factors not related to pay. Moreover, increasing the pay of only those Deputy Officers below the proposed minimum could have unintended consequences (some examples outlined above) if other actions not included in the implementation plan. Consequently, unless the County strategically and comprehensively approaches recruiting and retention we are less likely to achieve the stated objectives we are seeking without contributing to other personnel concerns.

In conclusion, Human Resources recommends consideration for utilizing counter offers as an immediate tool to address turnover issues that will occur over the next several months on a case by case basis. There are several reasons for the recommendation to utilize counter offers that include it could be deployed immediately, would address the specific cases of turnover the motion is aimed at preventing, the County would have discretion of when to utilize retention pay and at what level, utilizing retention pay would minimize adverse impact relating to internal equity and wage compression, the fact that the County is in the process of securing a consultant to conduct a County wide classification and compensation study which will address the larger issue of competitive pay ranges, and it provides the County an opportunity to retain Deputy Sheriffs that have a bona fide job offer from another employer. By using a counter offer the retention issue can be addressed immediately and the recruiting issue will be addressed in the County wide classification and compensation study.

### **Legal**

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: The Council possesses the legal authority and discretion to increase the pay of deputies as requested. In exercising that authority, I would encourage the Council to consider the comments of the HR Director regarding maintaining internal equity in the process.

### **Administration**

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend addressing in the Countywide Compensation Study approved by Council.

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

Job Title: **UNIFORM PATROL OFFICER II**

Job Code: **527**

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	30	32,923	46,092	39,507	39%
ANDERSON	37.5	123	25,000	58,350	41,675	133%
BERKELEY	42.8	42	32,734	52,375	42,554	60%
CHARLESTON	40.0	78			43,256	
FLORENCE	42.0	5	30,335	45,004	37,669	48%
GREENVILLE	40.0	248	30,485	49,801	40,143	63%
LEXINGTON	43.0	12	40,402	56,563	48,482	40%
RICHLAND	42.5	34	30,925	49,480	40,202	60%
SPARTANBURG	43.0	28	29,102	43,625	36,363	49%
SUMTER	40.0	12	28,519	39,444	33,981	38%
YORK	40.0	38	33,292	46,610	39,951	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			25,000	39,444	33,981	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			40,402	58,350	48,482	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			31,371	48,734	40,343	57%

Job Title: **UNIFORM PATROL OFFICER I**

Job Code: **528**

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	14	31,354	43,896	37,625	40%
BERKELEY	42.8	33	30,552	48,883	39,717	59%
CHARLESTON	40.0	103			37,458	
FLORENCE	42.0	52	27,357	40,538	33,947	48%
GREENVILLE	40.0	17	29,312	49,801	39,556	69%
HORRY	42.8	148	31,835	47,754	39,794	50%
LEXINGTON	43.0	88	33,048	49,068	42,058	40%
RICHLAND	42.5	184	28,408	45,453	36,930	60%
SPARTANBURG	43.0	15	27,716	41,574	34,645	50%
SUMTER	40.0	22	26,780	36,644	31,712	36%
YORK	40.0	33	31,818	44,546	38,182	40%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			26,780	36,644	31,712	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			35,048	49,801	42,058	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			30,018	44,815	37,420	49%

Job Title: **CHIEF OF DETECTIVES**

Job Code: **530**

County	Hours	Staff Totals	Pay Range		Actual or Mid-Point	Percent Spread
			Minimum	Maximum		
AIKEN	40.0	1	46,831	65,564	56,197	40%
BERKELEY	42.8	1	49,101	78,562	63,831	60%
FLORENCE	42.0	1	45,226	67,341	56,283	48%
GREENVILLE	40.0	1	52,489	87,103	69,796	65%
LEXINGTON	40.0	2	58,249	81,549	69,899	40%
RICHLAND	37.5	1	53,648	83,837	69,742	60%
SPARTANBURG	43.0	1	49,774	74,660	62,217	49%
LOWEST REPORTED SALARIES:			45,226	65,564	56,197	
HIGHEST REPORTED SALARIES:			58,249	87,103	69,899	
ARITHMETIC AVERAGE:			50,759	77,230	63,995	51%

