

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 12, 2000
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE
D&S COMMITTEE MEETING**

PRESENT: Joseph McEachern, Chair; Paul Livingston; Anthony G. Mizzell; Stephen F. Morris; James Tuten

OTHERS PRESENT: J.D. "Buddy" Meetze, Susan Brill, Bernice G. Scott, L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Thelma Tillis, Kit Smith, Rodolfo Callwood, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Pam Davis, Ash Miller, Mullen Taylor, Buddy Langley, Jim Prater, Michelle Cannon-Finch, Marsheika Martin, Joan Brady, Monique Walters

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:17 p.m.

APPROVAL MINUTES – November 28, 2000

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. McEachern stated a resolution for a grant application for Senior Resources and a Township report need to be added to the agenda. These will be added as items G&H under Items Pending Analysis.

Mr. Morris moved, and it was seconded, to add those items to the agenda. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Tuten moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as amended. The vote in favor was unanimous.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

DHEC's Commendation of Emergency Services employees –a resolution

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to approve this resolution. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Facilities & Maintenance: DSS Entrance Renovation

Mr. McSwain stated renovations have been under consideration for about a year and a half. He stated the report does not mention the safety of the entire process. Mr. McSwain stated this has been budgeted and the Federal Funding Program (FFP) will pay for half of the renovation. The total cost will be \$103,000.00 with the County's portion being \$51,500.00

Mr. McSwain reported that he is not completely sure if the County would have to front the money, get immediately reimbursed by the state through the FFP or if the FFP will put the money up front with the County for renovations. He stated the money is budgeted in the DSS part of the budget.

**Richland County Council
A&F Committee Meeting
December 12, 2000
Page Two**

A discussion took place.

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to award a contract to Crider Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$103,000.00 for which the County's share would be \$51,500.00 and forward to the December 12th Council meeting. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Central Carolina Economic Development Alliance: Old and New Agreements

Mr. McSwain stated Central Carolina Economic Development Alliance requested the termination of the intergovernmental agreement that originally set up the alliance. He stated as Counties are added the bylaws and procedures are in conflict with the agreement and it is much simpler to terminate the agreement and enter into a new agreement between Richland County and the Alliance.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to approve and forward to the December 19th Council meeting in order for the legal staff to review the agreement. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Vector Control: Two Vehicles

Mr. McSwain stated this is a routine contract and is currently budgeted. He stated it is a replacement of vehicles that exists.

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

Coroner Retirement Issue – No backup at this time

Mr. McSwain stated this needed to be discussed in Executive Session.

Mr. Mizzell moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to go into Executive Session to discuss this item after the agenda is completed.

Mr. Morris suggested forwarding this item to the Council meeting without a recommendation in order for full Council to discuss it.

Mr. Mizzell withdrew his motion.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to forward to the Council meeting with no recommendation to be discussed in Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Funding Agreement for Conference Center: Executive Summary

Mr. McEachern stated committee members should have the funding agreement before them.

Mr. McSwain stated the Executive Summary prepared by legal staff is in the packets. He stated the County had an agreement to agree with Lexington and the City of Columbia to provide 2.5 million dollars to the University of South Carolina as part of the 7.5 million dollars for the building of the

**Richland County Council
A&F Committee Meeting
December 12, 2000
Page Three**

conference center. Mr. McSwain stated the agreement was to have this money by the first of February. He stated he was not clear if that was February 1st or the first part of February.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Pearce noted the agreement does not mention anything about funding for the Township.

The discussion continued.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward this item to the Council meeting recommended approval of 2.5 million dollars to the University of South Carolina for First Reading and forward the remainder of the agreement to a work session for more information.

A discussion continued. Ms. Scott requested a brief synopsis from staff on what is going on.

Mr. McEachern called for the question, and it was seconded. The vote in favor was unanimous.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Mr. McEachern opposed.

Township Report

Mr. Morris moved to forward this item to the December 19th meeting and directed staff to provide various funding options.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Morris withdrew his motion.

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Tuten, to forward this item to the Council meeting for an approval not to exceed \$800,000.00 from the Fund Balance and reimburse the fund balance when the bond or whatever is decided is found. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Resolution for a Grant Application for Senior Resources

Mr. Morris moved, seconded by Mr. Mizzell, to approve a resolution for support to purchase a replacement van for Senior Resources. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by,

Joseph McEachern
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: GIS: Two New FT Positions

A. Purpose

This item seeks Council approval for two new full-time positions. The positions are to be a GIS Analyst and GIS Programmer. No additional funds for 2000/01 are necessary.

