



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

**JANUARY 24, 2012
6:00 PM**

**2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC
Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: December 20, 2011 (pages 5-7)

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS 400 Computer System-Treasurer's Office (pages 9-11)
3. Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS 400 Computer System and upgrade printers-

Auditor's Office (pages 13-15)

4. Auditor's Office Budget Amendment request to address requests not funded during the budget cycle (pages 17-19)
5. Business Licensing-Ordinance Adding Interstate Commerce Deduction (pages 21-26)
6. Business Licensing-Repealing Ordinance related to Interstate Commerce Business License Fee Discount (pages 28-32)
7. Capital Projects Sales Tax (pages 34-40)
8. Commercial Facade Improvement Grant Program (pages 42-60)
9. Credentialing System Equipment Project (pages 62-64)
10. Curtiss-Wright Hangar (pages 66-68)
11. Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) negotiation (pages 70-72)
12. Forensic Laboratory Enhancement Grant-Sheriff's Department (pages 74-75)
13. Permanently Finance CMRTA with Mass Transit Fee (pages 77-78)
14. Financial Impact of Transferring CMRTA to City of Columbia (page 80)
15. RCSD Entry Deputy Pay Increase FY 12 (pages 82-85)

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

16. 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. 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, A&F, November 2011).

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: December 20, 2011 (pages 5-7)

Reviews

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 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: Paul Livingston, Bill Malinowski, Valerie Hutchinson, Norman Jackson, Joyce Dickerson, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Sara Salley, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Daniel Driggers, Michael Byrd, John Hixson, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:02 p.m.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. Pearce expressed condolences to the Sheriff's Department on the death of Fargo.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to adopt the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Pursuant to a request from Gary Watts, the Richland County Coroner, I move that the County Administrator and/or his designee along with the County Attorney meet with the Coroner and Probate Judge Amy McCullough to determine whether a county ordinance could be developed that would assist in the recovery of costs associated with the disposition of unclaimed decedents. This would only apply to those individuals whose estates are determined to have financial resources available. Explanation: According to the Coroner, the number of families declining custody of their deceased relatives is rising annually with the County having to bear the cost of preparations and burial of these individuals. In many cases, the Coroner and Probate Judge have determined that the decedent's estates have sufficient assets to cover these costs; however, they currently have no means to recover the costs associated with these expenses – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to table. The vote was in favor.

Motion requesting the County Attorney establish a list of qualified bond attorneys – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that in connection with bond issues, the County establish a policy of including a separate role as disclosure counsel for bond issues in the amount of \$5,000,000 or more with the County Attorney to establish a process for selecting disclosure counsel from qualified law firms. There will be no change in the County's current bond counsel in partnership with a minority law firm. Additionally, we direct the County Attorney to consult with each of the attorneys/law firms currently working with Richland County to encourage minority participation, partnerships, and mentoring and finally we direct the County Attorney to engage the services of an outside firm to advise the County on modifications of our procurement code to increase minority and local participation in all procurement matters. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Status Offender Intervention Project/One Full-time position/10% match – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve the request for the Status Offender Intervention Project utilizing funds that are currently available in the County match account. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Broad River Administration Building—Loan Payment – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's request to appropriate and redirect a portion of the interest earned on the outstanding Broad River Sewer Bond to pay the internal loan back to the County's General Fund for the Broad River Administration Building. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Approval to Participate in Emergency Medicine Fellowship Program – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to allow Emergency Services to participate in the Palmetto Health Emergency Medicine Fellowship Program. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Landfill Office Building Replacement – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to authorize Procurement to award the

contract to Construction Dynamics in the amount of \$798,985.50 for the construction of the Richland County Landfill Office building. The amount includes the construction cost of \$694,770, along with a 15% contingency cost of \$104,215.50. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:19 p.m.

Submitted by,

L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS 400 Computer System-Treasurer's Office (pages 9-11)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Treasurer’s Office Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS400 computer system.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Richland County Treasurer’s Office budget in the amount of \$29,203 for the purpose of sharing the cost of the purchase of a new AS400 computer system with the County Auditor’s Office in order to maintain the performance of the computer system which staff needs in order to be able to continue to serve the taxpayers of Richland County and avoid an interrupted revenue stream.

B. Background/Discussion

- Currently we are running at 83.66% of our system storage (disk space). An IBM AS400 will begin decreasing response time once the system reaches 80%. Once the system reaches 90% of its storage capacity, it begins logging errors and the response time is drastically reduced. Slow response time slows the line processing time and causes the cashier line to back up so that taxpayers are waiting and not being served quickly. We are receiving taxpayer complaints, especially at month end. So as noted at almost 84% storage space being used we are fast approaching critical mass.
- In the five years between tax year 2006 and tax year 2011 vehicle tax notices have increased 6.3% and all other tax notices have experienced an 8.4% growth in the number of tax notices; with this rate of increase we will probably reach the 90% threshold when we add tax year 2012. At this point we will be required to delete records in order for the system to continue to operate at the level that it is currently running; this deleting and logging of errors compromises data integrity.
- Currently we are using a version V5R3M0 and this version of support will soon be dropped from support through IBM. The version V6R1 is the most current release available giving us the latest software options that will help with the current requests we are receiving from other County and State governments.
- The County collects over \$224,000 yearly in renewal fees that the County will lose if we are unable to meet DMV’s new barcode requirements. Without this upgrade, the Richland County Treasurer’s Office will be unable to process any decals. DMV plans to shut down the County’s ability to issue decals which would result in a loss of funds to the County for the remainder of this fiscal year of \$97,500 and taxpayer inconvenience.

C. Financial Impact

The County would save almost \$1,100 if we purchased the system outright as opposed to a lease-purchase agreement.

Replacement of AS400 system	\$29,203
<hr/>	
Total Budget Amendment	\$29,203
<hr/>	

D. Alternatives

County Council can approve the request thus allowing the Treasurer’s Office to maintain system integrity and continue to generate a revenue stream that accounts for 55% of General Fund Revenue as billed property taxes do as well as the decal annual revenue of \$224,000. Also we can continue to foster intergovernmental cooperation through providing other State and County entities information they request.

County Council can choose not to approve the request thus compromising data integrity and hindering the production of 55% of the General Fund Revenue stream and loss of \$224,000 yearly to County revenues.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request of the Budget Amendment

Recommended by: David A. Adams

Department: Richland County Treasurer

Date: 1/4/12

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/6/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

The information provided and the request seems consistent with the on-going need of the operation. Based on my understanding there are two separate requests for \$30k each but it is for one project and funding is required for both. Therefore it seems that the project request is for a budget amendment for \$60k. The ROA does not include a funding source therefore approval would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment. This one-time expenditure would be an appropriate use of fund balance based on the County Financial Policy.

Information Technology

Reviewed by: Janet Claggett

Date: 1/8/2012

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

The information provided appears consistent with the on-going needs of the operation and supports the requested budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/9/12

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: To the extent that Procurement has recommended approval of this item, I would assume that all of the procurement requirements, if any have been met. Therefore, my recommendation for approval is based on that premise.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 1/18/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funding to be appropriated from the fund balance of the General Fund.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS 400 Computer System and upgrade printers-Auditor's Office (pages 13-15)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Auditor’s Office Budget Amendment to address purchase of new AS400 computer system and upgrade printers.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Auditor’s Office budget in the amount of \$29,203 for the purpose of sharing the cost of the purchase of a new AS400 computer system with the County Treasurer Office in order to maintain the performance of the computer system which staff needs in order to be able to continue to serve the taxpayers of Richland County. In addition, with the system upgrade we will need to upgrade our two printers at a cost of \$800 each to be compatible with the new system. This is a total budget request of \$30,803.

B. Background/Discussion

- Currently we are running at 83.66% of our system storage (disk space). An IBM AS400 will begin decreasing response time once the system reaches 80%. Once the system reaches 90% of its storage capacity, it begins logging errors and the response time is drastically reduced. So as noted at almost 84% storage space being used we are fast approaching critical mass.
- In the five years between tax year 2006 and tax year 2011 vehicle tax notices have increased 6.3% and all other tax notices have experienced an 8.4% growth in the number of tax notices; with this rate of increase we will probably reach the 90% threshold when we add tax year 2012. At this point we will be required to delete records in order for the system to continue to operate at the level that it is currently running; this deleting and logging of errors compromises data integrity.
- Currently we are using a version V5R3M0 and this version of support will soon be dropped from support through IBM. The version V6R1 is the most current release available giving us the latest software options that will help with the current requests we are receiving from other County and State governments.
- Also, this system upgrade will replace our IBM 7208 8MM tape drive with a more current and reliable 1.5tb tape drive and replace the current approximately 8 year old UPS(Uninterrupted Power Source).

Financial Impact

The County would save almost \$1,100 if we purchased the system outright as opposed to a lease-purchase agreement.

Replacement of AS400 system	\$29,203
Printer Upgrades	\$ 1,600
<hr/>	
Total Budget Amendment	\$30,803

C. Alternatives

County Council can approve the request thus allowing the Auditor’s Office to maintain system integrity and continue to generate a revenue stream that accounts for 55% of General Fund

Revenue as billed property taxes do. Also we can continue to foster intergovernmental cooperation through providing other State and County entities information they request.

County Council can choose not to approve the request thus compromising data integrity and hindering the production of 55% of the General Fund Revenue stream.

D. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request of the Budget Amendment

Recommended by: Paul Brawley
12/22/11

Department: County Auditor

Date:

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/6/12

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

The information provided and the request seems consistent with the on-going need of the operation. Based on my understanding there are two separate requests for \$30k each but it is for one project and funding is required for both. Therefore it seems that the project request is for a budget amendment for \$60k. The ROA does not include a funding source therefore approval would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment. This one-time expenditure would be an appropriate use of fund balance based on the County Financial Policy.

Information Technology

Reviewed by: Janet Claggett

Date: 1/8/2012

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

The information provided appears consistent with the on-going needs of the operation and supports the requested budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/9/12

✓ 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: 1/19/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funding to be appropriated from the fund balance of the General Fund.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Auditor's Office Budget Amendment request to address requests not funded during the budget cycle (pages 17-19)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Auditor's Office Budget Amendment request to address requests not funded during the budget cycle.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Auditor's Office budget in the amount of \$45,500 for the purpose of providing the ability to print tax bills for a full year and to defray the costs of software changes needed to the computer system in order to comply with Special Source Revenue Agreements and the FILOT supplement Policy previously approved by Council.

