

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL  
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001  
6:00 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joseph McEachern, Chair; Paul Livingston; Anthony G. Mizzell; Joan Brady; James Tuten

**OTHERS PRESENT:** J.D. "Buddy" Meetze, L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Kit Smith, Susan Brill, Bernice G. Scott, Thelma Tillis, T. Cary McSwain, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Darren Gore, Larry Smith, Amelia Linder, Brad Farrar, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, John Hicks, Monique Walters, Ash Miller, Pam Davis, Geo Price, Stephany Snowden, Marsheika Martin

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:05 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 27, 2001: REGULAR SESSION MEETING**

Mr. Tuten moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Mr. Tuten moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to adopt the agenda as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**PRESENTATION – EdVenture**

Ms. Mildred McDuffie, board member of EdVenture, introduced members present.

The CEO of EdVenture, a children's museum, made a presentation requesting the County Council's consideration to make EdVenture either a millage agency or non-discretionary budget agency.

A discussion took place.

Ms. Smith requested to review comparisons of other children's museums in terms of attendance, square footage and costs and projections for those underway in South Carolina (Charleston, Spartanburg, Greenville, etc.).

A discussion took place. Mr. McEachern recommended EdVenture to make a formal request to staff for consideration during the ongoing budget work sessions.

Mr. Meetze requested staff to research the possibility of this agency becoming a millage agency.

Ms. Smith also requested the study of the economic impact.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION**

**A. Administration: Authorization to Award Township Bid**

Mr. McSwain informed Council bids are due May 2<sup>nd</sup>. He requested authority to award the bid to the lowest bidder provided it does not exceed \$600,000.00

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to authorize staff to award a contract to the lowest qualified bidder for the refurbishing of the Township Auditorium's seats, in an amount not to exceed Council's previously approved budget estimate of \$600,000.00.

Mr. McEachern requested Mr. McSwain to forward the information to Council before awarding the contract.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**B. Legal: Discharge of Firearms**

Mr. Tuten requested the Committee to withdraw this item with unanimous consent. The Committee approved this request unanimously.

**C. Soil & Water: Soil and Water Stewardship Week Proclamation**

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to approve a Proclamation designating April 29 through May 5, 2001 as Soil and Water Stewardship Week. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**D. Heathwood Hall: Resolution for JEDA Bond Issuance**

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to approve the revised resolution required for the issuance of bonds by JEDA for the Heathwood Hall Episcopal School project as required by the Enabling Act and authorize a public hearing for this purpose on May 15<sup>th</sup>. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**E. Police Officers' Retirement**

Mr. McSwain updated the Committee on the policy, which is similar to the provision of a conversion of a standard, or regular State Employee Retirement System to a Police Retirement System. He stated there are six criterias recommended by staff that would meet those standards. Mr. McSwain stated he received legal advice from the County Attorney and from a specialist in personnel law.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Tuten moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to study the criterias recommended by staff and have further discussion at a Special Called A&F Committee meeting on Monday,

**Richland County Council  
Administration and Finance Committee  
Tuesday, April 24, 2001  
Page Three**

April 30<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m. in the Administrator's Back Conference Room. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS**

There were no items pending at this time.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION**

**Legal: Reapportionment**

Mr. Larry Smith, County Attorney, briefed Council on the information submitted to his department regarding the reapportionment of the county districts.

Mr. Meetze requested a copy of the map of his district and surrounding districts which would include a census tract showing population.

Ms. Smith suggested for Council member to meet individually with the demographer to discuss the shape of each member's district and make recommendations.

**Communications Specialist**

No report was given at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 6:58 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Submitted by,

Joseph McEachern  
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL  
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL CALLED MEETING  
TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2001  
4:30 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joseph McEachern, Chair; Paul Livingston; Anthony G. Mizzell; Joan Brady

**ABSENT:** James Tuten

**OTHERS PRESENT:** T. Cary McSwain, Darren Gore, Larry Smith, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Brad Farrar, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Pam Davis, George Wilson, Marsheika G. Martin

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:38 p.m.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to adopt the agenda. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**PRESENTATION**

There were no items for presentation at this time.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION**

**A. Bond for Detention Center Expansion and Other Projects**

Mr. McSwain stated this item needed to go before Council for discussion. He stated the issuance of the bonds have not yet been approved for the Detention Center. Mr. McSwain asked the Council to consider the estimates as one lump sum or eliminating certain items.