## Columbia

<b>Population:</b> 116,278	<b>Total FTEs:</b> 2,128
<b>Fiscal Budget:</b> \$107,395,624.00	<b>Budget Year Begins:</b> July
<b>Total Annual Payroll:</b> \$99,515,922.00	
<b>Comp and Class Plan:</b> Yes	<b>Minimum Merit Raise:</b> 0.00 %
<b>Performance System:</b> Yes	<b>Maximum Merit Raise:</b> 0.00 %
	<b>Cost of Living Raise:</b> 0.00 %

Position Title	FTE	Minimum	Median/Actual	Maximum
Account Clerk I	5	\$26,841.30	\$0.00	\$42,946.62
Administrative Officer/Manager	3	\$85,771.62	\$0.00	\$137,235.02
Administrator/Manager	1	\$0.00	\$161,138.64	\$0.00
Animal Control Officer	1	\$23,818.91	\$0.00	\$38,109.86
Assistant Administrator/Manager	1	\$0.00	\$134,907.78	\$0.00
Assistant Clerk/Treasurer	1	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Assistant Fire Chief	3	\$52,528.76	\$0.00	\$84,045.59
Assistant Police Chief	1	\$0.00	\$94,000.00	\$0.00
Assistant Public Works Director	1	\$0.00	\$82,512.39	\$0.00
Automotive Parts Manager	1	\$35,908.38	\$0.00	\$57,452.97
Billing Clerk	4	\$34,396.65	\$0.00	\$55,035.07
Building Codes Administrator	1	\$0.00	\$52,409.43	\$0.00
Building Inspector	4	\$40,440.35	\$0.00	\$64,704.56
Building Maintenance Electrician	3	\$32,886.01	\$0.00	\$52,617.21
Building Maintenance Supervisor	1	\$51,018.09	\$0.00	\$81,628.75
Building Maintenance Worker	5	\$25,330.63	\$0.00	\$40,528.80
Business Licensing Director	1	\$46,485.08	\$0.00	\$74,376.10
Business Licensing Inspector	3	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Cashier/Customer Service Rep.	16	\$23,818.91	\$0.00	\$38,109.86
Chief Engineer	1	\$64,617.17	\$0.00	\$103,387.67
Chief Engineering Technician	1	\$41,951.01	\$0.00	\$67,121.42
City Attorney	1	\$0.00	\$135,960.01	\$0.00
Civil Engineer	3	\$41,951.01	\$0.00	\$67,121.42
Clerk to Council	1	\$0.00	\$63,035.98	\$0.00

Clerk/Typist	19	\$20,797.60	\$0.00	\$33,276.17
Code Enforcement Officer	4	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Communications Center Director	1	\$0.00	\$92,693.56	\$0.00
Community Development Admin.	1	\$0.00	\$67,759.16	\$0.00
Community Services Officer	29	\$23,818.91	\$0.00	\$38,109.86
Computer Programmer/Analyst	2	\$46,485.08	\$0.00	\$74,376.10
Council Member	6	\$0.00	\$13,350.00	\$0.00
Custodian I	2	\$17,775.23	\$0.00	\$28,440.39
Detective/Investigator	6	\$32,886.01	\$0.00	\$52,617.21
Diesel Mechanic	7	\$32,886.01	\$0.00	\$52,617.21
Dispatcher	42	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Economic Development Admin.	1	\$0.00	\$117,934.88	\$0.00
Electric Superintendent	1	\$40,440.35	\$0.00	\$64,704.56
Electrical Foreman	3	\$35,908.38	\$0.00	\$57,452.97
Engineering Technician	8	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Finance Director	1	\$0.00	\$101,000.00	\$0.00
Financial/Budget Analyst	1	\$58,572.45	\$0.00	\$93,716.12
Fire Captain	49	\$41,951.01	\$0.00	\$67,121.42
Fire Chief	1	\$0.00	\$104,853.26	\$0.00
Fire Codes Inspector	1	\$41,951.01	\$0.00	\$67,121.42
Fire Training Officer	3	\$41,951.01	\$0.00	\$67,121.42
Firefighter	70	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
GIS Analyst	1	\$40,440.35	\$0.00	\$64,704.56
GIS Department Manager	1	\$0.00	\$48,704.53	\$0.00
GIS Technician	1	\$35,908.38	\$0.00	\$57,452.97
Heavy Motor Equipment Operator	31	\$28,651.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Human Resources Assistant/Specialist	2	\$29,873.64	\$0.00	\$47,781.42
Human Resources Director	1	\$0.00	\$108,217.07	\$0.00
Information Services Manager	1	\$76,705.58	\$0.00	\$122,278.70
Laborer I	34	\$17,775.23	\$0.00	\$28,440.39
Lead Laborer	12	\$25,330.63	\$0.00	\$40,528.80
Light Motor Equipment Operator	15	\$22,306.97	\$0.00	\$35,693.01
Mayor	1	\$0.00	\$17,500.00	\$0.00

