#### RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL SOUTH CAROLINA

### RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL BUDGET WORK SESSION JUNE 11, 2015 5:00 PM 4th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

- 1. CALL TO ORDER The Honorable Torrey Rush
- 2. REVISED AUDITOR'S MILLAGE NUMBERS [PAGES 2-6]
- 3. FIRE BUDGET [PAGES 7-10]
- 4. MIDLANDS AUTHORITY FOR CONVENTIONS, SPORTS 7 TOURISM (CONVENTION CENTER) [PAGES 11-12]
- 5. ADJOURN



#### **Council Members**

Torrey Rush, Chair District Seven

Greg Pearce, Vice Chair District Six

Joyce Dickerson District Two

Julie-Ann Dixon District Nine

Norman Jackson District Ten

Damon Jeter District Three

Paul Livingston District Four

Bill Malinowski District One

Jim Manning District Eight

Seth Rose District Five

Kelvin E. Washington, Sr. District Ten

# **NO MILLAGE INCREASE**

	7-4-1										100K R	100K C
	- oral	Tropport	4-7				Non-Owner Occupied				Net Tax	Net Tax
Agency	FY 16 Budget	Carryforward	State Reimbursement	School	Net Taxes	Proj15 Millage	Mill Value	T Mill Value 14 Millogo	14 Millogo	Millage	Effect	Effect
SD #1	196,969,120	4,400,000	5,794,000	50,678,020	136.097.100	247.9	549 000	773 000	247 O	Dilleletice	Y02	YOO!
SD #2	134,373,726		1,217,500	48,524,226	84.632.000	298.0	284 000	505,000	208.0	'		, A 6
Recreation	13,059,800	134,000	666,000		12,259,800	12.6		973.000	12.6	·	6	9 6
MTC	5,203,700	000'86	255,500		4,855,200	3.4		1 428 000	3.4		9 6	9 6
ATCC	2,245,000	15,000	88,000		2,142,000	1.5		1.428.000	1.5		· ·	9 64
Storm	3,134,400		156,000		2,978,400	3.4		876.000	3.4		·	÷ &
Fire Operating	21,223,000	328,200	1,018,600		19,876,200	21.1		942,000	21.1	'	÷ 5	÷ &
General Fund	84,364,000		3,682,000		80,682,000	56.5		1.428,000	56.5		5	
Library	24,058,000	110,000	1,100,000		22,848,000	16.0		1.428,000	16.0	•		· ·
MH	1,977,700	7,500	113,800		1,856,400	1.3		1.428,000	13	,	·	· ·
Zoo	2,172,600	71,000	102,400		1,999,200	1.4		1,428,000	1.4	'	- 45	
Landfill	4,908,200		195,800		4,712,400	3.3		1.428,000	33	1		
Conservation	743,700		29,700		714,000	0.5		1.428,000	0.5		· e	+
Neighborhood	743,700		29,700		714,000	0.5		1.428,000	0.50			÷ 4
Capital	5,125,800		270,600		4,855,200	3.4		1,428,000	3.4	'	- G	· ·
											,	

NOTE: Based on Estimates provided by the RC Assessor and RC Treasurer; these values are subject to change with more definitive values from theses offices