B. Background/Discussion

- The Auditor's request for funding was denied during the budget cycle thus creating a need for this Amendment
- The Auditor made his request during the budget cycle to the County Administrator and his staff; the Auditor also addressed a letter to County Council concerning the budgetary needs of this Office.

The Auditor's Office successfully implemented outsourcing the printing of the tax bills two years ago at a tremendous savings to county taxpayers; these bills have contributed to a well-informed tax base; there is an increase in the number of tax bills printed.

County Council gave approval for a FILOT Supplement Policy which will require the Auditor's Office to flag certain Fee accounts so as to reserve 3% of the Fee amount; Council also gave approval previously for a Infrastructure Credit Agreement with South Pills and South University which gives them a Special Source Credit and this will require an extensive reconfiguration of our system so as to account for this Credit. Because the company is not a manufacturer; we cannot use our current method of extending a Credit.

The Verizon Agreement has two different levy years and the system has to be reconfigured to accommodate the agreement.

C. Financial Impact

We spent \$70,839 for the fiscal year 2011 to print tax bills. This represents a little more than \$5,000 in excess of the \$65,000 that was budgeted or about 9 % less than what we actually needed to print the tax bills; we expect this cost to be \$73,000 for the fiscal year 2012; we have been budgeted \$65,000; but we need the additional \$8,000 to cover the increase in tax bills. Based off the CAFR for fiscal year 2010, property taxes accounted for roughly 55% of the General Fund revenues; the billing of tax bills is vitally important to the financial viability of not only the County but also the other millage agencies that depend on local funding. Using an outside vendor to print the tax bills results in an annual average postage savings of \$16,000 to the County's General Fund budget. Not being fully funded will cause the Auditor's Office to not be able to print vehicle bills for the last three months of the fiscal year thus resulting in the County and other millage agencies forgoing billable tax revenues in the amount of \$17,446,764.

Printing of additional tax bills	\$8,000
Software Changes necessary	\$ 37,500

Total Budget Amendment	\$45,500
------------------------	----------

D. Alternatives

County Council can approve the request thus allowing the Auditor’s Office to print tax bills for the full fiscal year and provide for the County and other millage agencies the opportunity to receive \$17,446,764 in billable tax revenues; also allowing the Auditor’s Office to comply with previously approved policies and agreements by Council.

County Council can choose not to approve the request thus permitting the County and other millage agencies to lose out on \$17,446,764 in billable tax revenues because of the Auditor’s Office inability to have tax bills printed for the last three months of the fiscal year, April, May, & June; also thus preventing the implementation of the FILOT policy and Special Source Revenue Credit Agreements already approved by Council.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approved the request of the Budget Amendment

Recommended by: Paul Brawley Department: County Auditor Date:
01/10/12

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/11/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

The request is the approval of a budget amendment for \$45,500. The information provided and the request seems consistent with the on-going need of the operation and is Council’s discretion to authorize an increase to a department’s budget appropriation. Based on the ROA, it is unclear if the request will result in an increase, decrease or is budget neutral in subsequent years so we would recommend this be considered during the discussion in order to plan for all associated cost. However, the ROA does not include a funding source therefore approval would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment.

Information Technology

Reviewed by: Janet Claggett Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

The information provided seems consistent with the functions of the Auditor's Office. The software quote of \$37,500 is from the sole vendor of the Auditor's proprietary software system and no other vendor would be authorized to make any software changes. It would be to the Council's discretion whether to authorize a budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 1/12/12
✓ 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: 1/18/12
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funding to be appropriated from the fund balance of the General Fund.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Business Licensing-Ordinance Adding Interstate Commerce Deduction (pages 21-26)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Business Licensing – Ordinance Adding Interstate Commerce Deduction

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to amend Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations, to allow the deduction of interstate commerce income from gross income.

B. Background / Discussion

As a result of mediation between Richland County and two businesses bringing litigation against the County resulting from the inclusion of interstate commerce income in business license fee calculations, an agreement between the parties was reached, to wit: the County will allow interstate commerce income to be deducted from business license calculations, and the ordinance establishing the current interstate commerce discount on business license fees will be repealed. This repeal would be accomplished in a separate ordinance, which is being presented as a companion to the attached ordinance. It is appropriate since interstate commerce would no longer be included in business license fee calculations, but rather, with Council's approval of this ordinance, it would now be an allowable deduction.

Forty-five businesses reported interstate commerce sales exceeding one million in volume during the 2011 business license year. Of the total 9,431 businesses receiving a 2011 business license, this group of 45 represents .5% of all business license renewals.

The draft ordinance is attached.

C. Financial Impact

The anticipated financial impact of adding interstate commerce as an authorized deduction from gross income reported for business license purposes while removing the interstate commerce discount is approximately \$250,000 in lost revenues to the County annually.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the ordinance as drafted.
2. Approve an amended ordinance.
3. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

These proposed ordinance amendments are at Council's discretion, with the understanding that approving the ordinance amendments will follow the agreement reached during mediation and disapproving the ordinance amendments will cancel the agreement reached during mediation.

Recommended by: Pam Davis, Director, BSC

Date: 1/6/2012

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/6/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council Discretion:

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council. Based on the ROA, approval would have a negative incremental impact of \$250k annual to the County non-tax revenue stream which would need to be absorbed through other means. The amount considered is immaterial to the total County funding structure.

Business Service Center

Reviewed by: Pam Davis

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation: See recommendation noted in Item E.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 1/9/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council discretion

Comments regarding recommendation: It is my understanding that the attached ordinance is the result of a settlement agreement between the County and one or more businesses.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation: Approving the amendment to the ordinance would allow staff to properly implement a policy decision of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: 1/18/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that Council amend Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations, to allow the deduction of interstate commerce income from gross income. This recommendation for approval is consistent with, and facilitates, the settlement approved by Council on December 13, 2011 regarding the Interstate Commerce lawsuits with FN Manufacturing, LLC and McEntire Produce, Inc.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-12HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 16, LICENSES AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS; ARTICLE I, IN GENERAL; SECTION 16-7, DEDUCTIONS, EXEMPTIONS, CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS, AND DETERMINATION OF CLASSIFICATION; SO AS TO ALLOW THE DEDUCTION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE INCOME FROM GROSS INCOME.

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

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 16, Licenses and Miscellaneous Business Regulations; Article I, In General; Section 16-7, Deductions, Exemptions, Charitable Organizations, and Determination of Classification; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 16-7. Deductions, Exemptions, Charitable Organizations, and Determination of Classification.

- (1) No deductions from gross income shall be made except as follows:
 - (a) Income from business done wholly outside of the county jurisdiction on which a license fee is paid to another county or to any municipality, taxes collected for a governmental entity, or income which cannot be taxed pursuant to state or federal law. The applicant shall have the burden to establish the right to deduction by satisfactory records and proof by including with the business license application, either new or renewing, a separate itemized list showing all deductions claimed, or no deductions will be allowed. Deductions will be approved as authorized by this section.
 - (b) Businesses whose business activity(ies) are described by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) with codes beginning with 4411 or 4412, which includes the following:
 1. New and Used Automobile Dealers (441110 and 441120),
 2. Recreational Vehicle Dealers (441210),
 3. Motorcycle, ATV, and Personal Watercraft Dealers (441221),
 4. Boat Dealers (441222), and
 5. All Other Motor Vehicle Dealers (441229).

These businesses shall be authorized to deduct the amounts paid to customers in exchange for motor vehicle trade-ins as part of sales transactions.

(c) Income from sales generated by interstate commerce, i.e. sales of goods or products across state lines. Provided, however, such deducted income shall be included in the business' reported gross income.

(2) Exemptions.

(a) No person shall be exempt from the requirements of this article by reason of the lack of an established place of business within the County, unless exempted by State or Federal law.

(b) The following businesses, occupations or professions are exempt from the requirements of this article:

1. Teachers;
2. Ministers, pastors, preachers, rabbis and other leaders of commonly recognized religious faiths;
3. Telephone, telegraph, gas and electric and other utilities or providers regulated by the South Carolina Public Service Commission;
4. Insurance companies; and
5. An entity which is exempt from license tax under any state law other than South Carolina Code of Laws, § 4-9-30(12), or a subsidiary or affiliate of any such exempt entity.

(c) No person shall be exempt from this article by reason of the payment of any other tax or fee, unless exempted by State law, and no person shall be relieved of the liability for the payment of any other tax or fee by reason of the application of this article.

(3) In lieu of the license required by Section 16-1, a participant in a single annual event of not more than ten consecutive calendar days in length may be issued a permit at the rate of \$10.00 on gross income on the first \$2,000.00 and \$1.20 on each additional \$1,000.00 of gross income or fraction thereof. This permit will be valid only for the time period specified thereon and can be obtained for no more than one event annually. Organizers of such events may pay for and obtain a business license on behalf on all its vendors at a rate of \$10 per vendor or on the previous year's income generated by the event based upon the rate above, whichever is greater.

Inspections prior to the issuance of a permit may be waived. Inspections may be conducted during the event. For purposes of this subsection, an event is defined as participation by a group of exhibitors or others where displays are established in individual booths or stalls for the purpose of presenting to the audience goods, wares, merchandise or services offered for sale, rent or promotional purposes or for the general good will of the exhibitors. An event may be a trade show, an antique show, a craft show, or any other type of show fitting this definition.

(4) Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, businesses and individuals defined as *contractor* herein shall be exempt from the provisions of this article in the following manner:

The business license fee shall be reduced by excluding that portion of the business' gross income generated from work done for which a Richland County building permit was obtained and a building permit fee paid (by either the general contractor or subcontractor responsible for that work), pursuant to the provisions of Section 6-51 of the Richland County Code of Ordinances.

If all income of a contractor is generated from work done for which a building permit fee is paid (by either the general contractor or subcontractor responsible for that work), said contractor shall be exempt from paying any business license fee. Such an exempt contractor shall still submit a business license application by the deadline with documentation attached establishing such contractor's right to an exemption.