Mechanic	9	\$26,841.30	\$0.00	\$42,945.62
Meter Reader	24	\$26,841.30	\$0.00	\$42,945.62
Municipal Court Clerk	11	\$23,818.91	\$0.00	\$38,109.86
Municipal Judge	6	\$0.00	\$35,920.00	\$0.00
Park and/or Recreation Director	1	\$73,683.21	\$0.00	\$117,892.94
Park and/or Recreation Supervisor	2	\$35,908.38	\$0.00	\$57,452.97
Park/Recreation Laborer	38	\$20,797.60	\$0.00	\$33,376.17
Payroll Clerk	3	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Planner I	1	\$35,908.38	\$0.00	\$57,452.97
Planning Director	1	\$0.00	\$101,879.19	\$0.00
Police Administrative Officer	1	\$0.00	\$68,886.62	\$0.00
Police Chief	1	\$85,771.62	\$0.00	\$137,235.02
Police Records Clerk	2	\$20,797.60	\$0.00	\$33,276.17
Police Training Officer	1	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Public Safety Director	1	\$0.00	\$94,886.32	\$0.00
Public Safety Officer	1	\$0.00	\$75,000.00	\$0.00
Public Utilities Director	1	\$79,726.91	\$0.00	\$127,563.45
Public Works Director	1	\$0.00	\$108,527.56	\$0.00
Public Works Foreman I	5	\$25,330.63	\$0.00	\$40,528.80
Purchasing Agent	1	\$0.00	\$58,710.02	\$0.00
Purchasing Assistant	4	\$29,863.64	\$0.00	\$47,781.42
Risk Manager	1	\$0.00	\$72,846.88	\$0.00
Sanitation Supervisor	1	\$0.00	\$55,192.61	\$0.00
Sanitation Truck Driver	28	\$22,306.97	\$0.00	\$35,693.01
Secretary I	18	\$23,818.91	\$0.00	\$38,109.86
Secretary II	29	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Senior Account Clerk	1	\$43,462.72	\$0.00	\$69,540.34
Senior Detective/Investigator	26	\$32,886.01	\$0.00	\$52,617.21
Senior Firefighter/Engineer	140	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Senior Planner	1	\$51,018.09	\$0.00	\$81,628.75
Senior Secretary/Admin. Assistant	21	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Signmaker	2	\$34,396.65	\$0.00	\$55,035.07
Street and Sanitation Supervisor	1	\$44,973.36	\$0.00	\$71,957.18
Street Supervisor	1	\$0.00	\$65,606.13	\$0.00