Mr. Darren Gore, Finance Director, briefed Council on the issuance and sale of general obligation bonds. He stated there is no increase in millage to reissue the bonds. He explained how the \$20,600,000.00 was broken up and it was as follows:

- \$12 million dollars – One of the last estimates on the Detention Center.
- \$1,030,000.00 - Township Auditorium rounded off to \$1.1 million. (If \$400,000.00 were received from the City of Columbia, then the County would bond \$600,000.00).
- \$600,500,000.00 - GIS System and the purchase for hardware software implementation for the Assessor's office.
- \$600,000.00 - Telephone System
- \$400,000.00 – County Voting Machines

Ms. Brady requested for staff to itemize each request for the GIS system, along with estimates, when making the presentation to full Council.

**Richland County Council  
Administration and Finance Committee  
Special Called Meeting  
Page Two**

A discussion took place.

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, recommended first reading approval to an ordinance authorizing the sale of General Obligation bonds for the purpose of funding projects. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**B. Police Officers' Retirement**

Mr. McSwain briefed the Committee on the conditions of this particular retirement. The conditions were as follows:

- 1) The employee making the request must be retiring.
- 2) The employee must be a member of the Police Officers Retirement System at the time he or she retires.
- 3) The employee must have had previous service under the Regular Retirement System while in the same (or similar) job that he or she is in upon retirement.
- 4) The amount of time that can be converted cannot exceed ten years.
- 5) Only service time with Richland County is eligible to be converted.
- 6) Employees taking advantage of this program must do so by the end of the 2001/02 fiscal year, i.e.; June 30, 2002.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Ms. Brady, to forward to full Council with no recommendation.

A discussion continued.

Mr. Mizzell requested the number of employees eligible and questioned the long-term costs.

Mr. Mizzell/Ms. Brady withdrew their motions.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to strike out #1 and #6 and directed the County Administrator to recommend an alternative end-date for this benefit. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Richland County Council  
Administration and Finance Committee  
Special Called Meeting  
Page Three**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 6:58 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Submitted by,

Joseph McEachern  
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Local Option Sales Tax

## **A. Purpose**

County Council is requested to consider whether or not a local option sales tax referendum should be added to the ballot in November. The deadline for informing the Election Commission of referendums to be added to the November ballot is Wednesday, August 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **B. Background / Discussion**

In November 1999, the Richland County Council, through the initiative of Council member Tony Mizzell, began considering ways to relieve the pressure of property taxes on homeowners in the County. To thoroughly investigate the viability of the local option sales tax for the County, Mr. Mizzell formed the Local Government Finance Advisory Committee (LGFAC), whose members included the business community, academic community, social and civic organizations, government leaders, and citizens. Their charge was to review the appropriateness and desirability of a local option sales tax for Richland County residents. Another question was whether or not the local option sales tax makes financial sense for Richland County.

Learning about the local option sales tax was “taxing” at best, but persistence won the day. The primary issues identified early on include the tax’s regressivity, trust in local government officials, and the local option sales tax’s effects on comparable counties which have passed the tax. Some fundamental principles were also learned. There are three criteria regarding the appropriateness of a local option sales tax for a county: the number of tax-exempt parcels, the number of visitors/tourists, and if the county is a regional shopping hub.

The local option sales tax is also not about replacing one tax with another. It is about having users of County services and infrastructure to pay their fair share: commuters, shoppers, visitors/tourists, and others, estimated at over 75,000 people a day. The local option sales tax is also not intended to be a tax cut. Property tax millage rates will continue to rise whether or not a local option sales tax is passed. These increases are necessary to keep pace with the rising costs of providing services and maintaining infrastructure. The local option sales tax *is*, however, a means of reducing the homeowners’ burden of paying for these costs by sharing it with other, currently non-paying, users.

