

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY  
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
BEAUFORT COUNTY GOVERNMENT ROBERT SMALLS COMPLEX  
100 RIBAUT ROAD  
POST OFFICE DRAWER 1228  
BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA 29901-1228  
TELEPHONE: (843) 255-2000  
FAX: (843) 255-9401  
www.bcgov.net

D. PAUL SOMMERVILLE  
CHAIRMAN

GERALD W. STEWART  
VICE CHAIRMAN

COUNCIL MEMBERS

CYNTHIA M. BENSCH  
RICK CAPORALE  
GERALD DAWSON  
BRIAN E. FLEWELLING  
STEVEN G. FOBES  
ALICE G. HOWARD  
WILLIAM L. MCBRIDE  
STEWART H. RODMAN  
ROBERTS "TABOR" VAUX

GARY T. KUBIC  
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

JOSHUA A. GRUBER  
DEPUTY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
SPECIAL COUNSEL

THOMAS J. KEAVENY, II  
COUNTY ATTORNEY

SUZANNE M. RAINEY  
CLERK TO COUNCIL

AGENDA  
COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY  
Monday, August 10, 2015  
4:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers, Administration Building  
Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex  
100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort

Citizens may participate in the public comment periods and public hearings from telecast sites at Hilton Head Island Branch Library, Hilton Head Island as well as Mary Field School, Daufuskie Island. Speaker sign-up is required no later than 4:45 p.m. prior to the beginning of the meeting.

1. CAUCUS - 4:00 P.M.
  - A. Discussion of consent agenda
  - B. Discussion is not limited to agenda items
2. REGULAR MEETING - 5:00 P.M.
3. CALL TO ORDER
4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
5. INVOCATION – Councilman Gerald Dawson
  - A. Moment of Silence on Remembrance of:  
Julie Williams, former EMS Employee  
Rhashard Spikes, Animal Shelter Employee
6. ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT AGENDA
  - A. Approval of Minutes – July 27, 2015 ([backup](#))
  - B. Receipt of County Administrator’s Two-Week Progress Report ([backup](#))
  - C. Receipt of Deputy County Administrator/Special Counsel’s Two-Week Progress Report ([backup](#))
  - D. Committee Reports (next meeting)
    1. Community Services (August 24 at 1:00 p.m., HHI Branch Library)
    2. Executive (September 14 at 2:00 p.m., ECR)
    3. Finance (August 17 at 2:00 p.m., BIV #3)
      - a. Minutes – July 27, 2015 ([backup](#))
    4. Governmental (August 24 at 2:30 p.m., HHI Branch Library)
      - a. Minutes – July 27, 2015 ([backup](#))
    5. Natural Resources (August 10 at 2:00 p.m., ECR)
    6. Public Facilities (August 17 at 4:00 p.m., BIV #3)
  - E. Appointments to Boards and Commissions ([backup](#))