Dist. 1 Dist. 2

#### Richland County Auditor Paul Brawley

## MILLAGE CAP

	  -#-}										100K R		100K C
	- 0[a	7	1		_		Non-Owner Occupied				Net Tax	_	Net Tax
Agency	FY 16 Budget   Carryforward	Carryforward	State Reimbursement	School	Net Taxes	Proj15 Millage	Mill Value	T Mill Value	14 Millade	Millage	Effect	<b>.</b>	Effect
SD #1	199,439,620	4,400,000	5,794,000	50,678,020	138,567,600	252.4	549 000	773 000	247 0	א א		_   <del>6</del>	27.00
SD #2	137,213,726		1,217,500	48,524,226	87.472.000	308.0	284 000	505,000	208.0	4 4		9 6	00.12
Recreation	13,351,700	134,000	666,000		12,551,700	12.9	22,12	973,000	12.6	0.0	6	+	00.00
MTC	5,346,500	93,000	255,500		4,998,000	3.5		1 428 000	2.4	5.5			0.9
MTCC	2,245,000	15,000	88,000		2,142,000	1.5		1.428.000	1 2	5	1	<u>:</u>	0.00
Storm	3,222,000		156,000		3,066,000	3.5		876.000	3.4	0.1		0.40	, O
Fire Operating	21,694,000	328,200	1,018,600		20,347,200	21.6		942.000	21.1	0.5		+	8 6
General Fund	86,363,200		3,682,000		82,681,200	67.5		1.428.000	56.5	14		+	8 40
Library	24,629,200	110,000	1,100,000		23,419,200	16.4		1,428,000	16.0	4.0		-	2.40
MH	1,977,700	7,500	113,800		1,856,400	1.3		1,428,000	1.3	;	l	+	-
200	2,172,600	71,000	102,400		1,999,200	1.4		1,428,000	1.4	-		6-53	1
Landfill	4,908,200		195,800		4,712,400	3.3		1,428,000	3.3		€9	€9	t
Conservation	743,700		29,700		714,000	0.5		1,428,000	0.5		es	69	
Neighborhood	743,700		29,700		714,000	0.5		1,428,000	0.5	1	65	· 6	
Capital	5,125,800		270,600		4,855,200	3.4		1,428,000	3.4	,	جا	+ €9	
										2.8	\$ 11.	11.20 \$	16.80
										Dist. 1	<b>\$</b> 11.	11.20 \$	43.80
										Dist. 2	\$ 11.	20 \$	76.80

NOTE: Based on Estimates provided by the RC Assessor and RC Treasurer; these values are subject to change with more definitive values from theses offices

# Comparative Data of FY16 Budget Estimate based on updated Millage Sheet

as of 6/4/15

	Estimate on allowable look-bifference back millage	1,525,310	987,018	179,609	35,562	4,500	73,308	3,200	41,600	299,105	
Millage CAP	6/4/2015	\$ 199,439,620 \$	137,213,726	13,351,700	5,346,500	2,245,000	24,629,200	1,977,700	2,172,600	21,694,000	
A	4/8/2015	\$ 197,914,310	136,226,708	13,172,091	5,310,938	2,240,500	24,555,892	1,974,500	2,131,000	21,394,895	
					<u>'</u>			•			Comparison to the Administrator's Recommended Budget. See motion list item #72aa for the County
	Difference	\$ 1,511,810	964,500	133,800	31,900	4,500	48,000	3,200	41,600	227,300	
No Millage Increase	6/4/2015	\$ 196,969,120	134,373,726	13,059,800	5,203,700	2,245,000	24,058,000	1,977,700	2,172,600	21,223,000	
N ON	4/8/2015	\$ 195,457,310	133,409,226	12,926,000	5,171,800	2,240,500	24,010,000	1,974,500	2,131,000	20,995,700	
<b>L</b>		School District One	School District Two	Recreation Commission	Midlands Technical College			Columbia Area Mental Health	Riverbanks Zoo		

Millage Agency Summary of Options		Option 1	11		Option 2		O	Option 3			Option 4		
	FY15	Fund at a "Flat" dollar amount based on direction sent to Agencies in accordance with Council vote on 2/17/15.	Flat"  cunt  cies in  with  e on Change in \$	Estimated tax change for every \$ \$100k -C in value	Fund with an increase in \$ based on same mill rate as PY15	Estimated tax change for every Change in \$ \$100k -C in from FY15 value		Fund at the FY16 Requested Amount from the Agency	E ta ta Change in \$\$1 from PY15	Estimated tax change for every \$100k -C In value	Fund with an \$ increase to the CAP as allowable under Act388 based on updated numbers provided by County Auditor on 6/4/15	Change in \$	Estimated tax change for every \$100k -C in value
School District One	\$ 192,927,437	\$ 192,97	192,927,437 \$	- \$ (44.17)	\$ 196,969,120	\$ 4,041,683 \$	<i>پ</i> ه	198,221,400 \$	5, 293,963 \$	13.69	620	m 1	\$ 27.00
School District Two	\$ 133,208,281	\$ 133,20	133,208,281 \$	- \$ (24.62)	\$ 134,373,726 \$	\$ 1,165,445 \$	, ,	137,159,263 \$	3,950,982 \$	58.85	\$ 137,213,726	\$ 4,005,445	\$ 60.00
O Recreation Commission	\$ 12,814,400	\$ 12,8:	12,814,400 \$	- \$ (1.51)	\$ 13,059,800 \$	\$ 245,400 \$	,	13,172,091 \$	357,691 \$	0.69	\$ 13,351,700 \$	\$ 237,300 \$	1.80
Midlands Technical College	\$ 5,119,600	\$ 5,11.	5,119,600 \$	- \$ (0.35)	\$ 5,203,700	\$ 84,100 \$	, , ,	5,324,384 \$	204,784 \$	0.51	\$ 5,346,500 \$	\$ 226,900 \$	0.60
Library	\$ 23,764,000	\$ 23,76	23,764,000 \$	- \$ (1.24)	\$ 24,058,000	\$ 294,000 \$	· ·	24,555,892 \$	791,892 \$	5.09	\$ 24,629,200 \$	\$ 865,200 \$	3 2.40
Riverbanks Zoo	\$ 2,061,277	\$ 2,06	2,061,277 \$	- \$ (0.47)	\$ 2,172,600	\$ 111,323 \$	v.	2,131,000 \$	69,723 \$	(0.17)	\$ 2,172,600 \$	111,323 \$	,
Columbia Area Mental Health s	\$ 1,957,200	\$ 1,95	1,957,200 \$	(60.0) \$ -	\$ 1,977,700	\$ 20,500 \$	٠,	1,957,200 \$	ν. '	(60.0)	\$ 1,977,700 \$	\$ 20,500 \$	,