A local option sales tax benefits a county in several ways. It diversifies the County’s revenues by reducing reliance on the property tax. It is also a financially responsible practice for those using services to pay for that use. Additionally, the local option sales tax is a faster growing revenue source, averaging 8% annually, than the property tax, averaging 3% annually.

As with anything, there are also drawbacks to the local option sales tax. The tax is regressive, meaning low and moderate income residents spend a greater percent of their income on sales tax than do higher income residents. The State Legislature, however, has lessened the regressivity by exempting many items from the sales tax or capping the sales tax

paid. The tax also does not benefit people in apartments as much, with direct property tax relief limited to their vehicles.

The LGFAC concluded its investigation by presenting their recommendation to County Council. Members almost unanimously supported the developed recommendation, voting 14-2 in favor, indicating the members’ consensus on the matter and the concerns that remain.

See the Comprehensive Summary package for more details about the local option sales tax.

**C. Financial Impact**

The projections for local option sales tax revenues are based on the net taxable sales for the County. (If we know how much a five cent sales tax generates, we can project how much an additional one cent might generate.) See the chart below for projected revenues based on 1998 net taxable sales. (More current projections are being worked on.)

State law requires that a minimum of 71% of the revenues generated be used for property tax relief. If the roll-back is something less than 100%, the remaining revenues may be used as Council deems appropriate. An ordinance is often used to stipulate what these funds shall be used for.

City/County	1998 City/County Net Taxable Sales	1¢ Sales Tax Distribution	71% Roll-back	90% Roll-back	100% Roll-back
Arcadia Lakes	-	\$60,922	\$43,255	\$54,830	\$60,922
Blythewood	\$14,564,445	\$12,184	\$8,651	\$10,966	\$12,184
Columbia	\$2,152,293,534	\$12,460,603	\$8,847,028	\$11,214,543	\$12,460,603
Eastover	\$1,750,547	\$89,352	\$63,440	\$80,417	\$89,352
Forest Acres	\$161,288,259	\$710,758	\$504,638	\$639,682	\$710,758
Irmo	\$16,442,838	\$101,537	\$72,091	\$91,383	\$101,537
Unincorporated Areas	\$2,431,865,358	\$27,280,922	\$19,369,455	\$24,552,830	\$27,280,922
Total	\$4,778,204,981	\$40,716,278	\$28,908,558	\$36,644,651	\$40,716,278

There will be costs associated with educating citizens about a local option sales tax for Richland County, if Council chooses to go forward. Mailing costs are one expense: either to all the property owners in the County, or to all the registered voter households in the County. A letter could be mailed with an accompanying analysis to inform the recipient of how a local option sales tax would affect them specifically for their particular property. Mailing a letter to every real estate property owner would cost the same as if it were a property tax bill, or approximately \$23,000. There are 186,540 active registered voters in the County, which would cost \$63,424 to mail a letter to this group of citizens. (Identifying the number of registered voter “households” would reduce this cost below \$23,000, as not all taxable properties in the County are owned by registered voters.)

Another expense associated with an educational effort of this sort is getting the word out. Often times the services of a marketing firm will be engaged for this purpose. Charleston County itself spent no money for the marketing of the local option sales tax. However, area

businesses raised between \$300,000 and \$350,000 to help market the local option sales tax effort. The City of Charleston also spent no public funds for this purpose. Florence County did the same, passing its local option sales tax with no public funds. Even more, only \$40,000 in privately raised funds was used for marketing the campaign in Florence County, which included newspapers, fliers, brochures, and no television air time.

Funds have been recommended for next year's budget for an educational effort. As the local option sales tax affects/benefits all property owners, business and residential alike, it may be that the Chamber of Commerce or other business organizations or companies would consider contributing to the success of a local option sales tax educational campaign.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Recommend placing the local option sales tax on the referendum in November at 100% roll-back. All revenues generated would be used to provide property tax relief.
2. Recommend placing the local option sales tax on the referendum in November at something less than 100% roll-back. The revenues generated would be used for property tax relief as well as other purposes as defined by Council.
3. Do not recommend placing the local option sales tax on the referendum in November.