Income generated from work done for which a Richland County building permit is not required, such as general repairs, shall be subject to a business license fee on that income.

(5) Charitable organizations which have exemptions from state and federal income taxes and/or are 501(c)(3) organizations according to the IRS Tax Code and where all proceeds are devoted to charitable purposes are exempt from a business license fee. Documentation of the claim to this exemption must be provided.

(6) The provisions of this article shall not extend to persons who grow their own agricultural produce or products, and use the Columbia State Farmers' Market, or other farmers' markets officially recognized by the County, to sell their produce directly to consumers.

(7) The License Official shall determine the appropriate classification for each business.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective beginning with calendar year 2012.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Kelvin E. Washington, Sr., Chair

ATTEST THIS THE _____ DAY

OF _____, 2012

Michelle M. Onley
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Business Licensing-Repealing Ordinance related to Interstate Commerce Business License Fee Discount (pages 28-32)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Business Licensing – Repealing Ordinance No. 055-08HR (Interstate Commerce Business License Fee Discount)

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to enact an ordinance repealing Ordinance Number 055-08HR in its entirety, while ensuring that businesses are not harmed by such repeal.

B. Background / Discussion

On October 7, 2008, County Council enacted Ordinance No. 055-08HR, which provided a business license fee discount to businesses within Richland County that were engaged in interstate commerce. As a result of mediation between Richland County and two businesses bringing litigation against the County resulting from the inclusion of interstate commerce income in business license fee calculations, an agreement between the parties was reached, to wit: the County will allow interstate commerce income to be deducted from business license calculations, and the ordinance establishing the current interstate commerce discount on business license fees will be repealed. This repeal is appropriate since interstate commerce would no longer be included in business license fee calculations, but rather, with Council's approval, it would now be an allowable deduction through the enactment of a companion ordinance (which is being presented separately).

Forty-five businesses reported interstate commerce sales exceeding one million in volume during the 2011 business license year. Of the total 9,431 businesses receiving a 2011 business license, this group of 45 represents .5% of all business license renewals.

Four businesses are projected to be adversely affected by the repeal of the interstate commerce discount and the addition of the interstate commerce deduction. (This results from the level of these businesses' reported gross income and their level of interstate commerce.) This impact is recommended to be mitigated completely for five years, then have the mitigation gradually reduced by 20% per year for five years, in order to be equitable with all other companies in ten years.

The draft ordinance is attached.

C. Financial Impact

The anticipated financial impact of adding interstate commerce as an authorized deduction from gross income reported for business license purposes (see companion ordinance) while removing the interstate commerce discount is approximately \$250,000 in lost revenues to the County annually.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the ordinance as drafted.

2. Approve an amended ordinance.
3. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

These proposed ordinance amendments are at Council’s discretion, with the understanding that approving the ordinance amendments will follow the agreement reached during mediation and disapproving the ordinance amendments will cancel the agreement reached during mediation.

Recommended by: Pam Davis, Director, BSC Date: 1/6/2012

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/6/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council. Based on the ROA, approval would have a negative incremental impact of \$250k annual to the County non-tax revenue stream which would need to be absorbed through other means. The amount considered is immaterial to the total County funding structure.

Business Service Center

Reviewed by: Pam Davis Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: See recommendation noted in Item E.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 1/9/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: It is my understanding that the attached ordinance is the result of a settlement agreement between the County and one or more businesses.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Council’s approval of the amendment to the ordinance would allow staff to implement the decision made by Council related to this matter.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta Date: January 18, 2012
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that Council approve the attached ordinance repealing Ordinance Number 055-08HR in its entirety, while ensuring that businesses are not harmed by such repeal. This recommendation for approval is consistent with, and facilitates, the settlement approved by Council on December 13, 2011 regarding the Interstate Commerce lawsuits with FN Manufacturing, LLC and McEntire Produce, Inc.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-12HR

AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL ORDINANCE NUMBER 055-08HR IN ITS ENTIRETY, AND TO ENSURE THAT BUSINESSES ARE NOT HARMED BY SUCH REPEAL.

WHEREAS, Ordinance Number 055-08HR was adopted on October 7, 2008, and went into effect on January 1, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance Number 055-08HR required business license fees for those businesses engaged in interstate commerce, but provided for such fees at a discounted rate; and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council adopted Ordinance Number ____-12HR on _____, 2012, which allows interstate commerce income to be deducted from gross income for business license purposes; and

WHEREAS, Richland County Council now wishes to repeal Ordinance Number 055-08HR in its entirety, but also wishes to ensure that business are not harmed by such repeal;

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

SECTION I. Ordinance Number 055-08HR, which was adopted by Richland County Council on October 7, 2008, and went into effect on January 1, 2009, is hereby repealed in its entirety for any business license issued after January 1, 2012.

SECTION II. No business which paid Business License fees on interstate commerce in the years 2009, 2010 or 2011, and which received the interstate commerce discount in any of those years shall be required to pay more Business License fees on an equivalent amount of income than that business would have paid starting in 2012 had the discounted rate not been repealed by this Ordinance (see Section I., above), and had the interstate commerce deduction not been added to Section 16-7 (see Ordinance Number ____-12HR). Any such business whose Business License fees would increase starting in 2012 as a result of both the repeal of Ordinance Number 055-08HR and the enactment of Ordinance Number ____-12HR shall be entitled to mitigation or relief of such increase in its Business License fee based on and up to an amount of gross income and interstate commerce income equivalent to the amounts reported for business license purposes in 2011.

SECTION III. Section II of this Ordinance shall remain in full effect for five (5) years beginning January 1, 2012. Beginning with Calendar year 2017, the relief provided by Section II of this Ordinance shall decrease for eligible businesses by 20% of the 2012 amount for each of the five years beginning with 2017; and shall be completely eliminated effective January 1, 2021, and thereafter.

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

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

SECTION VI. Effective Date. This amendment shall be effective beginning with calendar year 2012.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Kelvin E. Washington, Sr., Chair

ATTEST THIS THE _____ DAY

OF _____, 2012

Michelle M. Onley
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Capital Projects Sales Tax (pages 34-40)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Capital Projects Sales Tax [Jackson]

A. Purpose

Council is requested to review the motion made by Councilman Jackson at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made by Councilman Jackson at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting:

Develop a Capital Projects Sales Tax for November 2012, with collection beginning May 1, 2013. The Capital Projects Sales Tax is a 1% increase, with 100% of the proceeds going towards identified capital projects in both the City, County and adjacent municipalities. It is a seven year tax, through 2019, expected to generate over \$400,000,000. A Priority Investment Element inventories potential funding sources and forecasted revenues available to finance planning initiatives, capital improvements, and other quality of life projects in the community should be used. Planning for roads, new parks, or new schools is the easy part; figuring out a long range capital plan to pay for them is the true challenge. New growth and development demand additional public services, roads, and utilities. Managing available revenue sources and enumerating project needs helps ensure that adequate capacity is available to serve the magnitude and timing of anticipated development.

In essence, the Priority Investment Element would be a catalyst for the development of a more formalized Capital Improvement Planning Process and the incorporation of capital planning elements in our annual budgets that looks beyond year to year budget cycles. The Element would require improved coordination across multiple disciplines: Land Use, Transportation, Schools, and other Public Facilities would be planned and programmed not in a vacuum, but in a manner which anticipates the impacts each has on the other. Plans, programs, policies, and capital projects recommended in the Priority Investment Act (PIA) address needs highlighted throughout the Comprehensive Plan for Richland County and the City of Columbia as well as related entities. [Jackson]

The Capital Projects Sales Tax Act is included below for your convenience.

It is at this time that staff requests direction from Council regarding this item.

C. Financial Impact

Unknown until further direction is provided by Council.

D. Alternatives

1. Receive the item as information only.
2. Direct staff as appropriate.

E. Recommendation

Develop a Capital Projects Sales Tax for November 2012, with collection beginning May 1, 2013.

Recommended by: Councilman Jackson December 6, 2011

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/9/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a request for direction and a policy decision for Council. Additional information or analysis can be provided upon request. If approved, Council should consider the impact to current operations.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This represents a policy decision that is within Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 1-10-12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This represents a policy decision that is within Council's discretion.

Article from SC Code of Laws, Title 4-Counties, Chapter 10-Local Sales and Use Tax

CHAPTER 10.

LOCAL SALES AND USE TAX

ARTICLE 3.

CAPITAL PROJECT SALES TAX ACT

SECTION 4-10-300. Short title.

This article may be cited as the “Capital Project Sales Tax Act”.

SECTION 4-10-310. Imposition of tax.

Subject to the requirements of this article, the county governing body may impose a one percent sales and use tax by ordinance, subject to a referendum, within the county area for a specific purpose or purposes and for a limited amount of time. The revenues collected pursuant to this article may be used to defray debt service on bonds issued to pay for projects authorized in this article. However, at no time may any portion of the county area be subject to more than one percent sales tax levied pursuant to this article, pursuant to Chapter 37, Title 4, or pursuant to any local law enacted by the General Assembly.

SECTION 4-10-320. Commission creation; composition.

(A) The governing body of any county is authorized to create a commission subject to the provisions of this section. The commission consists of six members, all of whom must be residents of the county, appointed as follows:

- (1) The governing body of the county must appoint three members of the commission.
- (2) The municipalities in the county must appoint three members, who must be residents of incorporated municipalities within the county, and who are selected according to the following mechanism:

(a) The total population of all incorporated municipalities within the county, as determined by the most recent United States census, must be divided by three, the result being an apportionate average.

(b) The respective population of each municipality in the county must be divided by the apportionate average to determine an appointive index.

(c) Each municipality in the county appoints a number of members to the commission equal to the whole number indicated by their appointive index. However, no single municipality may appoint

more than two members to the commission; unless there is only one municipality in the county, and in such case the municipality is entitled to three appointments to the commission.

(d) When less than three members are selected to the commission in accordance with the prescribed appointive index method, the remaining member or members must be selected in a joint meeting of the commission appointees of the municipalities in the county. The member or members must be chosen from among the residents of the municipalities in the county that before this time have not provided a representative for the commission.