	Estimated tax tax change ed change in \$ 5100K-C from FV15 in value	86,363,200 \$ 2,878,200 \$ 8.36
Option 4	Fund with an \$ increase to the CAP as allowable under Act388 based on updated numbers provided by County Auditor on 6/4/15	\$ 86,363,20
	Estimated tax change for every \$ \$100k-C in value	æ
e	ed n Change in \$ from FY15	Ba
Option 3	Estimated ax change Fund at the for every FY16 Requested Amount from the Agency	E
n 2	t Change in \$ \$ from FY15	(3.73) \$ 84,364,000 \$ 879,000 \$
Option 2	Fund with an increase in \$ based on same mili rate as PY15	\$ 84,364
	Estimated tax change for every change in \$ \$100k -C in from FV15 value	+s> '
Option 1	Fund at a "Flat" dollar amount based on direction sent to Agencies in accordance with Council vote on 2/17/15.	\$ 83,485,000 \$
VI	FY15	\$ 83,485,000
Millage Agency Summary of Options		County General Operations Fund



June 4, 2015

The Honorable Torrey Rush Chairman Richland County Council 2020 Hampton Street Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Chairman Rush,

I write to you today to express my deep concern over the FY 2015/2016 budget ordinance before your council today for second reading specifically regarding your funding allocation for fire service.

As you know, the City of Columbia has developed a Recruitment and Retention Plan designed to address serious attrition issues within the fire department and ensure the safety of all those who depend on our unified fire service. Fire Chief Aubrey Jenkins and his staff along with our City Manager Teresa Wilson have kept the Richland County Council and Richland County's Administration well informed of these plans and their projected costs dating back to January of this year.

I was encouraged to see these costs included in the \$23, 218,000 fire service allocation which passed First Reading of your council on May 5th and Public Hearing on May 21st and I was further encouraged to see that same allocation included in the budget advertised on Richland County Council's agenda for consideration at tonight's Second Reading.

Unfortunately, it has come to my attention that despite passing First Reading, Public Hearing and being advertised for tonight's Second Reading, this \$23,218,000 allocation has been cut to \$21,505,000 and of that only \$18,708,000 will actually go to fire suppression.

This creates a well over \$1.2 million shortfall from Chief Jenkins' budget request completely eliminating the County's share of implementing the Recruitment and Retention Plan.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you take your responsibility seriously especially when it comes to ensuring the safety of Richland County's families. I have serious concerns that failing to fully fund fire protection at the level identified by Chief Jenkins including the County's share of the Recruitment and Retention Plan could put that safety at risk.

To that end I ask that County Council vote tonight to restore that funding including a minimum of \$19,943, 517 lump sum appropriation for fire suppression service as requested by Chief Jenkins. I believe it is the very least our families deserve.

Thank you for your consideration and please feel free to contact me with any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely.

Stephen K. Benjamin Mayor

Columbia, SC

#### RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

SOUTH CAROLINA

FROM THE DESK OF CHAIRMAN TORREY RUSH, COUNCIL DISTRICT 7 REPRESENTATIVE

June 10, 2015

Mayor Stephen K. Benjamin 1737 Main Street Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Mayor Benjamin:

Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding the Columbia-Richland Fire Budget. Please note that this is my official response to your letter dated June 4, 2015, in reference to Richland County Council's funding of the 2015-2016 fire budget request.