**E. Recommendation**

This is best left to Council's discretion.

Recommended by: Department: Date:

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore Date: 05/11/01  
Comments:

**Procurement**

Approved by: Date:  
Comments:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 05/14/01  
Comments:

**Administration**

Approved by: Tony McDonald Date: 5/16/01  
Comments: Recommend placing the Local Option Sales Tax question on the ballot for the November 2001 election, with the rollback percentage to be left to the discretion of the County Council. Funding for educating the public on the proposed sales tax has been incorporated into the FY 2001-02 budget, which, of course, is subject to final approval by the Council.

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Auditor's Office: Requisition for Tax Notices

**A. Purpose**

This item seeks Council authorization to purchase 534,000 pre-printed tax notices required for all property tax billing. This requisition is for \$54,763 and requires Council approval.

**B. Background / Discussion**

The tax notices used are a moisture seal form manufactured by Transkrit and made specifically to be used with the Info-Seal burster/folder/sealer equipment in our office. These are the same type forms we have been using since 1990. The forms and the equipment have proven to be fast, efficient and reliable. We have also received excellent service from Data-Tec Business forms, the vendor for the forms.

Transkrit has printed our forms for the past ten years. Printed forms necessitate the use of sole source procurement. Data-Tec is the exclusive representative to the state of South Carolina for all Transkrit products. Data-Tec is also recognized by Transkrit as the preferred vendor for Richland County.

**C. Financial Impact**

Tax Notices As Follows:	Amount	Cost per unit	Totals
Motor Vehicle Renewals	300M	99.80	29,940.00
Motor Vehicle Dealer Notices	40M	99.80	3,992.00
Boats and Motors Notices	14M	99.80	1,397.20
Business Pers. Prop. Notices	30M	99.80	2,994.00
Real Estate Regular Notices	90M	99.80	8,982.00
Real Estate Mortgage Notices	48M	76.10	3,652.80
Real Estate Mobile Home Notices	12M	99.80	1,197.60
		<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>	52,155.60
		<b>SALES TAX:</b>	2,607.78
		<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$54,763.38</b>

The cost of the forms for the Auditor's Office is \$54,763.38. There are sufficient funds available in the current budget.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to purchase the tax notices from Data-Tec.
2. Use a different tax form requiring redesign of the forms and new equipment.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase the tax notices from Data-Tec.

Recommended by:

Department:

Date:

## **F. Approvals**

### **Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 05/02/01

Comments:

### **Procurement**

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 05/04/01

Comments:

### **Grants**

Approved by:

Date:

Comments:

### **Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 05/07/01

Comments:

### **Administration**

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/9/01

Comments: Recommend approval of the purchase of tax notice forms from Data-Tec in the amount of \$54,763.38. Funds for this purchase have been appropriated in the Auditor's budget; no additional funding is required.

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** City Center Business Improvement District (BID)

### **A. Purpose**

The County Council is requested to consider including the BID as part of the County's 2002 budgeting process and consider an annual contribution based upon the fair share assessment for County-owned properties within the thirty-six (36) block area.

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

In order to continue to attract new investment and to protect and maintain the existing investment in the downtown Columbia area, property owners are proposing to assess themselves to form a private sector, self-help improvement district for five years beginning January 1, 2002 and ending December 31, 2006. These districts are commonly called Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). (This plan is described at length in the Improvement Plan, which will be attached with the agenda package.) There are several reasons why downtown property owners are taking this action, including:

1. to provide consistent funding to improve both the reality and perception of downtown
2. an opportunity to strengthen private sector management and accountability of downtown
3. the need to be proactive in determining the future of the downtown area
4. the need to attract new business and investment

The City Center Improvement District will provide new and enhanced improvements and activities, including: maintenance, security, marketing, promotion, and economic development services above and beyond those currently provided by the City. Special projects and enhanced landscape programs are also planned. The area of this district would include the area of downtown bounded by Assembly, Elmwood, Gervais, and Marion Streets.

