



Richland County Council

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

September 26, 2017 – 6:00 PM

4th Floor Conference Room

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29201

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Pearce, Chair; Bill Malinowski, Paul Livingston, Norman Jackson and Jim Manning

OTHERS PRESENT: Joyce Dickerson, Dalhi Myers, Gwen Kennedy, Chip Jackson, Yvonne McBride, Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Sandra Yudice, Jamelle Ellis, Stacey Hamm, James Hayes, Jennifer Wladischkin, Chris Eversmann, James Brown, Gerald Seals, Quinton Epps, Michael Byrd, Larry Smith, Alfonso Smith, and Chad Fosnight

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM. e
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. July 25, 2017 – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Council Motion: Request that administrative staff and Emergency Services Director evaluate the current contract for ambulance service fee collection to determine whether a rebid of this contract might improve the revenue from ambulance operations. A recommendation regarding this contract would then be reported to the A&F Committee for any necessary action [PEARCE] – Mr. Pearce stated he made this motion to expedite the discussion regarding current fee collections. A comprehensive report was prepared for the committee’s review and it appears the contracts for the 2 companies currently working for the County will end next year. The recommendation is that in fall 2018 those contracts be rebid.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to initiate a procurement action for EMS billing and collection in the fall of 2018 in order to have new contracts in place prior to the expiration of the current contracts in 2019. The vote in favor was unanimous.
 - b. Reassignment of Projects for Outstanding Bonds – Mr. Seals introduced Teresa Cawley, Southern Municipal Advisors, to the committee.

Ms. Heizer stated the purpose of the ordinance is to officially authorize the redirection or expenditure of unspent bond proceeds from previous bond issues. The redirection of funds has been done in the past, but on a much smaller scale. Therefore, Council simply passed a resolution to

authorize the redirection. In each of the bond ordinances, there is language included that references the project (i.e. Sheriff's vehicles, Public Safety Building, LRADAC Building, etc.). There is a general catch all also included which states, "and for such other lawful and corporate purchases as the Council shall determine."

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what the original intent of the bonds listed on p. 15 of the agenda packet were.

Ms. Heizer stated staff has researched what the bonds were originally issued and can be provided to the committee.

Mr. Pearce stated one of the bonds was for the Detention Center and the other once was the EMS Substation. The one he was not sure of was 2014B.

Mr. Madden stated there is a brief summary of each issuance in the attached ordinance.

Mr. Pearce stated it is still not clear why there was such a large issuance.

Ms. Heizer stated her office can go back in their records to determine what the issuance was for.

Mr. Pearce inquired if the County would need to issue any bonds this year since this is such a significant amount.

Ms. Heizer stated the County did not issue any 8% bonds this year.

Mr. Pearce stated it is his understanding that one of the bonds listed was a part of the arbitrage list. And if so, does this create any problems for the County?

Ms. Heizer stated paying arbitrage itself does not necessarily create a problem. It means the bond proceeds have been invested at an interest rate higher than the interest rate paid on the bond. And so to the extent that rebate payments are made in a timely fashion, and the County has not spent the money, the money would be there to make the payments. One of the goals of this process is to clear out all of the funds and start with a clean slate.

Mr. Seals stated if you are not careful one of the more onerous consequences of arbitrage is you bring into question your tax exemption status.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there are any recurring costs that will have to be dealt with.

Mr. Seals stated there are items that are recurring (i.e. vehicles). The goal is to not use bonds to fund the costs of vehicle replacement in the future.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if these funds are interest or remaining bond principle.

Ms. Heizer stated for IRS purposes they are the same.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if an additional breakdown/specifics on these items will be provided.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council to approve the reassignment of the outstanding bond proceeds. The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Legislative Delegation Funding Request – Mr. Pearce stated this item is in reference to the letter Mr. Seals received from Representative James Smith, Chair of the Legislative Delegation, in July. In the aforementioned letter, Rep. Smith has requested the County to approve a \$10,000 increase for each staff member in the Legislative Delegation Office, move part-time Administrative Assistant to full-time, to separate out the Veterans Service Representative as a separate position, and request funding of approved office equipment as needed.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to why this was not presented during the normal budget process.

Mr. Seals stated there was a request received from the Legislative Delegation and Council approved the request. This request was received after the budget was adopted and Council had responded to the original request.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to what Council approved in the budget.

Mr. Seals stated there was a 3% salary adjustment in the biennium budget.

Mr. Manning stated for the record that when he saw the letter addressed to Mr. Seals and cc'ed to Councilwoman Myers in District 10 he did not read the letter.