7. PUBLIC COMMENT – Speaker sign-up no later than 4:45 p.m. prior to the beginning of the meeting.
8. ANNOUNCEMENT / SPANISH MOSS TRAIL MATCHING GRANT
  - Mr. Ed McBrayer, Executive Director, Path Foundation
  - Mr. Dean Moss, Executive Director, Friends of Spanish Moss Trail
9. NEW BUSINESS / A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE THROUGH BLANKET BOND ([backup](#))
10. CONSENT AGENDA
  - A. AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED AUGUST 22, 2005 TO PROVIDE FOR AMENDMENT OF THE RATE STRUCTURE, ADJUST UTILITY RATES, AND TO MODIFY CERTAIN TERMS TO ACCURATELY REFLECT ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE (TO ADOPT RATE STRUCTURE E) ([backup](#))
    1. Consideration of second reading to occur August 10, 2015
    2. Public hearing 2 of 2 - August 24, 2015 beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the large meeting room of the Hilton Head Island Branch Library, 11 Beach City Road, Hilton Head Island
    3. First reading approval occurred July 27, 2015 / Vote 8:3
    4. Public hearing 1 of 2 was held July 27, 2015
    5. Natural Resources Committee discussion and recommendation to approve ordinance on first reading occurred July 20, 2015 / Vote 5:2
    6. Stormwater Management Utility Board discussion and recommendation to approve ordinance on first reading occurred July 15, 2015 / Vote 5:0
11. AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE PROHIBITING THE IMPORTATION OF EXOTIC ANIMALS WITHIN BEAUFORT COUNTY ([backup](#))
12. PUBLIC HEARING
  - A. AN ORDINANCE DECLARING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND AUTHORIZING BEAUFORT COUNTY ADMINISTRATION TO TRANSFER REAL PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS TMP: R120 008 000 0210 (AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO TRANSFER THE PROPERTY TO LOWCOUNTRY HABITAT FOR HUMANITY FOR REMEDIATION AND THE PROMOTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING) ([backup](#))
    1. Consideration of third and final reading to occur August 10, 2015
    2. Second reading approval occurred July 27, 2015 / Vote 11:0
    3. First reading approval occurred June 22, 2015 / Vote 11:0
    4. Public Facilities Committee discussion and recommendation to approve ordinance on first reading occurred June 15, 2015 / Vote 6:0
13. PUBLIC COMMENT
14. ADJOURNMENT

Official Proceedings  
County Council of Beaufort County  
July 27, 2015

The electronic and print media duly notified in  
accordance with the State Freedom of Information Act.

**CAUCUS**

A caucus of the County Council of Beaufort County was held Monday, July 27, 2015 beginning at 4:00 p.m. in the Executive Conference Room of the Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

**ATTENDANCE**

Chairman D. Paul Sommerville, Vice Chairman Gerald Stewart and Councilmen Cynthia Bensch, Rick Caporale, Gerald Dawson, Brian Flewelling, Steven Fobes, Alice Howard, William McBride, Stewart Rodman and Roberts "Tabor" Vaux.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

At the request of Mr. Flewelling, Council discussed agenda item 12E, renewal of annual contract with CompuCom for Microsoft licensing, including structured query language server licenses for Beaufort County. During the Finance Committee held earlier today, members approved a reduction in the contract award from \$186,677 to \$153,469.

**CALL FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Mrs. Bensch, seconded by Mr. Flewelling, that Council go immediately into executive session to receive legal advice relating to (i) discussion of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements and proposed purchase of property: (a) proposed purchase of property pursuant to the Beaufort County Rural and Critical Lands Program, (b) Arthur Horne Building Relocation; and (ii) receipt of legal advice relating to pending and potential claims covered by the attorney-client privilege. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

The regular meeting of the County Council of Beaufort County was held Monday, July 27, 2015 beginning at 5:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of the Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

## **ATTENDANCE**

Chairman D. Paul Sommerville, Vice Chairman Gerald Stewart and Councilmen Cynthia Bensch, Rick Caporale, Gerald Dawson, Brian Flewelling, Steven Fobes, Alice Howard, William McBride, Stewart Rodman and Roberts “Tabor” Vaux.

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Chairman led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **INVOCATION**

Councilman Cynthia Bensch gave the Invocation.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

### **Mr. Bill Love**

Mr. Gary Kubic, County Administrator, introduced Mr. Bill Love, new Director of the Disabilities and Special Needs Department. Mr. Love has been an employee of the Disabilities and Special Needs Department for the past eight years, most recently as Deputy Director. He has a BA degree from York College of Pennsylvania, a Master of Education in Social Restoration from Lehigh University, and completed course work toward a Ph.D. in Administration of Justice at Penn State University.

### **Dr. Rodell Lawrence**

Mr. Gary Kubic, County Administrator, introduced Dr. Rodell Lawrence, new Director of Penn Center. Dr. Lawrence, drafted in 1967 into the U.S. Army, spent a tour of duty in combat in the Republic of South Vietnam. He has a BS degree in electrical engineering with a minor in mathematics from S.C. State University. He received an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree in 1992. Dr. Lawrence has fundraising experience in areas of corporate, alumni, foundation, and annual giving along with organizational and individual giving.