(e) In the event no municipality is entitled to appoint a member to the commission pursuant to the formula in subitem (c) of this subsection, the municipality with the highest appointive index must be deemed to have an appointive index of one.

(B) When the governing body of any county creates a commission, it must be created in accordance with the procedures specified in subsection (A) and only upon the request of the governing body of the county. If within the thirty-day period following the adoption of a resolution to create the commission, one or more of the municipalities fails or refuses to appoint their proportionate number of members to the commission, the county governing body must appoint an additional number of members equal to the number that any such municipality is entitled to appoint. A vacancy on the commission must be filled in the manner of the original appointment.

(C) The commission created pursuant to this section must consider proposals for funding capital projects within the county area. The commission then formulates the referendum question that is to appear on the ballot pursuant to Section 4-10-330(D).

SECTION 4-10-330. Contents of ballot question; purpose for which proceeds of tax to be used.

(A) The sales and use tax authorized by this article is imposed by an enacting ordinance of the county governing body containing the ballot question formulated by the commission pursuant to Section 4-10-320(C), subject to referendum approval in the county. The ordinance must specify:

(1) the purpose for which the proceeds of the tax are to be used, which may include projects located within or without, or both within and without, the boundaries of the local governmental entities, including the county, municipalities, and special purpose districts located in the county area, and may include the following types of projects:

(a) highways, roads, streets, bridges, and public parking garages and related facilities;

(b) courthouses, administration buildings, civic centers, hospitals, emergency medical facilities, police stations, fire stations, jails, correctional facilities, detention facilities, libraries, coliseums, educational facilities under the direction of an area commission for technical education, or any combination of these projects;

(c) cultural, recreational, or historic facilities, or any combination of these facilities;

(d) water, sewer, or water and sewer projects;

(e) flood control projects and storm water management facilities;

(f) beach access and beach renourishment;

(g) jointly operated projects of the county, a municipality, special purpose district, and school district, or any combination of those entities, for the projects delineated in subitems (a) through (f) of this item;

(h) any combination of the projects described in subitems (a) through (g) of this item;

(2) the maximum time, in two-year increments not to exceed eight years from the date of imposition, or in the case of a reimposed tax, a period ending on April thirtieth of an odd-numbered year, not to exceed seven years, for which the tax may be imposed;

(3)(a) if the county proposes to issue bonds to provide for the payment of any costs of the projects, the maximum amount of bonds to be issued, whether the sales tax proceeds are to be pledged to the

payment of the bonds and, if other sources of funds are to be used for the projects, specifying the other sources;

(b) the maximum cost of the project or facilities or portion of the project or portion of the facilities, to be funded from proceeds of the tax or bonds issued as provided in this article and the maximum amount of net proceeds expected to be used to pay the cost or debt service on the bonds, as the case may be; and

(4) any other condition precedent, as determined by the commission, to the imposition of the sales and use tax authorized by this article or condition or restriction on the use of sales and use tax revenue collected pursuant to this article.

(B) When the tax authorized by this article is imposed for more than one purpose, the enacting ordinance must set forth the priority in which the net proceeds are to be expended for the purposes stated. The enacting ordinance may set forth a formula or system by which multiple projects are funded simultaneously.

(C) Upon receipt of the ordinance, the county election commission must conduct a referendum on the question of imposing the sales and use tax in the area of the county that is to be subject to the tax. The referendum for imposition or reimposition of the tax must be held at the time of the general election unless the vote is to reimpose a tax in effect on or before June 1, 2009, and in existence at the time of such vote, in which case the referendum may be held on a general election day or at a time the governing body of the county and the Department of Revenue determine necessary to permit the tax to be reinstated and continue without interruption. The choice of election times rests with the governing body of the county. However, a referendum to reimpose an existing tax as permitted above only may be held once whether or not the referendum is held on a general election day or at another time. Two weeks before the referendum the election commission must publish in a newspaper of general circulation the question that is to appear on the ballot, with the list of projects and the cost of the projects. If the proposed question includes the use of sales taxes to defray debt service on bonds issued to pay the costs of any project, the notice must include a statement indicating that principal amount of the bonds proposed to be issued for the purpose and, if the issuance of the bonds is to be approved as part of the referendum, stating that the referendum includes the authorization of the issuance of bonds in that amount. This notice is in lieu of any other notice otherwise required by law.

(D) The referendum question to be on the ballot must read substantially as follows:

“Must a special one percent sales and use tax be imposed in (county) for not more than (time) to raise the amounts specified for the following purposes?

(1) \$ _____ for _____

(2) \$ _____ for _____

(3) etc.

Yes []

No []”

If the referendum includes the issuance of bonds, the question must be revised to include the principal amount of bonds proposed to be authorized by the referendum and the sources of payment of the bonds if the sales tax approved in the referendum is inadequate for the payment of the bonds.

(E) All qualified electors desiring to vote in favor of imposing the tax for the stated purposes shall vote “yes” and all qualified electors opposed to levying the tax shall vote “no”. If a majority of the votes cast are in favor of imposing the tax, then the tax is imposed as provided in this article and the enacting ordinance. A subsequent referendum on this question must be held on the date prescribed in subsection (C). The election commission shall conduct the referendum under the election laws of this State, mutatis mutandis, and shall certify the result no later than November thirtieth to the county governing body and to the Department of Revenue. Expenses of the referendum must be

paid by the governmental entities that would receive the proceeds of the tax in the same proportion that those entities would receive the net proceeds of the tax.

(F) Upon receipt of the returns of the referendum, the county governing body must, by resolution, declare the results thereof. In such event, the results of the referendum, as declared by resolution of the county governing body, are not open to question except by a suit or proceeding instituted within thirty days from the date such resolution is adopted.

SECTION 4-10-340. Tax imposition and termination.

(A) If the sales and use tax is approved in the referendum, the tax is imposed on the first of May following the date of the referendum. If the reimposition of an existing sales and use tax imposed pursuant to this article is approved in the referendum, the new tax is imposed immediately following the termination of the earlier imposed tax and the reimposed tax terminates on the thirtieth of April in an odd-numbered year, not to exceed seven years from the date of reimposition. If the certification is not timely made to the Department of Revenue, the imposition is postponed for twelve months.

(B) The tax terminates the final day of the maximum time period specified for the imposition.

(C)(1) Amounts collected in excess of the required net proceeds must first be applied, if necessary, to complete a project for which the tax was imposed.

(2) If funds still remain after first using the funds as described in item (1) and the tax is reimposed, the remaining funds must be used to fund the projects approved by the voters in the referendum to reimpose the tax, in priority order as the projects appeared on the enacting ordinance.

(3) If funds still remain after first using the funds as described in item (1) and the tax is not reimposed, the remaining funds must be used for the purposes set forth in Section 4-10-330(A)(1). These remaining funds only may be expended for the purposes set forth in Section 4-10-330(A)(1) following an ordinance specifying the authorized purpose or purposes for which the funds will be used.

SECTION 4-10-350. Department of Revenue to administer and collect local tax.

(A) The tax levied pursuant to this article must be administered and collected by the Department of Revenue in the same manner that other sales and use taxes are collected. The department may prescribe amounts that may be added to the sales price because of the tax.

(B) The tax authorized by this article is in addition to all other local sales and use taxes and applies to the gross proceeds of sales in the applicable area that is subject to the tax imposed by Chapter 36, Title 12 and the enforcement provisions of Chapter 54, Title 12. The gross proceeds of the sale of items subject to a maximum tax in Chapter 36, Title 12 are exempt from the tax imposed by this article. Unprepared food items eligible for purchase with United States Department of Agriculture food coupons are exempt from the tax imposed pursuant to this article. The tax imposed by this article also applies to tangible personal property subject to the use tax in Article 13, Chapter 36, Title 12.

(C) A taxpayer required to remit taxes under Article 13, Chapter 36 of Title 12 must identify the county in which the personal property purchased at retail is stored, used, or consumed in this State.

(D) A utility is required to report sales in the county in which the consumption of the tangible personal property occurs.

(E) A taxpayer subject to the tax imposed by Section 12-36-920, who owns or manages rental units in more than one county, must report separately in his sales tax return the total gross proceeds from business done in each county.

(F) The gross proceeds of sales of tangible personal property delivered after the imposition date of the tax levied under this article in a county, either under the terms of a construction contract executed before the imposition date, or a written bid submitted before the imposition date, culminating in a construction contract entered into before or after the imposition date, are exempt from the sales and use tax provided in this article if a verified copy of the contract is filed with the Department of Revenue within six months after the imposition date of the sales and use tax provided for in this article.

(G) Notwithstanding the imposition date of the sales and use tax authorized pursuant to this chapter, with respect to services that are billed regularly on a monthly basis, the sales and use tax authorized pursuant to this article is imposed beginning on the first day of the billing period beginning on or after the imposition date.

SECTION 4-10-360. Revenue remitted to State Treasurer and held in a separate fund.

The revenues of the tax collected under this article must be remitted to the Department of Revenue and placed on deposit with the State Treasurer and credited to a fund separate and distinct from the general fund of the State. After deducting the amount of any refunds made and costs to the Department of Revenue of administering the tax, not to exceed one percent of the revenues, the State Treasurer shall distribute the revenues quarterly to the county treasurer in the county area in which the tax is imposed and the revenues must be used only for the purposes stated in the imposition ordinance. The State Treasurer may correct misallocations by adjusting subsequent distributions, but these adjustments must be made in the same fiscal year as the misallocations. However, allocations made as a result of city or county code errors must be corrected prospectively. Within thirty days of the receipt of any quarterly payment, the county treasurer or the county administrator shall certify to the Department of Revenue amounts of net proceeds applied to the costs of each project and the amount of project costs remaining to be paid and, if bonds have been issued that were approved in the referendum, a schedule of payments remaining due on the bonds that are payable from the net proceeds of the sales tax authorized in the referendum.

SECTION 4-10-370. Calculating distributions to counties; confidentiality.

The Department of Revenue shall furnish data to the State Treasurer and to the county treasurers receiving revenues for the purpose of calculating distributions and estimating revenues. The information that must be supplied to counties and municipalities upon request includes, but is not limited to, gross receipts, net taxable sales, and tax liability by taxpayers. Information about a specific taxpayer is considered confidential and is governed by the provisions of Section 12-54-240. A person violating this section is subject to the penalties provided in Section 12-54-240.