As you may already be aware, during our County Council annual retreat that took place in January, Chief Aubrey Jenkins discussed his plan for pay raises. At that time, he was unable to provide specifics as it related to implementation of the plan or associated cost. Subsequently, he, along with other city officials, mentioned the proposed plan at several meetings, including the Fire Advisory Committee meeting, but was still unable to provide us with the details of the plan.

As we appreciate the effort that has been put forth and after several attempts to obtain it, we finally received the outlined plan April 23, 2015 when Columbia's City Manager provided the County Administrator with a copy. We have, without hesitation, been very candid with everyone this fiscal cycle, including city personnel, that funding is at a critical state this year, and we don't foresee having the ability to increase funding. In fact, we are requiring all county departments to take a one percent (1%) budget reduction.

The City's request is to provide raises that could result in an employee getting up to a 21% raise on top of the 5% raise the City provided at the beginning of the current fiscal year. At this time, the new total request to provide additional raises is \$1,268.452. Chief Jenkins also increased his regular budget by \$270,957, making the total FY 16 budget request \$19,943,517, a \$1,539,408 increase over the FY 15 budget of \$18,404,109.

As we began our budget process, we used last year's numbers in the first reading and public hearing documents. In order for us to fully fund the fire department's budget and purchase capital equipment last fiscal year, we used fund balance. Unfortunately, using fund balance is not an option this year because we are below our Council-approved financial policies. Our total

Chair

Airport Commission

**Budget Committee** 

Central Midlands Council of Governments

City of Columbia Liaison

Convention & Visitors Bureau

Courthouse Ad Hoc Committee

Discretionary Grants Committee

Dirt Road Committee

Economic Development Committee

Fire Advisory Committee

Health Insurance Study Ad Hoc Committee

I-77 Alliance

Innovista Ad Hoc Committee

International Ad Hoc Committee

Midlands Technical College

Ordinance Review

Palmetto Health Alliance (RMH)

Recreation Commission

Richland County Department of Social Services Facility Ad Hoc Committee

River Alliance

1

#### RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

fire budget provides funding for other fire services other than fire suppression.

As of June 4, 2015, the current available funds to provide for fire service are as follows:

\$22,695,700 (Millage, water fees collected by the City and potential "Cap Funds")

-1,189,951 ("Less allocated costs")

- 860,000 (Less costs to dispatch county fire 911 calls)

\$20,645,749 (Total available)

-1,937,231 (County budget) (To cover fire marshals, suppression support costs such as station

maintenance; Truck, Station & Volunteer Insurance;

Voice and data communications costs, Etc.)

\$18,708,518 (Available for City's Budget)

Please note that the proposed \$18,708,518 includes "Cap Funds"; however, Council has yet to commit to using "Cap Funds." The potential City budget of \$18,708,518 is \$304,409, or 1.6%, above the current year funding. In addition to cutting county departments by 1%, County Council has decided to not fund any open positions that are not already included in the current budget year.

Re-allocating funds within the County's potentially available budget of \$18,708,518 may free up money to assist with portions of the proposed pay raise; however, that is not a guarantee.

Respectively, we do ask that moving forward, Richland County has an active role in deciding actions that may result in a budget increase or changes in service. I will also note that it concerns me that funding for a raise in the 26% range would not be thoroughly vetted and discussed with us prior to preliminary implementation to ensure that all options have been researched.

Mayor, as I have a great deal of respect for you and the work that the City of Columbia continues to do for the citizens within the incorporated areas of Richland County, I am appalled that you would make such a strong statement as it relates to the citizens of Richland County being in danger because we may be unable to fund a 26% pay increase. I respectively ask that you allow



#### RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

room for an applicable and reasonable solution that will ensure we are able to provide quality service to both our citizens and employees.

Mayor Benjamin, Richland County Council will approve a responsible budget and provide the maximum level of funds available that will continue the efficient and excellent quality of service our citizens have always received. It is our belief that we can find a resolution to the aforementioned concern; however, if it appears that at the end of this budget process we cannot find a reasonable and equitable solution, we can begin exploring other alternatives.