## **PROCLAMATION**

### **Gullah Geechee Nation Appreciation Week**

The Chairman proclaimed July 26 through August 1, 2015 as Gullah Geechee Nation Appreciation Week in Beaufort County. Queen Quet, Chieftess, Gullah/Geechee Nation, accepted the proclamation.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT AGENDA**

### **Review of Proceedings of the Regular Meeting held June 22, 2015**

This item comes before Council under the Administrative Consent Agenda.

It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Fobes, that Council approve the minutes of the regular meeting held June 22, 2015. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

### **County Administrator's Five-Week Progress Report**

This item comes before Council under the Administrative Consent Agenda.

Mr. Gary Kubic, County Administrator, presented his Five-Week Progress Report, which summarized his activities from June 22, 2015 through July 24, 2015.

### **Deputy County Administrator/Special Counsel's Five-Week Progress Report**

This item comes before Council under the Administrative Consent Agenda.

Mr. Joshua Gruber, Deputy County Administrator/Special Counsel, presented his Five-Week Progress Report, which summarized his activities from June 22, 2015 through July 24, 2015.

## **Committee Reports**

### **Community Services Committee**

#### **Disabilities and Special Needs Board**

Lynn Russo

The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. Mrs. Lynn Russo garnered the six votes required to serve as a member of the Disabilities and Special Needs Board.

### **Finance Committee**

Mr. Stewart, as Chairman of the Finance Committee, nominated Mr. Harold Wallace, representing reside in close proximity (three-mile radius) of the Beaufort County Airport (Lady's Island), to serve as a member of the Airports Board.

### **Governmental Committee**

#### **A resolution of Beaufort County Council to authorize the County Administrator to prepare the necessary documents to establish a nonprofit Economic Corporation to coordinate and implement economic development plans and initiatives for Beaufort County**

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, as Chairman of the Governmental Committee (no second required), that Council adopt a resolution to authorize the County Administrator to prepare the necessary documents to establish a nonprofit economic corporation to coordinate and implement economic development plans and initiatives for Beaufort County. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

The Vice Chairman passed the gavel back to the Chairman in order to continue the meeting.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Chairman recognized Mrs. Kitty Wright, a resident of Shell Point, who stated the 11.92 acres lies between Cypress and Shell Point Roads. Her father-in-law was one of the two developers of this area, known as Shell Point and, it was intended to be a single-family residential area. She encouraged Council to use Rural and Critical Lands Program funds to purchase this property and take it off the market so that we do not have to keep fighting this fight to keep our neighborhood single-family residential.

Mrs. Carolyn Davis, a resident of Shell Point, stated the 11.92 acres is your perfect stormwater basin management tool. The water runs in there from all over the upper part of Shell Point. It is filtered out, in a nice little environmental biosphere with flora and fauna in freshwater wetlands, and then it runs out into Battery Creek. It has been there for eons. It seems to work fairly well. She urged Council to consider purchasing this land with Rural and Critical Lands funds.

Mr. James Clark, a resident of Shell Point, requested Council consider purchasing the Pike property/11.92 acres using Rural and Critical Lands Program funds. This property has become important in recent years, particularly, since the widening of U.S. Highway 802/U.S. Highway 21. All that drainage goes to one location, then into Battery Creek. Any further development in that area would be detrimental to that discharge point.

Ms. Donna Garcia, a resident of Shell Point, lives directly across the street from the 11.92 acres in Shell Point. Natural wetlands are present there. Please consider purchasing this land with Rural and Critical Lands funds.