SECTION 4-10-380. Unidentified funds; transfer and supplemental distributions.

Annually, and only in the month of June, funds collected by the department from the local option capital project sales tax, which are not identified as to the governmental unit due the tax, must be transferred, after reasonable effort by the department to determine the appropriate governmental unit, to the State Treasurer's Office. The State Treasurer shall distribute these funds to the county treasurer in the county area in which the tax is imposed and the revenues must be used only for the purposes stated in the imposition ordinance. The State Treasurer shall calculate this supplemental distribution on a proportional basis, based on the current fiscal year's county area revenue collections.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Commercial Facade Improvement Grant Program (pages 42-60)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the inception of the Richland County Government's Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program (CFIGP). The Richland County Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP) has developed a Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program to encourage enhancement and investment to the overall revitalization of the Commercial Corridors in unincorporated Richland County. This program provides up to \$10,000 in grant funds to finance exterior improvements to a property owner or tenant's commercial building that will be aesthetically pleasing and complimentary to local design guidelines.

B. Background / Discussion

The intent of the program is to provide financial incentive to business owners located within the Commercial Corridors of unincorporated Richland County and to provide an opportunity to upgrade the exterior of their building. The program is designed to retain and attract businesses, strengthen the Commercial Corridors, increase utilization of existing buildings, restore economic vitality and enhance property values.

Applicants eligible to apply for the grant funding include property owners or business tenants that are willing to improve the exterior facades of existing commercial buildings located in Commercial Corridors of unincorporated Richland County. Owners may receive assistance for more than one building provided that funding is available. A maximum of one grant application per store front shall be accepted. Applicants should contact the Neighborhood Improvement Program office at (803) 576-1340 for determination of property eligibility.

The Façade Improvement Grant Program will not be applied retroactively to work started prior to the commencement of this program. Property owner(s) and tenant(s) who have defaulted under any previous grant program with the Neighborhood Improvement Program or Richland County Government will not be eligible for the Commercial Façade Improvement Grant. Likewise, Façade Improvement Grants will not be issued to any eligible applicants who are in arrears of any municipal financial obligation or, if a tenant, in arrears with any rent or other payments specified in its lease agreement with the property owner.

Eligible uses:

- Exterior Signs (installation of new or repair or replacement of legally installed and mounted signs; including neon or halo lit signs);
- Awnings, canopies, or sunshades (installation of new or repair or replacement of fixed metal or fabric awnings), which could include perpendicular wall-mounted castle banners (without signage);

- Painting or exterior surface treatment (stucco, tile, stone, or brick replacement or repair);
- Asphalt paving, replacement or repair of tiles or decorative pavers (not in the public right-of-way); sidewalk or courtyard repaving (not in the public right-of-way);
- Repair or replacement or restoration of façade masonry, brickwork or wood.
- Outdoor lighting (installation of new exterior lighting fixtures; repair or replacement of existing exterior lighting fixtures);
- Installation, repair or replacement of decorative or security fencing;
- Replacement or repair of windows.
- Replacement, repair or restoration of cornices, eaves, parapets and other architectural features.
- Entranceway modifications that improve the appearance and or access to the commercial units.
- Restoration of historic features.
- Redesign and reconstruction of the store front

Ineligible Uses: Funds may not be used for improvements that are not permanent or mounted or affixed to the building or the sidewalk. Ineligible uses include but are not limited to:

- Vinyl letter signage (windows);
- Portable signs, such as sandwich board or A-frame signs; signs not mounted or attached to storefronts;
- Flags or banners;
- Benches and trash receptacles;
- Tables, chairs, or umbrellas.

Application Process:

1. Applicants must submit a completed application form. Applications must be downloaded from Neighborhood Improvement Program website at www.rcgov.us. Complete applications with supporting documentation are forwarded to the review committee for approval. Applicants with incomplete applications are informed of their deficiencies. The review committee meets twice a month to approve grant applications.
2. Once a completed application is submitted, the review committee will review the application and make a determination on the project. Within 30 days, the applicant will be notified by letter concerning the status of the review including any award conditions, if applicable.
3. Prior to project commencement, Neighborhood Improvement Program staff will meet with the applicant and the contractor to sign the grant agreement and the construction contract. During that meeting the Neighborhood Improvement Program staff will also:
 - a. Discuss the requirements and provisions of Davis Bacon & Related Acts with the contractor and applicant to ensure that all related responsibilities are understood.
 - b. Schedule the date(s) and time(s) for the required interviews with project construction workers in consultation with the contractor.

- c. Sign and notarize the Certificate of Authority which designates and authorizes the contractor to sign and provide certified weekly payroll reports to the Neighborhood Improvement Program.
4. Any proposed improvements must be in compliance with Richland County building code and Commercial Corridor Design Standards. If approved, the applicant/contractor is responsible for obtaining all building permits and any other required approvals for the work to be done. The applicant is responsible for conformance with all applicable safety standards and conditions. The applicant also agrees to maintain the property and the improvements.

Application Review Documentation

All completed applications must be accompanied with the following items:

1. Completed Application
2. Current photographs of project site
3. Elevation, rendering or product information reflecting the vision of the completed project
4. Project Specifications Sheet Copy of Mortgage/Deed (If Owner is Applicant)
5. Letter of Agency *and* copy of Lease (If Tenant is Applicant)
6. Proof of Good Standing for:
 - a. Property taxes
 - b. Sewer Fees & Water Fees
 - c. Mortgage & Rent or Lease payments
7. Copy of Property and Liability Insurance for site where project will take place
8. Copy of Current Business License

Tenant(s) must provide written authorization and an agreement from the registered property owner(s) to apply for the Commercial Façade Improvement Grant

C. Financial Impact

The maximum grant shall not exceed \$10,000 per applicant per store front and a minimum request of \$1,000 is permitted. Although there is no funding match required for the program, applicants are encouraged to leverage the grant fund with other funding sources.

The Program is not a reimbursement program; payment will be issued to approved vendors upon receiving invoices' on a business letterhead. The applicant (owner, purchaser or tenant of a property) shall contract out all design and construction expenses related to improvements to the exterior façades of an existing commercial building. The Neighborhood Improvement Program Office shall pay the contractor or business directly on behalf of the applicant for eligible improvement expenses not exceeding the approved grant amount. The Façade Improvement Grant Program will not be applied retroactively to works started prior to the commencement of this program.

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/11/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Based on a discussion with Community Development the funds are available and will come out of budget 1202882010.4820600.532200

Community Development

Reviewed by: Valeria Jackson

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Based upon discussion with Planning Department to complete applicable full environmental assessments, as deemed appropriate.

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 1/11/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/12/12

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: 1/17/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval of the Richland County Government Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program.

Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program (CFIGP)



The CFIGP is a grant program that will award up to \$10,000 per Applicant.

ELIGIBLE Improvements

Permanent Façade Improvements: Purchase, Preserve, Repair or Replace:

NOTE: *CFIGP participants will be required to submit for all permits and design approval through the Planning and Development Services. All projects must adhere to the Design Guidelines for the specified area that the project will be completed in. The Design Guidelines are available at www.rcgov.us or in the Neighborhood Improvement Program Office.*

- Windows
- Doors
- Awnings
- Signs
- Lighting
- Minor Masonry/Carpentry Repairs
- Painting
- Architectural Detail (Cornice, Corbel, Frieze, Gutter, Downspout)
- Iron Bar Removal/Disposal from Windows or Doors
- Storefront Remodeling (Per Existing Design District Guidelines)
- Decking, Stairways, Visible Roofing Repair & Parking Lot Enhancements are

When accompanying one or more of the authorized improvement elements above an Applicant may choose to utilize this program to assist them in completing a large-scale project that may not only include exterior façade improvements, but also includes interior improvements; **however**, only the exterior portion of the improvement is eligible for funding by this program. The entire project (interior & exterior improvements) must be executed as one project, with one start date and one finish date.

NOTE: *No improvements to the interior or exterior of the building may begin prior to being issued the **Notice to Proceed** from the Neighborhood Improvement Program.*

Program Procedures Summary

I. Program Purpose

The Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP) is providing an incentive program to improve building façades within targeted redevelopment areas – ***Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program (CFIGP)***. By offering assistance to Property Owners or Business Tenants to make improvements to building façades, this program is able to reduce and prevent blight, contribute to the opportunity to create jobs and restore and expand the area’s economic vitality. Façade improvements boost the marketability of individual business spaces, as well as the overall business district. The energy created by bustling businesses not only draw patrons to the area, but also additional businesses soon in-fill any remaining available retail space.

II. Program Overview

CFIGP is grant program, for eligible, exterior building improvements within a designated project area.

Applications will be made available in the Richland County Planning Department at 2020 Hampton Street, 1st floor, Columbia, SC, 29204. Applicants will contact the CFIGP Administrator to schedule a time to pick-up an application and also receive a brief orientation for this program.

The Application Review Committee (ARC) will evaluate the application and render a decision on awarding the grant. If an award is Approved, Agreements/Contracts, etc. will be signed and a Notice to Proceed issued to Applicant.

Guidelines have been established to govern the Application, Grant Agreement, ARC and Administrative processes. These guidelines indicate the procedures that the NIP must use to administer the CFIGP. These guidelines are consistent with federal regulations.

III. Program Administration

A. Program Administrator (PA)

- a. Create/Design or gather all necessary forms/documents to fulfill the needs of CFIGP & Federal regulations
- b. Establish Administration Procedures Guide
- c. Have Administration and Planning Management approve the final version of each document prior to program launch
- d. Establish an Application Review Committee (ARC)
- e. Determine the Application Review Criteria and Point Rating Values
- f. Establish Program Performance Indicators and Reporting Frequency
- g. Facilitate ARC, Agreement Signing or similar meetings, as needed
- h. When CFIGP fully concludes, prepare final report and submit to Planning Management

B. Program Compliance Officer (PCO)

- a. Conduct all required Federal procedures and interviews throughout the life of the program (On & Off-site)
- b. Provide reporting format and forms for all required Federal or In-house reports throughout the life of the program.
- c. Davis Bacon Review Requirements
 - Notice of Debarment
 - Equal Employment Opportunity Form
 - US Dept. of Labor's Hourly Wage and Deduction Form and Statement of Compliance
 - Authorization to Sign Payrolls
- d. Schedules on-site visits with the Applicant/Contractor to complete interviews.
- e. PCO will provide orientation and assistance to Contractors to ensure they understand all instructions to complete required Federal forms.