Mr. Malinowski stated there is a lot of information provided, but much of it is not pertinent to the issue at hand. He further stated the salary increases are from 14-31% for the employees. There need to be more specifics and actual line by line comparisons provided.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to defer to the October A&F Committee meeting for additional information from Mr. Brown. The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Additional Office Space for the Public Defender's Office – Mr. Pearce stated this item is in reference to overcrowding in the Judicial Center. The Public Defender's Office has identified available office space at 1501 Main Street and 1730 Main Street.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why the Public Defender's Office was chosen for relocation and not another department.

Mr. Pearce stated Council passed, as a part of the budget, last year or the year before funding to find a place for the Public Defender.

Mr. Manning inquired if there would be any staff from the Public Defender's Office still at the Judicial Center.

Mr. Strickland stated the majority of staff will still be located at the Judicial Center.

Mr. Manning stated the staff's recommendation is 1501 Main Street. What is the Public Defender's recommendation?

Mr. Strickland stated he would be satisfied with either one, but his first choice would be the one directly across the street from the courthouse (1730 Main Street). He is aware the lease on this property is more and it does not offer as many amenities as the other property.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about the square footage of each property.

Mr. Fosnight stated he can provide that information prior to the Council meeting.

Mr. Manning inquired about the difference in costs for the properties.

Mr. Fosnight stated the difference is \$1.50 per sq. ft. (1501 Main St. is 4,524 sq. ft. and 1730 Main St. is 5,000 sq. ft.)

Mr. Manning moved to approve the lease of the property at 1730 Main Street. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Pearce stated there needs to be a side by side comparison of the properties provided to Council for clarification.

Mr. Seals stated the property located at 1730 Main St. does not have janitorial services and is more per sq. ft.

The vote was in favor.

- e. Resolution to Distribute \$24,326.99 in Federal Forestry Funds – Mr. Pearce stated staff provided a formula for the distribution of the funds based on how it has been historically been distributed.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification on what staff's recommendation was.

Mr. Manning withdrew his motion.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the resolution allocating \$24,326.99 of which 50% (\$12,163.49) will be apportioned to public schools, and the remaining 50% (\$12,163.50) for the construction and/or improvement of public roads.

Mr. Manning inquired as to who decides what roads are going to be constructed with the Federal Forestry funding.

Mr. Ozbek stated the Federal Forestry funding is used as needed for repairs or improvements to County roads.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- f. Construction Contract Award for an Airfield Lightning Signage Project at the Jim Hamilton-LB Owens Airport – Mr. Pearce stated this is a part of the Airport Improvement project funded predominantly by FAA funds, subsidized by State funds, and the match funding has been approved in the budget.

Mr. Malinowski stated the backup documentation states, "we anticipate ultimately being able to obtain State funding."

Mr. Eversmann states it is all driven by a cash flow situation with the State Aeronautics Commission. When the contract was awarded for the design, there was an identical situation that required the

County to fund the local and State match. There was an award for reimbursement of that funding and it is anticipated the same thing will apply in this situation.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the request to award this contract for construction services as advertised. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS**

Mr. Malinowski stated in the future he would like to see when the motions were initiated and be provided an update on why there is a delay in the items being placed on the agenda for action.

- a. Council Motion: The City of Columbia announced that they will be targeting Hospitality Tax businesses in the unincorporated area for annexation to take HTax funds. The City receives more than \$10 million annually while the unincorporated area receives over \$5 million annually. The County spends more than half its funds in the City while the City spends its funds in the City only. I move unless the City develops an IGA or MOU with the County not to take target and take the County HTax funds that Richland County then there should be some discussion to reevaluate collection of the HTax funds [N. JACKSON & MALINOWSKI]
- b. Council Motion: Explore funding Eco Tourism with funds from Mitigation Bank Credits and Economic Development [N. JACKSON]
- c. Council Motion: Explore additional options on supplemental insurance for employees. NOTE: There are new products available. Staff should talk to existing and additional agencies to provide better or additional options for employees. [N. JACKSON]
- d. Council Motion: Move that the Recreation Commission provide an update of the Recreation Bond to ensure that it was executed as Council approved and that any funds remaining after all items are completed it is Richland County Council's decision on how it is spent [N. JACKSON]
- e. Richland County funds thirteen mills eight mills more than the five mills required by statute. I move that County Council develop a separate Recreation Commission to manage the eight additional mills if the Recreation Commission does not agree to the MOU or if Council still feels that there is taxation without representation. Note: This is a partial solution to the constant challenge for taxation and representation [N. JACKSON]

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:47 PM.