**DEMONSTRATION / NEW CITIZEN TRANSPARENCY INTERACTIVE WEBSITE**

Mrs. Alicia Holland, CPA, Assistant County Administrator-Finance, demonstrated several features of the new citizen transparency financial interactive website. Users can review total spending to date, examine how funds are appropriated by department, see which vendors receive payments in a given year, or research spending for any area of the County, including non-tax dollar expenditures. Data is also available for the past two fiscal years. Citizen Transparency also features easy-to-navigate graphics with data organized by category, department, government area, fund, and vendor. The interactive charts and graphs allow for easy analysis of the County's financial data and give meaning and clarity to those numbers. Citizen Transparency will allow anyone with access to a computer to sort, search, analyze, and download the County's financial information. Unlike programs that only provide a static snapshot of data, Citizen Transparency will be updated weekly with the most recent figures.

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE BEAUFORT COUNTY STORMWATER STUDY, THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, AND TAKE ALL SUCH ACTION DEEMED NECESSARY TO MEET THE INCREASED DEMANDS ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY**

**Main motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, as Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee (no second required), that Council adopt a resolution adopting the Beaufort County Stormwater Study, the recommendations contained therein, and take all such action deemed necessary to meet the increased demands on the stormwater management utility.

**Motion to amend by substitution:** It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mrs. Bensch, that Council substitute the words, “. . . to meet federally mandated regulations” and delete, “. . . the increased demands on the Stormwater Management Utility” in the last sentence of the seventh paragraph. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Vaux. NAYS - Mr. Dawson, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Sommerville and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Vote on the amended motion, which is now the main motion, and includes the motion to amend by substitution:** Council adopt a resolution adopting the Beaufort County Stormwater Study, the recommendations contained therein, and take all such action deemed necessary to meet the increased demands on the stormwater management utility. Further, substitute the words, “. . . to meet federally mandated regulations” and delete, “. . . the increased demands on the Stormwater Management Utility” in the last sentence of the seventh paragraph. The vote: YEAS - Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville and Mr. Vaux. NAYS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Dawson, Mr. McBride and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**AN ORDINANCE DECLARING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND AUTHORIZING BEAUFORT COUNTY ADMINISTRATION TO TRANSFER REAL PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS TMP: R120-008-000-0210**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the June 15, 2015 meeting of the Public Facilities Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council approve on second reading an ordinance declaring certain real property as surplus property and authorizing Beaufort County Administration to transfer real property identified as TMP: R120-008-000-0210 to LowCountry Habitat for Humanity, a non-profit corporation located in Beaufort that seeks to provide affordable housing for Beaufort County citizens. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

The Chairman announced a public hearing Monday, August 10, 2015, beginning at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers of the Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

**RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / HAULING SERVICES FOR SOLID WASTE DEPARTMENT**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal for fiscal year 2016 to Republic Services, Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$850,000, to provide hauling services for the Solid Waste Department. Funding for this contract will come from Account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste Hauling Services. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / JANITORIAL SERVICES FOR COUNTY FACILITIES (FACILITIES MAINTENANCE, HILTON ISLAND AIRPORT/HXD AND LADY'S ISLAND AIRPORT/ARW)**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal for fiscal year 2016 to A & B Cleaning Services, Inc., Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$585,828 to provide janitorial services for County facilities (Facilities Maintenance, Hilton Island Airport/HXD and Lady's Island Airport/ARW). Funding for this contract will come from Accounts 10001310-51210, 51000011-51210, 54000011-51210, Cleaning Services. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.



### **RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / PUBLIC HEALTH INSECTICIDE FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal to Clarke Mosquito Control Products, Inc., St. Charles, Illinois, in the amount of \$315,000 to provide public health insecticides for Mosquito Control. Funding for this contract will come from Account 10001400-52320, Public Health Products. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

### **RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / MICROSOFT LICENSING INCLUDING STRUCTURED QUERY LANGUAGE (SQL) SERVER LICENSES FOR BEAUFORT COUNTY**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal to CompuCom, Dallas, Texas, in the amount of \$153,469, to provide Microsoft licensing, including structured query language (SQL) server licenses for Beaufort County. Funding for this contract will come from Account 10001150-51110, Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