C. Application Review Committee (ARC)

1. Program Administrator
2. Program Compliance Officer
3. Representative from the Neighborhood Improvement Program
4. Representative from the Planning and Development Services
5. Representative from the Department of Community Development
6. Representative from the Grants Administration Office
7. Representative from the Zoning Department

➤ **Quorum:**

A minimum of four (4) voting members will constitute a quorum. All votes must be recorded. For matters of convenience and expediency, proxy, phone or email votes may be taken and recorded.

➤ **Application Processing:**

Applications will be processed on a first come, first served basis. The Applicant's Package will be Time/Date Stamped to record the date that the application is received. The Application Package will be stamped by either the Program Administrator or a Representative from the Neighborhood Improvement Program.

➤ **General Items:**

The Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program may be modified, from time to time, to accommodate program flexibility, funding availability and/or boundary changes of the eligible project area.

IV. Application

a. Eligibility

Property Owners or Tenants are eligible to participate in the CFI Grant Program. (Tenants must have the Approval of the Property Owner in order to apply.)

b. Improvement Elements: Purchase, Preserve, Repair or Replace

Windows Doors Signage

Awnings

Lighting

Painting

- Minor Masonry/Carpentry Repairs
- Architectural Detail (Cornice, Corbel, Frieze, Gutter, Downspout)
- Iron Bar Removal/Disposal from Windows or Doors
- Storefront Remodeling (Per Existing Design District Guidelines)

Decking, Stairways, and Roofing Repair are limited to the area that **is *significantly visible from the commercial boulevard***. Parking Lot, hard-scape, and landscaping enhancements are **ONLY ELIGIBLE when** accompanying one or more of the improvement elements above.

An Applicant may choose to utilize this program to assist them in completing a large-scale project that not only includes exterior façade improvements, but also includes interior improvements; ***however***, only the exterior portion of the improvement is eligible for CFIGP funding.

c. Target Area:

The Project Site must be a retail or professional business space/building located in unincorporated Richland County.

d. Minimum/Maximum Grant Amount:

The minimum grant amount is \$1,000. *However, Applications of a lesser amount may be considered on a case-by-case basis.* **The maximum grant amount is \$10,000.**

e. Application Requirements

The CFIGP Application must include; but is not limited to:

- Completed Application
- Current photographs of project site
- Elevation, rendering or product information reflecting the vision of the completed project
- Project Specifications Sheet Copy of Mortgage/Deed (If Owner is Applicant)
- Letter of Agency **and** copy of Lease (If Tenant is Applicant)
- Proof of Good Standing for:
 - Property taxes
 - Sewer Fees & Water Fees
 - Mortgage & Rent or Lease payments
- Copy of Property and Liability Insurance for site where project will take place
- Copy of Current Business License

f. Ineligibility

A. The following types of businesses/buildings are Ineligible to participate in the program: **exclusively**

residential buildings and businesses/buildings that are in violation or are prohibited in the Commercial Redevelopment Design Guidelines and are in violation of the Richland County Land Development/Zoning Code.

B. Secondary Façade: Work to any secondary façade or work not clearly visible from a main thoroughfare, is **Ineligible**.

- C. **Professional Fees:** Architectural /design, or other professional fees incurred by the applicant as part of the application process **ARE NOT eligible expenses of CFIGP Grant Program.**

g. Grant Description

If the Applicant **closes, sells or re-names the location for any reason, to include foreclosure and/or any other legal action, within a 2 year period of the receipt of the grant,** which will be considered in default of the grant agreement. Richland County Government reserves the right to request immediate repayment of the entire grant amount.

V. Additional Program Information:

1. Get Your Application Package

Contact Program Administrator (PA) to receive an Application Package. PA: 803.576-1340, mcdanielsm@rcgov.us, 2020 Hampton Street, 1st floor, Columbia, SC 29202.

2. Contact Richland County Planning and Development Services

Mandatory Step: Set an appointment with the Richland County Planning and Development Services Office 803.576.2190 / 2020 Hampton Street, 1st Fl to discuss your façade improvements and total project plans.

County Planning Staff will determine when a rendering, elevation, digitally altered image, product brochure or similar, is required to accompany your application.

3. Other Required Application Documents

- A. Provide **Proof of Ownership** of the property where the project will take place.
- B. **If you lease** your location, please have the **Letter of Agency** (enclosed in your Application Package) signed by the Property Owner. **This document must be notarized.**
- C. Provide **Proof of Good Standing** for the following:
 - Property Taxes:** Copy of Paid Receipt from proper jurisdiction
 - Sewer & Water Fees:** Copy of most recent bill showing "zero" Past Due
 - Mortgage or Lease:** If paying either, copy of most recent statement (mortgage) or notarized letter from the Landlord (Leasing Company) indicating that payments are current.
- D. Copy of your **Property and Liability Insurance** must be provided with your application.
- E. Copy of your **Business License**, when applicable.

4. Assemble Application & Deliver (use the Application Checklist included in your package)

- A. Applications may be emailed: **mcdanielsm@rcgov.us**, faxed: (803) 576-1345 mailed or hand-delivered to 2020 Hampton Street, 1st floor, Columbia, SC 29204. Application Packages will be Time/Date Stamped to record receipt of the application.

- B. Applications will be reviewed within thirty (30) days of receipt. The CFIGP Application Review Committee (ARC) evaluates Application Packages the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of each month.

5. Application Package Evaluation

- A. Application Packages will be processed on a first come, first served basis. (Criteria by which Applications are evaluated are available by request.)
- B. The applicant will be notified within 30 days of the Application Review Date, by letter, phone call and/or email, of the status of the application: Approved, Denied, or if additional information is needed. If additional information is needed, your application will be placed “on hold” until received. *If denied, the Applicant is not prohibited from bringing the application into compliance with the program objectives and re-submitting for new evaluation.*

6. Project Agreements

- A. Once an application has achieved “Approved” status, the Applicant and Contractor will be contacted within 30 days or less to schedule an appointment to sign the grant agreement.
- B. All required documents will be signed and the work schedule established to allow smooth implementation of the project.
- C. Once the Grant Agreement is signed, the Applicant will be issued a “Notice to Proceed”. **You may not proceed with any implementation of the project without this Notice. It will be the responsibility of the Applicant to pay for any work, which is started/completed prior to receiving a ‘Notice to Proceed’.**
- D. NIP reserves the right to inspect your project at any time.

7. Vendor Payment Process

The Neighborhood Improvement Program **will begin issuing payment of Invoices directly to the Contractor, on the Applicant’s behalf**, when work has been satisfactorily completed and Invoice issued. **Any fees beyond the awarded grant amount offered by NIP will be the responsibility of the Applicant.**

Special Notes:

- ❖ Federal Regulations for façade programming prohibit funding for interior improvements.
- ❖ Properties that have previously received a Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program are Ineligible for a period of one (1) year except when that property conducts a renovation/reconstruction/improvement project that exceeds 50 percent (50%) of the property value.
- ❖ **This program is federally funded; therefore, all projects must comply with applicable Federal Laws.**



Commercial Façade Improvement Grant

Program

Application Submission Checklist

NAME OF BUSINESS: _____

PROJECT ADDRESS: _____

APPLICANT NAME: _____

APPLICANT TITLE: _____

Information required with all applications:

- _____ Completed Program Application
- _____ Current photograph of the project site
- _____ Elevation, drawing, photograph or product brochure, as determined by County Planning Staff
- _____ Proof of Ownership
- _____ Letter of Agency (if tenant making application)
- _____ Proof of Good Standing:
 - _____ Property Taxes
 - _____ Sewer Fees & Water Fees
 - _____ Mortgage Payments or Lease Payments
- _____ Copy of Property **and** Liability Insurance
- _____ Copy of Current Business License (the business name must match the business license)
- _____ Cost Estimates
- _____ Other

NOTES:

The Neighborhood Improvement Program shall have the right to inspect the subject property prior to, during and after the improvements are completed.

All improvements that require a Building Permit are subject to inspection by Richland County Code Enforcement Official.

The Applicant and the Contractor must agree to comply with all applicable Federal, State and Local Regulations, including, but not limited to, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 – as amended, Executive Order 11246 concerning Equal Opportunity – as amended and the Davis Bacon Act.

b) Received assistance, or are now under consideration for assistance, from other federally funded Richland County

Government program?

No Yes If yes, list the property location(s), investment amount(s) and date(s):

c) Has any existing, previous or pending contracts or other business relationship with Richland County Government?

No Yes

d) Is a spouse or immediate family member or business partner, currently employed by Richland County Government?

No Yes (If Yes, list the Richland County Government Employee's name, department and relationship.)

e) Is this property under contract to transfer ownership in the next 12 months? Yes No , (if yes, please explain)

7. Signatures

The Applicant, _____, asserts that the preceding information is true, and correct, and will comply with all Federal Regulations applicable to this program. The Applicant fully understands neither Richland County Government nor the Neighborhood Improvement Program/Planning Department can make any variances to the application process, or requirements, except as authorized in writing.

The Applicant fully understands and agrees that if his/her project at any time fails to meet municipal ordinances; he/she will be ineligible for a matching investment and agrees to forfeit all rights pursuant to the acquisition or recovery of any claims or damages regarding the funds of the Richland County Government and/or Neighborhood Improvement Program.

The Applicant agrees that in the event of its breach of any condition or provision, as described in the application process, or whenever it is deemed to be in the best interest of Richland County, the County has the right to terminate this agreement on thirty (30) days notice and to cancel this agreement, without prejudice to any other rights or remedies of Richland County.

If the Applicant is someone other than the property owner, written consent by the property owner must be provided by submitting a Letter of Agency with this application.