### **C. Financial Impact**

Anticipated district budget contribution from private property assessments for operations during the Year 2002 is \$552,674.

In addition to private property assessments, it is anticipated that public property owners (City, County, State, and Federal) will contribute at least \$200,005 to the Year 2002 operations budget. The projected request to each of these governmental levels is based on a formula which includes the appraised value of the properties within the district. Having frontage on Main Street results in an extra assessment, due to the projected increase maintenance costs associated with Main Street. Richland County's properties within this district are the County Judicial Center (which includes the extra assessment due to frontage on Main Street) and the Main Branch of the Richland County Library on Assembly Street. (Both sides of Assembly and Marion Streets are included in the BID, not with Elmwood or Gervais Streets.)

The City of Columbia's assessment for the BID is \$74,955.  
Richland County's assessment is \$89,241.  
The State's assessment is \$18,782.  
The federal assessment is \$71,171.

It is also anticipated that non-profit property owners, such as churches and hospitals, will contribute at least \$54,909 to the Year 2002 operations budget.

The total operations budget for Year 2002 is thus projected to be \$807,588.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to provide financial support to the City Center Business Improvement District.
2. Do not approve the request.

**E. Recommendation**

This is best left to Council's discretion.

Recommended by:                      Department:                      Date:

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore                      Date: 05/02/01  
Comments: Consideration needs to be given to fiscal impact of funding this project during the FY 2002 budget work sessions.

**Procurement**

Approved by:                      Date:  
Comments:

**Grants**

Approved by:                      Date:  
Comments:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder                      Date: 05/04/01  
Comments:

**Administration**

Approved by: Tony McDonald                      Date: 5/7/01  
Comments: It is recommended that the Council include this issue as part of the discussions on the FY 2001-02 budget, and, if the Council wishes to participate in the District, funds be appropriated in the budget for this purpose.

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** EMS Purchase Orders for 2001-2002 ESD012001

**A. Purpose**

Council is requested to approve the award of Purchase Orders for services in the 2001 – 2002 budget year. These services are required for the operations of the Emergency Services Department. The yearly amount of the expenditures will exceed \$30,000, so Council’s approval is required. These Purchase Orders and Contract Approvals are subject to Council’s adoption of the 2001-2002 budget.

**B. Background / Discussion**

The Emergency Services Department uses vendors to provide services for operations. When a purchase order or contract for service exceeds \$30,000, Council’s approval is required. It is necessary to have agreements in place by July 1, 2001 so services will not be interrupted at the start of the new budget year.

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>SERVICE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED AMOUNT</u>
* City of Columbia	Diesel & Gasoline	\$ 74,000
* Motorola	Maintenance & Service	\$ 45,000
* SCANA	Radio Service	\$ 117,000
* Carolina Occupational	Health & Physicals	\$ 37,000

**C. Financial Impact**

The funding is included in the 2001- 2002 Budget.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the purchase orders/contracts.
2. Do not approve the purchase orders.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the purchase orders/contracts for the services so there will not be an interruption of services at the beginning of the new budget year.

Recommended by: Michael A. Byrd    Department: Emergency Services    Date: 05-07-01

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 05/07/01

Comments:

**Procurement**

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 05/07/01

Comments:

**Grants**

Approved by:  
Comments:

Date:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder  
Comments:

Date: 05/08/01

**Administration**

Approved by: J. Milton Pope  
Comments: The funding is included in the 2001- 2002 Budget.



Comments:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 05/08/01

Comments:

**Administration**

Approved by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 5-9-01

Comments: Funding is provided in this year's budget.

## Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Ambulance Remount Procurement ESD032001

**A. Purpose**

Council is requested to authorize the renewal of a contract to Professional Fabrication in the amount of \$53,080 to remount ambulance vehicles. Richland County currently has a contract with Professional Fabrication for this service. Funds are available in the current budget. No new funding is required.