### **RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal to South Coast Logging, Savannah, Georgia, in the amount of \$180,000 to provide solid waste disposal. Funding for this contract will come from Account 10001340-51166, Solid Waste Disposal. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

### **RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT / PROPERTY ASSESSMENT AND TAX SOFTWARE AND SUPPORT FOR ASSESSOR'S, AUDITOR'S AND TREASURER'S OFFICES**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract renewal to Manatron (Aumentum), Chicago, Illinois, in the amount of \$177,975 to provide property assessment and tax software and support for the Assessor's Office, Auditor's Office and Treasurer's Office. Funding for this contract will come from Account 10001150-51110, Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**CONTRACT AWARD / BLUFFTON TOWNSHIP FIRE DISTRICT FLEET REPLACEMENT (10 FIRE TRUCKS)**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council award a contract to Spartan Fire and Emergency Apparatus, Inc., Roebuck, South Carolina, in the amount of \$4,126,920 for the purchase of ten fire trucks. Funding for this contract will come from Bluffton Township Fire District Account 73040011-57800. Further, approve the District entering into a contract with Palmetto Fire Apparatus to purchase the current Bluffton Fire District engine fleet for \$425,000. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**HILTON HEAD ISLAND AIRPORT/HXD HANGAR RENTAL RATE INCREASE (TO REFLECT A 3% INCREASE)**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council approve a three (3%) percent increase in hangar rental rate at the Hilton Head Island Airport/HXD (a monthly rate of \$418.85). The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**BEAUFORT COUNTY AIRPORT/ARW HANGAR RENTAL RATE INCREASE (TO REFLECT A 5% INCREASE)**

This item comes before Council under the Consent Agenda. Discussion occurred at the July 27, 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee.

It was moved by Mr. Rodman, seconded by Mr. Stewart, that Council approve a five (5%) percent increase in hangar rental rates at the Beaufort County Airport/ARW (a monthly rate of \$311.00). The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **ST. HELENA ISLAND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT / REZONING REQUEST FOR R300-016-000-183A-0000 (10 ACRES, OFF BALL PARK ROAD, KNOWN AS THE LEROY E. BROWNE CENTER) FROM T2-R (RURAL) TO T2-RNO (RURAL NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN)**

The Chairman opened a public hearing beginning at 6:00 p.m. for the purpose of receiving information from the public regarding a St. Helena Island Zoning Map amendment for R300-016-000-183A-0000 (10 acres, off Ball Park Road, known as the Leroy E. Browne Center) from T2-R (Rural) to T2-RNO (Rural Neighborhood Open). After calling three times for public comment and receiving none, the Chairman declared the hearing closed at 6:01 p.m.

It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, as Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee (no second required), that Council approve on third and final reading a St. Helena Island Zoning Map amendment for R300-016-000-183A-0000 (10 acres, off Ball Park Road, known as the Leroy E. Browne Center) from T2-R (Rural) to T2-RNO (Rural Neighborhood Open). The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

### **TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE BEAUFORT COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (CDC), SECTION 5.6.40 (PERMANENT SIGN TYPES FOR BUILDINGS, BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITIES) (TO PERMIT FREE STANDING SIGNS IN T4 DISTRICTS, SUBJECT TO CERTAIN CONDITIONS)**

The Chairman opened a public hearing beginning at 6:02 p.m. for the purpose of receiving information from the public regarding a text amendment to the Beaufort County Community Development Code (CDC), Section 5.6.40 (Permanent Sign Types for Buildings, Businesses and Communities) (to permit free standing signs in T4 Districts, subject to certain conditions). After calling twice for public comment, the Chairman recognized Mr. David Tedder, a member of the Beaufort Memorial Hospital Board as well as the applicant of record bringing this issue forward, who thanked the Natural Resources Committee and especially the staff for helping us work through and fix an unintended consequence of the new Community Development Code, adopted December 2014, that carried over so that we can address a specific situation that is caused by the presence of a large utility easement along U.S. Highway 21 that makes the Code not work right in that area.