Applicant (Print)
Date

Applicant's Signature

Applicants Social Security Number and/or Company's Federal ID Number

Neighborhood Improvement Program
Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program

Program Administrator: Monique McDaniels
2020 Hampton Street
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, SC 29204
803.576.1340
mcdanielsm@rcgov.us



Richland County Neighborhood
Improvement Program

Commercial Façade Improvement Program

Item# 8

Attachment number 1
Page 17 of 19

LETTER OF AGENCY

To: **Neighborhood Improvement Program**

RE:

(Property Address)

In connection with the subject property, I hereby authorize the person shown below as my agent for the purpose of filing any applications and required documentation, designing and reviewing plans, obtaining required permits and will be the responsible financial agent, as in reference to the above listed property.

Signature of Property Owner:

Owner's Name (Print):

Owner's Address:

Owner's Telephone: Cell: _____ Business: _____ Homes: _____

Owner's E-mail:

Signature of Tenant:

Applicant Name (Print):

Agent's Address:

Item# 8

Attachment number 1
Page 18 of 19

Agent's Office and Cell Phone:

Agent's E-mail:

Witness

Signature: _____

Witness

Printed Name: _____

Notary

Signature: _____

Seal:

Notary

Printed Name: _____

Date:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Credentialing System Equipment Project (pages 62-64)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Credentialing System Equipment Project/No FTE/ No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is being requested to approve a grant award that was not included in the Grant Budget Request for 2011-2012.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department has received a grant award from the State Homeland Security Program, administered by the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division. The credentialing system will allow RCSD capability to compile information regarding law enforcement identification and qualifications (example: hostage negotiator, bomb technician, medic, sniper, etc) to manage an incident, event, or secured area and verify via a secure smart card. This will provide the incident responder site access while allowing the incident commander situational awareness of who is at the site, what their qualifications are, where they are assigned, and when they arrived/departed/underwent a status check. Any supplies needed for future operation of this equipment will be provided in the RCSD operating budget.

C. Financial Impact

Credentialing System Total Project Cost:	\$ 6,400
Grantor Portion (100%):	\$ 6,400
Match (0%):	\$ 0

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to fund this program to provide a credentialing system for RCSD.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

E. Recommendation

1. It is recommended that Council approve the request for the Credentialing System Equipment Project

Recommended by: *Deputy Chief Stephen Birnie* Department: *Richland County Sheriff's Dept.* Date: *January 20, 2012*

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/5/12
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommendation is not based on the merits of the program but on the ROA request of no county funding required.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 1/7/12
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 1/9/12
✓ 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: 1/9/12
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION



NIKKI R. HALEY
Governor

MARK A. KEEL
Chief

December 13, 2011

Sheriff Leon Lott
Richland County Sheriff's Department
5623 Two Notch Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29223

RE: Fiscal Year 2011 State Homeland Security Program
Grant Number: 11SHSP47
Project Name: Credentialing System Equipment \$6,400.00
Total Amount of Award: \$6,400.00

Dear Sheriff Lott:

We are pleased to provide you with the original and one copy of the grant award approved by the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, as the State Administrative Agency, in the amount of \$6,400.00. This award will be effective upon **final approval** of the grant application budget and program narrative to be filled out on the Homeland Security Electronic Grant Management System located on the internet at <https://www.southcarolinadhs.com>. Final approval of the grant application will be sent to you in the form of a Grant Adjustment Notice. **No funds are to be obligated or expended until receipt of the Grant Adjustment Notice.** Additionally, in order to complete this award, it is necessary that the Official Authorized to Sign return the original grant award with an original signature no later than **December 31, 2011**. Also enclosed in this package are the grant terms and conditions and the certification pages. Please fill out, sign and return the certification pages with the signed grant award. The signed originals should be sent to the following address:

South Carolina Law Enforcement Division
Office of Homeland Security
Post Office Box 21398
Columbia, South Carolina 29221-1398

As a reminder, the Request for Payment/Quarterly Fiscal Report is due within 30 days of the end of every calendar quarter. The **final** Request for Payment/Quarterly Fiscal Report and the Program Evaluation are due 45 days after the end of the grant period. Semi-annual Progress Reports are due within 30 days after the end of the reporting period, until the expiration of the grant. Your commitment to addressing the homeland security needs in your community and throughout South Carolina is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mark Keel, Chief
South Carolina Law Enforcement Division



2011 DEC 27 PM 8:50
RCSD RECEIVED

P.O. Box 21398 / Columbia, South Carolina 29221-1398 / (803) 737-9000 / Fax (803) 896-7588

Item# 9

Attachment number 1
Page 3 of 3

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Curtiss-Wright Hangar (pages 66-68)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Curtiss-Wright Hangar

A. Purpose

To seek approval from Richland County Council to direct Richland County staff to review and report on the legal aspects of the possible sale of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar (CWH) and surrounding land at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB) to a private developer as a means of accomplishing its restoration and redevelopment.

B. Background / Discussion

During the Richland County Airport Commission’s meeting on January 9, 2012, a private development group called the CWH Partners presented a concept for the restoration and redevelopment of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar (CWH) into a restaurant and event venue with an aviation theme.

CWH Partners has performed extensive investigation of the site, initial due diligence, and business planning associated with this concept. The funding for this project will use private investment capital and tax credits available to historic restoration projects. The CWH was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1998 and any restoration, regardless of end function, will need to meet the associated guidelines and requirements. Initial legal research by the CWH Partners indicates that their concept is only economically viable if they can purchase the CWH compound property.

The principal members of the CWH Partners project team are:

Mr Edwin Garrison	Coldwell Banker	Project Management
Mr Scott Linaberry	Five Points Association	Operations & Finance
Mr Ben Riddle	CBRE	Marketing & Development
Mr Sanders Tate	Watson Tate Savory Liollo	A&E Services

Following the presentation and question and answer session, The Airport Commission voted to proceed as follows:

- ➔ To seek a legal determination from Richland County staff to determine if the CWH and surrounding land could be sold to a private developer and what permanent legal protections to the County and Airport should be established as part of such a sale.
- ➔ To have the Airport Commission Marketing and Operations Committees jointly conduct meetings and work sessions to discuss and evaluate the proposal from CWH Partners within the next 45 days in order to have sufficient information to make a formal recommendation to the County Council.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impacts to the County and Airport are not yet known. The intention of parallel review by Richland County staff and Airport Commission Committees is to answer legal questions and gather information so that an informed assessment of financial impact can be determined.

However, the following general conditions can be considered:

- ➔ Capital improvements to the Curtiss-Wright Hangar will be paid for by CWH Partners;
- ➔ If possible and appropriate, sale of the property to a private developer will provide revenue from the sale as well as returning property to the tax rolls;
- ➔ Direct and indirect positive economic impact (development project costs and jobs created) will be realized as well.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available to County Council follow:

1. Approve the request to direct Richland County staff to review and report on the legal aspects of the possible sale of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar (CWH) and surrounding land at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB) to a private developer as a means of accomplishing its restoration and redevelopment.
2. Disapprove the request to direct Richland County staff to review and report on the legal aspects of the possible sale of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar (CWH) and surrounding land.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to direct Richland County staff to review and report on the legal aspects of the possible sale of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar (CWH) and surrounding land at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB) to a private developer as a possible means of accomplishing its restoration and redevelopment.

Recommended by:	Department:	Date:
Christopher S. Eversmann, PE, CM	Airport	January 10, 2012

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: <u>Daniel Driggers</u>	Date: 1/11/12
✓ Recommend Council approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:	

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/12/12

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 1/13/12

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval as outlined above. This request is intended only to determine the Council's interest in the proposed project and to determine if there are any legal hurdles relating to project. Of course, if the Council gives the direction to move forward at this point, any future decisions about a contractual arrangement would be brought back to the Council for consideration.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) negotiation (pages 70-72)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) negotiation

A. Purpose

To seek approval from Richland County Council to enter into negotiations between Richland County and Aircraft Maintenance Services, Incorporated of Camden, SC for the purpose of establishing a Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) for aircraft maintenance at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB).

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County Council previously authorized the issuance of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) for aircraft maintenance at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB). This RFP was issued (RC-007-P-1112) and one response was received from Aircraft Maintenance Services, Incorporated of Camden, SC (AMS, Inc).

An evaluation committee made up of two representatives from the Richland County Airport Commission, the Airport Director, and an Assistant County Administrator was formed to review the proposal which was received and conduct an interview of the company's leadership. As a result of these actions, the evaluation committee recommended to the Airport Commission that negotiations be authorized in order to determine if an agreement can be drafted.

Eagle Aviation is the existing Fixed Base Operator (FBO) at CUB that provides airport operation services (fueling, hangar lease administration, flight school, *etc*) as well as aircraft maintenance services. The SASO would be in competition with the FBO in the functional area of aircraft maintenance. However, anticipated increased aircraft traffic associated with the SASO could produce increased fuel sales which would benefit the FBO. Additionally, the competition that would be generated would be beneficial to the aviation community.

There is sufficient area for development of a maintenance facility (which would be developed by AMS, Inc and revert to County ownership at the end of a lease period anticipated to be 30-years in duration) and such development is with the Airport Master Plan Update / Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

The Richland County Airport Commission voted in their meeting on January 9, 2012 to recommend to Richland County Council to enter into negotiations with Aircraft Maintenance Services, Incorporated of Camden, SC for the purpose of establishing a Specialized Aviation Service Operation (SASO) for aircraft maintenance at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB).

If an agreement is negotiated and drafted, it will be brought back to County Council for final approval.

C. Financial Impact

The actual financial impact of this cannot be determined until a draft agreement is negotiated. However, the following provisions will be incorporated into the draft agreement:

- Capital improvements will be paid for by AMS, Inc and revert to County / Airport ownership at the end of the lease period.
- Lease payments will be made to the County / Airport by AMS, Inc.
- A portion of revenue will be paid to the County / Airport by AMS, Inc.
- Direct and indirect, positive economic impact (jobs created) will be considered as well.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available to County Council follow:

1. Approve the request to authorize negotiation of a draft agreement with AMS, Inc.
2. Do not approve the request to authorize negotiation of a draft agreement with AMS, Inc.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to authorize negotiation of a draft agreement with AMS, Inc for developing a SASO for aircraft maintenance at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB).