**B. Background / Discussion**

EMS uses “type one” ambulance vehicles. When the ambulance chassis needs to be replaced, the patient compartment can be removed and remounted on a new chassis. The process of remounting on a new chassis verses buying a new ambulance vehicle saves about \$30,000 per ambulance. The life of each ambulance chassis is approximately three years. EMS remounts ambulances each year. The contract includes a “trade-in allowance” for the old chassis. The new truck chassis have been purchased under a separate action recently approved by Council.

\$16,652	Per Vehicle
\$ 3,200	Trade-In

-----  
\$13,452 per vehicle x 4 = \$53,808

Professional Fabrication has successfully remounted Richland County ambulance vehicles before.

**C. Financial Impact**

The funding is included in the 2000-2001 Budget.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the renewal of the contract.
2. Do not approve the renewal of the contract.
3. Rebid the contract.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the contract renewal to Professional Fabrication in the amount of \$53,808 for remounting ambulance vehicles.

Recommended by: Michael A. Byrd    Department: Emergency Services    Date: 05-07-01

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 05/07/01

Comments:

**Procurement**

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 05/07/01

Comments:

**Grants**

Approved by:

Date:

Comments:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 05/08/01

Comments:

**Administration**

Approved by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 5-08-01

Comments: The funding is included in the 2001- 2002 Budget.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** Quality Assurance for Data Conversion Project

**A. Purpose**

IT/GIS requests Council permission to negotiate and award a contract for Quality Assurance (QA) services to be performed during the upcoming parcel data conversion project. The QA contract shall not exceed \$250,000.

**B. Background / Discussion**

An RFP (RFP 021-P-01) was issued to seek professional services that are required during the conversion of paper documents to digital (GIS) formats. This request is only for the QA portion of the overall parcel conversion project. A second RFP for the actual conversion is forthcoming.

The resulting data will be used for maintaining a parcel layer within the County GIS. The QA contract will include contracted review of delivered digital data and original source materials to assure spatial and attribute accuracy.

**C. Financial Impact**

The negotiated contract shall not exceed the \$250,000 that has been budgeted for this service in account 1871.5307.01. The services are required because the County does not maintain the staff necessary to execute this one-time project.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request. The data conversion RFP will be issued subsequent to this contract.
2. Do not approve the request. Move forward with data conversion project without quality control procedures.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that this request be approved (#1 above) and the County moves forward with data conversion.

Recommended by: Patrick J. Bresnahan      Department: IT/GIO      Date: 5/8/01

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore      Date: 05/09/01  
Comments:

**Procurement**

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood      Date: 05/09/01  
Comments:

**Grants**

Approved by:  
Comments:

Date:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder  
Comments:

Date: 05/09/01

**Administration**

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/9/01

Comments: Recommend that the Council authorize the staff to negotiate and award a contract for quality assurance services for the upcoming parcel data conversion project, provided the negotiated cost is within the budgeted amount of \$250,000. These services are necessary to ensure the integrity of the data that results from the parcel conversion project. Funds have been budgeted for these services; no additional funding is required.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

**Subject:** USC Geography Department Contract

**A. Purpose**

IT/GIS requests Council's permission to renew an existing contract, in the amount of \$36,085, with the University of South Carolina Geography Department for graduate student and faculty assistance on two County projects.

**B. Background / Discussion**

USC personnel will provide analysis and technical support in developing geographic solutions to surface-water related problems. As stormwater management requirements are being addressed by Public Works, the GIS department (with USC graduate students) has provided technical assistance with utilizing spatial technologies to solve 'real' hydro-related problems.

USC personnel will also develop internet-based data request and packaging applications. As the GIS foundation layers are completed, data requests will require staff time to fill. An internet-based spatial query and data request application will provide citizens/users with an interactive method of requesting GIS data.

USC students and staff have been utilized very effectively under the original contract to provide technical support to County departments that do not possess such resources.

**C. Financial Impact**

The contract renewal is for \$36,085 and is budgeted in 1871.5265.

**D. Alternatives**

1. Approve the request. USC graduates will continue to assist Public Works and IT personnel with GIS-related projects.
2. Do not approve the request. Project could be outsourced, at a higher cost, to private consultants.