It has been our pleasure to work with you and the honorable members of Columbia City Council, and we look forward to continuing our collaborative efforts that will continue providing the citizens of Richland County with supreme service.

Sincerely,

Torrey Rush Chairman

Richland County Council

From: DANIEL DRIGGERS

Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 5:57 PM

To: Paul Livingston; Damon Jeter; Joyce Dickerson; Julie-Ann Dixon; Norman Jackson; Torrey Rush; Bill

Malinowski; Jim Manning; Gregory Pearce; Seth Rose; Kelvin Washington

Cc: TONY MCDONALD; DANIEL DRIGGERS
Subject: Follow up on Letter from CVB - 6/5/15

#### Council Members

The County Administrator has forwarded to me a letter from Bill Ellen, CEO of the Columbia Metropolitan Convention & Visitors Bureau (CVB), along with a follow-up email from Councilman Manning. In his letter Mr. Ellen noted that he had learned that CVB funding from the Hospitality Tax was inadvertently overlooked in the Second Reading of the Fiscal 2016 Budget and CVB had thus received H-Tax funding. Mr. Ellen also reiterated his appreciation for past funding and stressed the need to receive at least \$75,000 to support CVB's Fiscal 2016 marketing plans. Mr. Manning asked for the history on this funding and wanted to know if it was in fact overlooked, and if so, how that could have happened and how it could now be corrected. I am writing you to address the concerns expressed in both of these communications.

#### **Prior-Year Treatment**

Council voted during the Second Reading of the Fiscal 2015 budget discussion to move the CVB to the Special Promotions category with no level of funding determined. The amounts Council later approved for Fiscal 2015, and the amounts proposed by the County Administrator for Fiscal 2016 are as follows:

Funding Source	FY15 Approved	FY16 Recommended
Accommodations	\$193,200	\$166,000
Hospitality Tax	\$100,000	\$0
Total	\$293,200	\$166,000

#### **Chorology of County Administrator's Current-Year Recommendations**

The County Administrator's Recommended Budget for Fiscal 2016 was presented with H-Tax funding to be held to Fiscal 2015 levels. Since no specific Fiscal 2015 funding was included for CVB in the H-Tax budget, none was included in the Administrator's 2016 recommendations. The H-Tax Committee also did not make a recommendation for funding from County Promotions. In the absence of such a recommendation, a motion by Council could have been put forth to change the budget. The County Administrator provided to Council in its Fiscal 2016 budget binders a summary of A-tax and H-Tax funding recommendations for the coming year. This summary included CVB funding recommendations of \$166,000 from A-Tax and \$0 from H-Tax, as shown above. The Administrator also provided to Council as part of the budget binder a proposed Hospitality Tax

Budget sheet for Fiscal 2016 and reviewed this sheet with Council at the budget work session on May 21, and again at the Second Reading last Thursday, May 28. Because funding for CVB through H-Tax Ordinance was \$0 in 2015, the Administrator included no H-Tax allocation for the CVB in the 2015

budget sheet. This sheet did highlight separately that CVB had requested \$275,000 for Fiscal 2016. At this point, no recommendation has been received from Council that would amend the Administrator's recommendation.

#### Possible Additional Funding by Council

With the vast multitude of decisions Council has to make in the annual budget process, it would be easy to overlook the funding from one source for one organization. If Council now wishes to change the funding for CVB, it can do so by approving a motion filed by a council member to add the funding; however, since Council agreed in its second reading to fund all agencies at the FY 2015 level, any such additional funding motion will need to also include a funding source. Below are a couple of options for your consideration:

- 1. A motion has already been proposed by a Council Member to reduce the Council Member's discretionary H-tax funds by \$7,000 per district and reallocate the \$77,000 to CVB.
- 2. Amend the recommended funding for other agencies within H-Tax and reallocate it to CVB, or
- 3. Award \$80,000 to CVB derived as follows
  - a. Award the \$25,000 in unallocated discretionary H-Tax funds To CVB and
  - b. Adjust each Council member's discretionary fund balance from \$37,272 to \$32,272. This would free up \$5,000 per council member, yielding a total of \$55,000 that Council can then allocated to CVB.

Please let me know else I can help.

Daniel Driggers | Richland County - Chief Financial Officer | driggersd@rcgov.us | tel: 803.576.2100 |

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged information protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not read, use, copy, or distribute this e-mail message or its attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail message in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail or telephone immediately, and destroy all copies of the original message.