Recommended by:	Department:	Date:
Christopher S. Eversmann, PE, CM	Airport	January 10, 2012

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: <u>Daniel Driggers</u>	Date: 1/11/12
✓ Recommend Council approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:	

Procurement

Reviewed by: <u>Rodolfo Callwood</u>	Date: 1/12/12
✓ Recommend Council approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:	

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 1/13/12

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that the Council authorize the staff to negotiate with AMS, Inc. The results of the negotiations will be brought back to the Council for consideration.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Forensic Laboratory Enhancement Grant-Sheriff's Department (pages 74-75)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Forensic Laboratory Enhancement Grant---No FTE/ No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is being requested to approve a grant application that was not included in the Grant Budget Request for 2011-2012.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department has applied for a grant to provide upgraded equipment and advanced training for the Forensic Laboratory Drug Identification Section. This application is for funding through a special solicitation of the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Program. This project will have a shortened grant period (April 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012) and is designed to reduce forensic case backlogs. An upgrade to current equipment and software will be purchased. These will allow for examination and court presentation of new "designer" drugs that are available. In-house advanced training will also be provided to lab personnel through this funding. Any supplies or service plans needed for future operation of this equipment will be provided in the RCSD operating budget.

C. Financial Impact

Forensic Lab Total Project Cost:	\$ 27,000
Grantor Portion (100%):	\$ 27,000
Match (0%):	\$ 0

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to fund this program to provide for upgraded forensic equipment and training for RCSD.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

E. Recommendation

- 1. It is recommended that Council approve the request for the Credentialing System Equipment Project

Recommended by: *Deputy Chief Stephen Birnie* Department: *Richland County Sheriff's Dept.* Date: *January 20, 2012*

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/9/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 1/9/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 1/11/12
 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: 1/11/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that Council approve the grant to provide upgraded forensic equipment and training for the RCSD.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Permanently Finance CMRTA with Mass Transit Fee (pages 77-78)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Permanently Finance CMRTA with Mass Transit Fee

A. Purpose

Council is requested to review the motion made by Councilman Jackson at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made by Councilman Jackson at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting:

Permanently finance the bus by a \$5 vehicle registration fee for noncommercial vehicles and \$10 for commercial vehicles. [Jackson] Referred to the A&F Committee.

The Mass Transit Fee (\$5, private (non-commercial) vehicles; \$10 commercial vehicles) currently brings in approximately \$1,670,000, which is the amount in the FY 12 CMRTA IGA.

If you include growth, FY 13 Mass Transit Fee revenues should be approximately \$1,800,000, assuming the \$5 and \$10 fee remains the same.

Additional information to be considered:

The previous annualized request for the CMRTA was approximately \$3.3M. If we use that amount as our guideline, some additional alternatives which should perhaps be considered to fund the system include the following:

1. Adjust the fee to be \$10 for non-commercial and \$15 commercial.
2. Keep the fee at \$5 and \$10 respectively and levy 1.0 mill of tax

C. Financial Impact

If you include growth, FY 13 Mass Transit Fee revenues should be approximately \$1,800,000, assuming the \$5 and \$10 fee remains the same. Growth in future years should increase these revenues, but an exact amount cannot be determined at this time.

D. Alternatives

1. Receive the item as information.
2. Direct staff as appropriate.

E. Recommendation

Permanently finance the bus by a \$5 vehicle registration fee for noncommercial vehicles and \$10 for commercial vehicles.

Councilman Jackson, December 6, 2011

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/10/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council on if and how you would like to participate in this project. We can provide a more precise analysis on the funding options once the decision is made as to the level of funding needed.

As noted in the ROA, the current fee level of \$5 for non-commercial and \$10 for commercial will generate approximately \$1.8m. Increasing the fee to \$10 and \$15 respectively would generate an annual amount of \$3.3m.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 1-10-12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision of Council

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Financial Impact of Transferring CMRTA to City of Columbia (page 80)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Financial Impact of Transferring CMRTA to City of Columbia

A. Purpose

Council is requested to review the motion made by Councilman Malinowski at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made by Councilman Malinowski at the December 6, 2011 Council Meeting:

Based on Councilwoman Dickerson's motion to return the CMRTA to the City of Columbia, I make a motion to direct staff to determine the financial impact on Richland County of such action on an annual basis with a projection out to 5 years. [Malinowski] Referred to the A&F Committee. ACTION: ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE

County staff is currently waiting on information from the CMRTA's CPA regarding the cost of services in the unincorporated areas of the County.

Therefore, at this time, the cost is not available, but should be available for discussion at the Committee meeting, per the CPA. This item is also scheduled for discussion at Retreat, which will be held January 26 and 27.

C. Financial Impact

Not available at this time.

D. Alternatives

1. Receive the item as information.
2. Direct staff as appropriate.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

RCSD Entry Deputy Pay Increase FY 12 (pages 82-85)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: RCSD Entry Deputy Pay Increase FY12

A. Purpose

The Sheriff is requesting County Council approval to increase the base salary for entry level Deputies. The request is to increase the starting salary of a Deputy to \$35,000 and increase the starting salary of a Deputy III to \$30,000.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department is at a distinct competitive disadvantage regarding starting salaries in relation to comparables in the area. The Sheriff is requesting an increase, with immediate effect, for new hire Deputies to start at \$35,000 (from \$29,000) and new hire Deputy III at \$30,000 (from \$25,750). Additionally, the Sheriff is requesting additional compensation for new hires who meet additional qualifiers (see below). It is anticipated RCSD will hire 10 new deputies through June 30, 2012. Current fiscal year funding, realized through attrition, will be used to address the partial year salary increase through FY12.

C. Financial Impact: None to Richland County in FY12.

The additional part-year funding projected at \$52,750

Recommended Starting Base Salary

Deputy: \$35,000

Deputy III: \$30,000

Additional Qualifiers

Reside in Richland County	2%
Bi-Lingual	2%
Master's Degree	3%
PhD/Law Degree	4%

With Years of Service:

Certified 1-5 Years	2%
Certified 6-10 Years	3%
Certified 11-15 Years	4%
Certified 16+	5%

D. Alternatives

- 1. Approve the request to allow the increase immediately to which current year RCSD funds will be placed against the increase for the balance of the fiscal year with the increase annualized by council thereafter.
- 2. Do not approve: RCSD will continue to operate at a disadvantage without the benefit of a competitive salary for Deputy new hires compromising the Sheriff’s ability to hire well qualified Deputies to enhance public safety.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve this request to improve the Sheriff’s ability to hire the best and brightest to serve and protect our community.

Recommended by: *Chief Deputy Steve Birnie* Department: *Richland County Sheriff’s Department* Date: *January 10, 2012*

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/18/12
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

I do support the intent of the ROA and believe that the County should make efforts to remain competitive in salary and benefits for all positions. My recommendation is not based on the merits of the request but on Council's decision in October and December that similar request be incorporated with the County-wide compensation study. One purpose of the County-wide study would be to an attempt to maintain equity across all positions while assessing the market rates and compression related issues.

Based on the information provided in the ROA, the request only affects the base pay for the 10 anticipated vacant positions therefore the \$52k is the cost for the 6-months remaining in FY12 for those positions. However the financial impact included does not incorporate the cost of addressing current staff that will be below the (new) base or attempt to deal with the effects of compression. In a follow up conversation with the Sheriff’s Department, it is the expectation that those issues would need to be addressed in FY13 budget.

Based on a quick review, below are annualized estimates of the cost impact to address only those positions that will be below the based if approved as included. It seems that the annualized cost would be approximately between \$1.0m and 1.5m. Therefore, if approved, it would be prudent to identify the funding source for the annualized cost.

Deputy Sheriff	Deputy Sheriff III	Total ROA
----------------	--------------------	-----------

Current base	\$29,000	\$25,750	
Proposed base	\$35,000	\$30,000	
Total positions affected	186	59	
Group average salary	\$31,627	\$29,381	
# at/above new base	24	22	
Group average salary	\$39,728	\$36,061	
# below new base	162	37	199
Group average salary	\$30,427	\$26,773	
Estimated annualized adjustment exclusive of additional increases	\$870,000	\$140,000	\$1,010,000
Estimated annualized adjustment inclusive of additional increases	\$1,300,000	\$260,000	\$1,560,000

*Additional increases include items in the ROA listed as exceptions for education and years of service only. There is not enough information to consider the effect of compression of other positions.

However, since this is a critical need, Council could also consider options to address the request and try to stay on target with the County-wide plan as well.

- One option is to request the vendor completing the county-wide compensation study to further accelerate the results which would allow Council to address the ROA request and County-wide need within a reasonable timeframe.

- A second option may be to provide some incremental increase to all county positions in the interim with a final adjustment being applied based on the compensation study once results are received.

With that said the financial position of the county is strong and with the right combination of decisions could support any of the options above.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: I generally agree with the comments of the Finance Director. Human Resources supports competitive wages and internal equity for all departments including the RCSD.

The Finance Director makes a valid point relating to internal equity of employees in the RCSD and other County departments that needs consideration. If an increase in wages was approved for one department considering it has been a few years since most County employees have had a pay increase that would likely adversely affect the morale of employees in other County departments. In looking at the turnover rate by County

department for 2011 there are some County departments have turnover rate much higher than the County's average.

The Council may want to consider adopting an overall compensation strategy and philosophy. This compensation strategy and philosophy would provide guidance to the County's actions relating to compensation and provide some understanding to County departments relating to the methodology of compensation. For example, does the County want to pay the highest starting wage in the Midlands and/or State of South Carolina for one department, some departments, or all departments? Does the County want to at least match the starting wages for Lexington County and/or the City of Columbia?

Human Resources had limited time to review this request, so there may be relevant information that we are not aware. However, Human Resources supports competitive wages and internal equity for the RCSD and all other County departments.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: All of the options as outlined in the ROA are within the Councils legal authority to exercise.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/20/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Administration supports pay increases for Sheriff's Department employees and all other County employees based on the results of the classification and compensation study authorized by County Council. Administration recommends handling the pay for the Deputies hired prior to implementation of the compensation study as salary exceptions through the regular process.

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. 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, A&F, November 2011).

Reviews