Switchboard Operator/Receptionist	1	\$20,797.60	\$0.00	\$33,276.17
Uniform Patrol Captain	10	\$51,018.09	\$0.00	\$81,628.75
Uniform Patrol Lieutenant	14	\$43,462.72	\$0.00	\$69,540.34
Uniform Patrol Officer I (Certified)	108	\$29,863.64	\$0.00	\$47,781.42
Uniform Patrol Officer I (Non-Certified)	10	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Uniform Patrol Officer II	110	\$29,863.64	\$0.00	\$47,781.42
Uniform Patrol Sergeant	38	\$38,929.68	\$0.00	\$62,287.71
Vehicle Maintenance Manager	1	\$0.00	\$85,220.93	\$0.00
Vehicle Maintenance Supervisor	1	\$0.00	\$62,571.77	\$0.00
Victim Witness Advocate	2	\$32,886.01	\$0.00	\$52,617.21
Wastewater Plant Operator A	3	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Wastewater Plant Operator D	11	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Wastewater Superintendent	1	\$0.00	\$92,075.46	\$0.00
Water Plant Operator A	3	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Water Plant Operator B	4	\$31,374.31	\$0.00	\$50,199.30
Water Plant Operator C	8	\$34,396.65	\$0.00	\$55,035.07
Water Superintendent	1	\$55,551.10	\$0.00	\$88,881.38
Water/Wastewater Maintenance Mechanic	5	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Water/Wastewater Plant Operator	11	\$28,351.93	\$0.00	\$45,363.52
Water/Wastewater Superintendent	2	\$58,572.45	\$0.00	\$93,716.12
Zoning Administrator	1	\$73,683.21	\$0.00	\$117,892.94

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject**

Responses from RFP to Medicare Retiree Group Health Insurance Benefit Services (Possible Executive Session Item)  
(pages 65-67)

**Reviews**



## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Responses from RFP to Medicare Retiree Group Health Insurance Benefit Services

### **A. Purpose**

County Council is being asked to approve and authorize staff to negotiate and award a contract to the recommended vendor in response to an RFP. Vendors responded to the RFP seeking to provide Medicare retiree group health insurance benefit services to Richland County.

### **B. Background / Discussion**

The County authorized Human Resources to hire a consultant, Wells Fargo Insurance Services, to assist with developing, publishing, collecting, analyzing, and making recommendations on responses to an RFP for several employee services and Medicare retiree group health insurance benefit services. WFIS has now received and analyzed responses from vendors for Medicare retiree services. The responding vendors for each service were narrowed down to a list of finalists that included the incumbent vendor.

Medicare operates on a calendar year, January – December. The CMS (Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services) does not release information on Medicare until later in the calendar year, therefore, vendors were not able to provide responses earlier in the calendar year because they had not received information from CMS relating to federal Medicare contributions.

County Staff is not proposing revisions to the Medicare retiree health plan. Human Resources requested the consultant complete a detailed and comprehensive comparative analysis. The comparison was done by comparing the current plan and each finalist vendor's proposal.

Medicare retirees will have the opportunity to participate and earn the same wellness incentives as employees and early retirees. After years of research and study, the County is now prepared and proposes to implement and integrate into our health plan an optional wellness incentive program as a strategic part of our health insurance plan. An eligible employee or retiree can continue to receive health insurance paid by the County up to 100% (based on the percentage they now qualify for the County to pay) contingent upon them completing a few items that have been identified as being beneficial to the employee's or retiree's personal health by health care professionals. Medicare retirees who decide not to participate in the incentive plan will pay \$50.00 per month (in addition to any other premiums due, see attachment for details). The wellness incentive plan does not exclude any retiree based on a medical condition, illness, injury, or disability. However, if it is unreasonably difficult due to a medical condition for a Medicare retiree to achieve these goals, or if it is medically inadvisable for the Medicare retiree to achieve these goals, they can call Human Resources. Human Resources will work with the Medicare retiree to develop a solution.

### **C. Financial Impact**

See Attachment

Specific vendor names along with their specific cost responses relating to potential contractual proposal will be provided to County Council during executive session.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve and authorize staff to implement wellness incentive program for Medicare retirees and negotiate and award contract to the recommended vendor.
2. Approve vendor other than recommended vendor and authorize staff to implement wellness incentive plan.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that County Council approve option # 1 based on the recommendation and justification provided by the consultant, WFIS and the actions that have been approved for employees and early retirees.