After calling once more for public comment and receiving none, the Chairman declared the hearing closed at 6:03 p.m.

It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, as Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee (no second required), that Council approve on third and final reading a text amendment to the Beaufort County Community Development Code (CDC), Section 5.6.40 (Permanent Sign Types for Buildings, Businesses and Communities) (to permit free standing signs in T4 Districts, subject to certain

conditions). The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion passed.

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED AUGUST 22, 2005 TO PROVIDE FOR AMENDMENT OF THE RATE STRUCTURE, ADJUST UTILITY RATES, AND TO MODIFY CERTAIN TERMS TO ACCURATELY REFLECT ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE (TO ADOPT RATE STRUCTURE E)**

The Chairman opened a public hearing beginning at 6:04 p.m. for the purpose of receiving information from the public regarding an ordinance to amend the Stormwater Management Utility Ordinance, as adopted August 22, 2005, to provide for the amendment of the rate structure, adjust utility rates, and to modify certain terms to accurately reflect the administration structure (to adopt Rate Structure E). After calling once for public comment, the Chairman recognized Mr. Earl Campbell, a resident of Lobeco, who stated the stormwater fee when first implemented was \$44.00 and is proposed to increase to \$87.00 (an increase of 74%). What is the dollar amount collected in stormwater fees? Please do not increase the fee.

Mr. Peter Dawson, a resident of Burton, stated the Public Works Director attended a community meeting and residents were told the purpose of the fee was to study stormwater. Is anyone exempt from paying the stormwater fee? How much money has been collected? Where has the money been spent?

Pastor James Moore, a resident of Sheldon, objects to the proposed stormwater fee increase from \$44.00 to \$87.00 being levied on every person who owns a home in Sheldon Township. We have many people who live below the poverty line and who struggle daily to make ends meet. What are the projects? He is bothered by levying an increase on the poorest people in this County. Please vote against the fee increase.

Mr. Edgar Williams, a resident of Yemassee, is opposed to the stormwater rate increase. How can Council recommend a fee increase of 75% on individuals who earn \$700 a month. This is unconscionable. Please vote against the fee increase.

Rev. Venus Young, a resident of Stewart Point, asked the question, “How can a person, living on a fixed income, pay the proposed rate increase?” Please waive the stormwater rate fee on those citizens who are on a fixed income and who have a difficulty making ends meet.

After calling twice more for public comment and receiving none, the Chairman declared the hearing closed at 6:21 p.m.

It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, as Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee (no second required), that Council approve on first reading an ordinance to amend the Stormwater Management Utility Ordinance as adopted August 22, 2005 to provide for the amendment of the rate structure, adjust utility rates, and to modify certain terms to accurately reflect the

administration structure (to adopt Rate Structure E). The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. NAYS – Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson and Mr. McBride. The motion passed.

**MOTION TO EXTEND BEYOND 8:00 P.M.**

It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mrs. Howard, that Council extend beyond 8:00 p.m. The vote: YEAS - Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Flewelling, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Sommerville and Mr. Stewart. NAYS – Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Vaux. The motion failed.

**MATTER ARISING OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION**

It was moved by Mrs. Howard, seconded by Mr. McBride, that Council approve fee title purchase in the amount of \$550,000 for the property known as the Shell Point property, located directly south of Parris Island Gateway and west of Shell Point Road. The property is zoned 11.92 acres +/- consisting of 19 tax parcels legally identified on the tax map as R100-33A parcels 26, 27, 168, 167, 166, 165, 164, 163, 172, 171, 170, 169, 22, 61, 56, 55, 54, 53 and 122. Acquisition will be made utilizing funds from the Beaufort County Rural and Critical Land Preservation Program. The vote: YEAS - Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mrs. Howard, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Sommerville, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. NAYS – Mrs. Bensch and Mr. Caporale. The motion passed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no requests to speak during public comment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Council adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY

By: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Paul Sommerville, Chairman

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne M. Rainey, Clerk to Council

Ratified:



# Memorandum

DATE: August 7, 2015  
TO: County Council  
FROM: Gary Kubic, County Administrator *Gary Kubic*  
SUBJ: County Administrator's Progress Report

The following is a summary of activities that took place Saturday, July 25, 2015 to Friday, August 7, 2015:

July 25, 2015 (Saturday)

- Guest speaker – Hilton Head Plantation Property Owners' Association

July 27, 2015 (Monday)

- Jim Beckert re: Auditor / First 30 Days
- Joshua Gruber, Philip Foot, Lt. Quandara Grant, and Suzanne Gregory re: Detention Center Employment Issues
- Employee New Hire Orientation
- Maria Walls re: Treasurer / First 30 Days
- Finance Committee
- Governmental Committee
- Caucus
- County Council

July 28, 2015 (Tuesday)

- Joshua Gruber and Attorney Tab Bendle re: Property Acquisition
- Mayor Billy Keyserling / William Prokop / Economic Development Prospect

July 29, 2015 (Wednesday)

- Donna Ownby re: EMS Status Report
- Joshua Gruber, Alicia Holland and Suzanne Gregory re: Segal Consulting Report
- Joshua Gruber / Tony Criscitiello / Economic Development Prospect
- Executive Committee re: Capital Project Sales Tax Commission

County Council  
August 7, 2015  
Page 2

July 30, 2015 (Thursday)

- Joshua Gruber, Tony Criscitiello, Councilman Tabor Vaux, Councilman Stu Rodman, Monica Spells, and Alicia Holland re: Daufuskie Island Infrastructure Needs

July 31, 2015 (Friday)

- Personal leave

August 3, 2015 (Monday)

- South Carolina Association of Counties Conference
- County / Town of Bluffton re: Kent Estates PUD Development Agreement and New Leaf, LLC TDR Application
- Bluffton Office

August 4, 2015 (Tuesday)

- Jim Baker, Thompson Engineering
- Joshua Gruber, Jon Rembold, Steve Riley and Charles Cousins re: Palmetto Hall MOU
- Joshua Gruber, Eric Larson, and Attorney Walter Nester re: Development Agreement Discussion

August 5, 2015 (Wednesday)

- Agenda Review with Chairman, Vice Chairman and Executive Staff re: Review Draft Agenda for August 10, 2015 County Council Meeting
- Eric Larson and Joshua Gruber re: Rate Study
- Scott Marshall re: PALS Update

August 6, 2015 (Thursday)

- Joshua Gruber, Tony Criscitiello, Hillary Austin, and Chuck Atkinson re: Blue Gray Estates Cottage Rental
- Joshua Gruber, Alicia Holland, Monica Spells / The Island Packet Editorial Board / Citizen Transparency – Maria Walls, Treasurer
- Colin Kinton re: Improved Access at Palmetto Bluff / Beaufort School District Campus

August 7, 2015 (Friday)

- Joshua Gruber, Monica Spells, Andrew Dalkos, and Mark Roseneau re: Old House Creek HHI Pier Security Cameras / Oakview Subdivision
- Mark Roseneau re: Facility Status Report



## Memorandum

DATE: August 7, 2015  
TO: County Council  
FROM: Joshua A. Gruber, Deputy County Administrator  
SUBJECT: Deputy County Administrator's Progress Report

---

The following is a summary of activities that took place July 27, 2015 through August 7, 2015:

July 27, 2015 (Monday):

- Gary Kubic, Phil Foot, Suzanne Gregory, and Colonel Quandara Grant re: Detention Center Employment Issues
- Finance Committee Meeting
- Governmental Committee Meeting
- County Council Meeting

July 28, 2015 (Tuesday):

- Eric Larsen re: Review of Public Works Director candidates information
- Gary Kubic and Attorney Tab Bendle re: Property Acquisition
- Meeting re: Design of New Animal Control Facility