B. Background / Discussion

During the 2000/01 Budget Planning process last March and April (3/7/00 and 4/13/00), two positions were requested to begin developing the County GIS program. It was the understanding of IT and the Administration that these positions were approved and included in this year's (2000/01) budget. Thus, interviews were conducted and candidates were selected. However, in actuality, the two positions were not entered into the approved budget.

GIS currently employs one GIS analyst through a temp-to-hire agency. The funds for temp-to-hire assistance are being transferred from other GIS budget items. By creating a direct FTE, the actual cost for this employee would be decreased. Because of the critical need for these two positions, funds from GIS projects could be utilized to fund the positions until July 1, 2001.

C. Financial Impact

There is no impact to the County General Fund. The revenue source for the two new positions is found within the 2000/01 fiscal year budget for GIS. A budget amendment is not necessary.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request for two new full-time GIS positions, to be funded from existing funds within the current GIS budget.
2. Deny the request for the two new GIS positions. The impact of Council's denial would jeopardize the implementation of multiple geographic applications and databases planned for the County.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request for the two new full-time positions of GIS Analyst and GIS Programmer to be funded by the current GIS.

Recommended by: Patrick J. Bresnahan, PhD Department: IT/GIS Date: 1/3/01

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore
Comments:

Date: 01/09/01

Procurement

Approved by:
Comments:

Date:

Legal

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

Date: 01/09/01

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 01/17/01

Comments: Recommend approval of the addition of two positions to the GIS Division of the Information Technology Department. The positions were intended to be included in the FY 2000-01 budget but were inadvertently deleted. Funding for the positions for the remainder of this fiscal year can be absorbed in the current GIS budget with no additional funds required. The positions will be included in the FY 2001-02 budget with full funding.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: PBX Telephone System

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to give permission to negotiate and award a contract to the telecommunications company Sprint for the purpose of providing a PBX telephone system. The costs are itemized below. Installation of a PBX telephone system is projected to save approximately between \$150,000 and \$200,000 per year in recurring costs, and simultaneously provide modern telephone features that have been needed and requested for many years.

B. Background / Discussion

A Request for Proposal was issued for a PBX telephone system for the following reasons:

- Richland County is using an ESSX/Centrex system that does not include modern telephone features in its base pricing. To enhance the ESSX/Centrex system to provide County-wide access to enhanced telephone features would be cost prohibitive.
- Richland County receives many citizen complaints concerning our antiquated telephone system. Many department heads also complain about the lack of modern features.
- The purchase of a modern PBX telephone system will allow Richland County to deploy the latest and most advanced telephone features to all County telephones, and simultaneously benefit from significant annual savings from recurring costs.
- In 1997, the telecommunications consulting company HSMM (Hayes, Seayes, Mattern & Mattern) recommended that Richland County implement a PBX to save recurring costs and to provide modern telephone features. However, the Richland County IT Department had to first upgrade the cabling and wiring in most County buildings in order to prepare for a future PBX. The infrastructure upgrade is now complete in most of the County buildings and is capable of sustaining a modern PBX. Any remaining upgrades that need to be completed can be completed in conjunction with the phone deployment.
- In 1998, the Richland County IT Department began a pilot phone project to test the emerging IP Telephony technology. The IT Department is extremely satisfied with how the technology has matured since 1998, and is extremely satisfied with the results of the pilot project.
- Installation of a PBX telephone system is projected to save approximately between \$150,000 and \$200,000 per year in recurring costs, and simultaneously provide modern telephone features that have been needed and requested for many years.

The following six vendors submitted proposals:

- Avaya (proposed a Lucent PBX)
- Computer Telephony Concepts (proposed a 3COM PBX)
- Matrix (proposed a Cisco PBX)
- NDS (proposed a Cisco PBX)
- Southeastern (proposed a Spherical PBX)
- Sprint (proposed a Cisco PBX)

The proposals were evaluated by the following committee members:

- Dale Welch, IT Department
- Michael LeBron, IT Department
- Staci Emanuel, IT Department
- Chuck Hagan, Health Department
- Elizabeth Levy, Solicitor's Office
- Judge McCulloch, Probate Office
- Kelly Davis, CASA

The Evaluation Committee completed a comprehensive review of each of the vendor's written proposals. From the written proposals, the committee selected three finalists. The three finalists were requested to give an oral presentation and a live demonstration. The following three vendors were finalists:

- Avaya
- Matrix
- Sprint

The criteria used for evaluation are presented below:

Evaluation Criteria

- Ability of the vendor to satisfy all the requirements. Focus is on vendor's understanding of the requirements, ability to satisfy all the requirements, and the ability to meet the proposed implementation plan
- Proposed vendor's ability to achieve success. This would include the vendor's history of success, the size of the company, and the number of years vendor has been in business. May also include a review of the vendor's audited financial statement and proximity to Richland County.
- Proposed system's demonstrated history of success. History of success must include medium to large-scale implementations of the proposed hardware/software. References can be local governments, state governments, educational institutions, and private companies that have similar needs.
- Proposed system's Fail Over strategy. This would include how the proposed system would maintain operational readiness in the event of hardware failure and/or software failures. Also, the ability of the proposed system to maintain operational readiness across multiple locations with the least amount of redundancy.

Evaluation Criteria (continued)

- Total system cost. This shall include the costs of the hardware, operating system, software, and services provided by the vendor. This shall also include the recurring annual costs that will be necessary to keep the County running on current versions of the system, such as possible software/support subscriptions.
- Proposed system's ability to co-exist on a single cable along with data and video. An example would be the system's ability to allow the user to have a PC and a phone on a single cat5 cable to their desktop.
- Proposed system's ability to meet the capacity requirements, including the ability of the proposed system to scale larger without major upgrades. This would also include the ability to meet future business needs in terms of volume and function without the need for major upgrades.
- The proposed system's "Quality of Service" (QOS) strategy. This includes the ability of the system to prioritize voice over data traffic, and the technique in which it is accomplished.
- Successfulness of system demonstration and/or system site visit. Evaluation Committee selected the top 3 proposals for a live demonstration of proposed system onsite at Richland County.

The Evaluation Committee unanimously determined that Sprint presented the most responsive proposal.

C. Financial Impact

Richland County currently has \$250,000 available from a bond that was established for the purpose of a new telephone system. This will not be enough to complete the implementation, but it is sufficient to deploy the new phone system to approximately 450 to 600 employees (depending on the type of handsets that are required by each individual department).

Each County department will have unique telephone requirements, some more complex than others. To ensure success, the deployment of the new telephone system will be a phased deployment, possibly one or two departments at a time. Depending on funding, the deployment can go more quickly or more slowly, as funding permits. The complete deployment will require approximately \$625,000 in additional funds. This amount will be requested in the upcoming 2001/2002 budget. If the upcoming budget only provides partial funding, then the difference will be requested in the 2002/2003 budget.

The type of contract that is being requested is a five-year "unit pricing" contract that specifies unit prices instead of a fixed total amount, similar to State Contract pricing. This will allow the phased implementation of the new phone system, as funding permits. This will also allow other governments to purchase off of the Richland County contract similar to how they purchase off of the State Contract, which will help us negotiate the best prices based on anticipated volume purchasing. The unit prices would be renegotiated with the vendor on an annual basis to benefit from anticipated price drops in the marketplace. If

Financial Impact (continued)

significant price drops in the marketplace occur more frequently than annually, then unit price renegotiations with the vendor would also be considered more frequently.

Once fully deployed, the new PBX telephone system is projected to save approximately between \$150,000 and \$200,000 per year in recurring costs. Additionally, there will be “soft” savings that will result from increases in employee productivity and efficiency.

Permission is requested to encumber the currently available \$250,000 with this vendor to begin the phased implementation of the new PBX phone system. After the new budget year begins, we will return to Council to request permission to continue the implementation with new money allocated from the new budget.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to negotiate and award the contract to Sprint and to encumber the initial \$250,000.
2. Reject the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, and republish the Request for Proposal.
3. Reject the decision to replace ESSX/Centrex with a PBX telephone system, and remain on the current system.
4. Forward to full Council with no recommendation.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to negotiate and award the contract to Sprint and to encumber the initial \$250,000 (Alternative #1).

Recommended by: Janet Claggett / Dale Welch Department: I. T. Date: 01/10/01

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore Date: 01/16/2001
Comments:

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood Date: 01/16/01
Comments: The cost, terms and conditions should be negotiated with the top finalist and if an agreement can't be reached, then negotiate with second and third if necessary. After receipt of Best and Final Offer and prior to awarding the contract (terms and conditions), it will be reviewed and approved by an attorney in the Legal department.

Grants

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
Comments:

Legal

Approved by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 01/16/01

Comments: It is standard practice that all contracts are reviewed and approved by Legal before being executed.

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald Date: 01/17/01

Comments: Recommend that the Council authorize the staff to negotiate and award a contract to Sprint for the phased implementation of a new phone system and to encumber the initial \$250,000 budgeted for this project.