Recommended by: Human Resources Department

Date: October 27, 2011

**F. Reviews**

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

**Finance**

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/14/11

✓  Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

**Procurement**

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 11/14/11

✓  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: Recommendation of approval is based on understanding from HR that our health care provider has determined that the wellness incentive program meets all of the requirements of federal law.

**Administration**

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/17/11

✓  Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval as proposed by the Human Resources Director.



# Richland County Government -2012 Medicare Advantage Market Analysis

BENEFITS	BCSSC Current Plan		Humana	
	In Network	Out of Network	In Network	Out of Network
Annual Deductible	\$350	\$500	\$350	\$500
Out of Pocket Maximum (excludes deductible)	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Out of Pocket Maximum (includes deductible)	\$2,350	\$4,500	\$2,350	\$4,500
Lifetime Maximum	Unlimited		Unlimited	
<b>Physician Services</b>				
Primary Care Office Visits	\$20 Copay	70% after deductible	\$20 Copay	70% after deductible
Specialist Office Visits	\$35 Copay	70% after deductible	\$35 Copay	70% after deductible
Preventive Care	100%	70%	100%	70%
Eye Exam (not routine)	\$35 Copay	70% after deductible	\$35 Copay	70% after deductible
Hospital Visits	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
<b>Outpatient Hospital Services</b>				
Emergency Room	\$50 Copay	\$50 Copay	\$50 Copay	\$50 Copay
Urgent Care	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
Lab	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
X-ray	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
MRI, CT, and PET Scans	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
Surgery	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
<b>Inpatient Hospital Services</b>				
Room/Board	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
<b>Prescription Drug Services</b>				
Generic	\$10 Copay		\$10 Copay	
Preferred BrandName	\$35 Copay		\$35 Copay	
Non-preferred BrandName	\$55 Copay		\$55 Copay	
Mail-Order	\$20/\$80/\$140		\$20/\$80/\$140	
Specialty Pharmaceuticals	\$75 Copay		\$75 Copay	
<b>Mental Health</b>				
Inpatient	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
Outpatient	\$20 Copay	70% after deductible	\$20 Copay	70% after deductible
<b>Other Services</b>				
Ambulance	80% after deductible	80% after deductible	80% after deductible	80% after deductible
DME	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
Home Health - limited to 60 visits per calendar year	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
Skilled Nursing Facilities - limited to 100 days	80% after deductible	70% after deductible	80% after deductible	70% after deductible
<b>Current Enrollment</b>				
Employee Only:	172	\$384.00	\$384.00	\$347.00
Spouse:	10	\$384.00	\$384.00	\$347.00
Per Child	2	\$384.00	\$384.00	\$347.00
Family:				
<b>Total Monthly Premium:</b>	\$70,656	\$70,656	\$63,848	\$63,848
<b>Total Annual Premium:</b>	\$847,872	\$847,872	\$766,176	\$761,760
<b>% Increase/Decrease over Current:</b>		0.0%	-9.6%	-10.2%
<b>\$ Increase/Decrease over Current:</b>		\$0	-\$81,696	-\$86,112

Red Denotes Plan Change with Lesser Benefit  
 Blue Denotes Plan Change with Increased Benefit

# Items Pending Analysis

## **Subject**

- a. Based on the new sewer planned for the lower Richland County area and the possibility of assistance being provided to Low/Middle income households (LMIH) I move that staff create an ordinance that sets forth criteria for qualifications to received assistance and that it will apply equally to all LMIH throughout Richland County (Malinowski, November 2010)
- b. To donate the Woodrow Wilson Home and Hampton-Preston Mansion to a non-profit organization that can handle its historic value and solicit funding from a larger area of funders or create such an organization and turn over all title and responsibility (Jackson, May 2011)
- c. That a policy be created regarding how to deal with approved grants prior to budget time and again at budget time when grants have been reduced or eliminated. When the grant ends Richland County will not provide additional funds in that agency's budget and they will have to absorb it if they want to keep it (Malinowski, November 2011)

## **Reviews**