**E. Recommendation**

It is recommended that this request be approved. The County realizes a significant benefit from the technical experience of USC students and staff. In return, the students gain practical experience and expand their technical capabilities within real-world situations. This symbiotic relationship is an excellent example of inter-governmental partnership and allows the County to continue development of technical capabilities as staffing resources are severely limited.

Recommended by: Patrick J. Bresnahan

Department: IT/GIO

Date: 5/8/01

**F. Approvals**

**Finance**

Approved by: Darren P. Gore  
Comments:

Date: 05/15/01

**Procurement**

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood  
Comments:

Date: 05/16/01

**Grants**

Approved by:  
Comments:

Date:

**Legal**

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder  
Comments:

Date: 5/16/01

**Administration**

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/17/01

Comments: Recommend renewal of the contract with the University of South Carolina providing for assistance from graduate students and faculty on GIS-related projects. This arrangement provides valuable support to the County's GIS efforts in lieu of the County having to employ additional personnel.

## CONTRACT

Between

**Richland County  
Department of Information Technology**

and

**University of South Carolina**

This contract shall be effective as of 8/15/2001 between the Department of Information Technology of Richland County, SC (hereinafter referred to as RCSC) and the University of South Carolina, Department of Geography (hereinafter referred to as USC).

### SCOPE OF WORK

USC will conduct the following projects with 2 graduate students for an average of 20 hours per week to assist in database development, GIS applications, and assessments. USC will provide the services of faculty for research efforts during the summer.

1. **Watershed Problem Support.** USC personnel will investigate the existing models for stormwater runoff mitigation. Students will work with Richland County Public Works personnel and the County Stormwater Manager to develop geographically-based technical solutions to common stormwater problems.
2. **Web-Based Geographic Information Dissemination.** USC personnel will investigate methods for delivering geographic information over the WWW. These methods will include *metadata* and *geographic data* delivery. In addition, USC personnel will investigate methods for static and dynamic mapping of content for Richland County information.
3. **Automated data packaging.** USC personnel will research client-driven data request fulfillment. Methods will be developed to allow internet-based requests to be packaged in map data bundles to be delivered to users. Consideration will be given to data, metadata, data licensing, database management of order processing, automated notification, and document flow and control.

### TIME OF PERFORMANCE

This contract shall be effective from 8/15/2001 through 6/30/2002.

**COMPENSATION**

RCSC agrees to compensate USC for the provision of the services described in section A.  
Total compensation under this contract shall not exceed \$37,586 per Attachment A.

**METHOD OF PAYMENT**

USC may submit invoices no more than quarterly to:

Dr. Patrick Bresnahan  
Department of Information Technology  
Richland County South Carolina  
2020 Hampton Street, Suite 3014  
Columbia, SC 29204

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Any changes to this Contract, which are mutually agreed upon between RSCS and USC,  
shall be incorporated in written amendments to this Contract.

RICHLAND COUNTY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
R. Steven Etheredge, Associate Director  
Office of Sponsored Programs

Date:

Date:

**ATTACHMENT A**

**CONTRACT BUDGET BETWEEN USC AND RICHLAND COUNTY  
8/15/01-6/30/02**

	<b>Months Full</b>	<b>Months 1/2</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>SENIOR PERSONNEL</b>			
Faculty summer	1		7,500
<b>OTHER PERSONNEL</b>			
Graduate Student 2@9 months		9	19,000
Graduate Student summer (\$1,000 month for ½ time)		4	4,000
<b>TOTAL OTHER PERSONNEL</b>			<b>23,000</b>
<b>FRINGE</b>			
Grad student as GA (.004)			76
Grad student not enrolled (.082) summer			328
Faculty (.1842)			1,381
<b>TOTAL Fringe</b>			<b>1,785</b>
<b>TRAVEL</b>			
Presentation of project results at profession meeting			3,000
<b>EDUCATIONAL SUPPLIES</b> (notebooks, diskettes, photocopying, etc.)			
			800
<b>TOTAL SALARIES and SUPPLIES</b>			<b>37,586</b>
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>			
Total * 0.0			0
<b>TOTAL ALL COSTS</b>			<b>\$36,085</b>