July 29, 2015 (Wednesday):

- D'Anne Haydel and Tom Keaveny re: Detention Center Mutual Aid Agreement (Beaufort and Orangeburg Counties)
- Gary Kubic, Alicia Holland and Suzanne Gregory re: Segal Consulting Report
- Gary Kubic / Tony Criscitiello / Economic Development Prospect
- Executive Committee re: Capital Project Sales Tax Commission

July 30, 2015 (Thursday):

- Dennis Thompson and SCDHEC re: Health Center
- Phil Foot and Hilton Head Humane Association re: Memorandum of Understanding with Beaufort County



- Gary Kubic, Tony Criscitiello, Councilman Tabor Vaux, Councilman Stu Rodman, Monica Spells, and Alicia Holland re: Daufuskie Island Infrastructure Needs

July 31, 2015 (Friday):

- Jon Rembold and Colin Kinton re: Lady's Island Airport
- Alicia Holland and Gene Hood re: Review of Public Defender's Office Finances

August 3, 2015 (Monday):

- South Carolina Association of Counties Conference
- South Carolina Annual CLE Meeting

August 4, 2015 (Tuesday):

- Gary Kubic, Jon Rembold, Steve Riley and Charles Cousins re: Palmetto Hall MOU
- Gary Kubic, Eric Larson and Attorney Walter Nester re: Development Agreement Discussion

August 5, 2015 (Wednesday):

- Agenda Review with Chairman, Vice Chairman and Executive Staff re: Review Draft Agenda for August 10, 2015 County Council Meeting
- Gary Kubic and Eric Larson re: Rate Study
- Engineering Coordination Standing Meeting with Rob McFee, Eric Larson, and Colin Kinton

August 6, 2015 (Thursday):

- Gary Kubic, Tony Criscitiello, Hillary Austin and Chuck Atkinson re: Blue Gray Estates Cottage Rental
- Gary Kubic, Alicia Holland, Monica Spells / The Island Packet Editorial Board / Citizen Transparency – Maria Walls, Treasurer
- Attend Median Beautification Board Meeting

August 7, 2015 (Friday):

- Tony Criscitiello, Tom Keaveny, Allison Coppage, Delores Frazier and Rob Merchant re: Pepper Hall/Graves Rezoning
- Gary Kubic, Monica Spells, Andrew Dalkos, and Mark Roseneau re: Old House Creek HHI Pier Security Cameras / Oakview Subdivision
- Tony Criscitiello, Colin Kinton, Jason Covington re: The Willows - Parking/Traffic Enforcement Regulations

## FINANCE COMMITTEE

July 27 2015

The electronic and print media duly notified in accordance with the State Freedom of Information Act.

The Finance Committee met Monday, July 27, 2015 beginning at 1:30 p.m., in the Executive Conference Room, Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

### ATTENDANCE

Chairman Jerry Stewart, Vice Chairman Steve Fobes and members Cynthia Bensch, Rick Caporale, Brian Flewelling, William McBride and Stu Rodman. Non-committee members Gerald Dawson, Alice Howard, and Paul Sommerville present. (Paul Sommerville, as County Council Chairman, serves as an *ex-officio* member of each standing committee of Council and is entitled to vote.)

County staff: Allison Coppage, Assistant County Attorney; Andrew Dalkos, Systems Management Director; Suzanne Gregory, Employee Services Director; Joshua Gruber, Deputy County Administrator/Special Counsel; Greg Hunt, Mosquito Control Director; Tom Keaveny, County Attorney; Gary Kubic, County Administrator; Dan Morgan, Mapping and Applications Director; Jim Minor, Solid Waste/Recycling Manager; Donna Ownby, EMS Director; Alicia Holland, Assistant County Administrator–Finance; Jon Rembold, Airports Director; and Dave Thomas, Purchasing Director.

Media: Joe Croley, *Lowcountry Inside Track*.

Public: Paul Boulware, Bluffton Township Fire Deputy Chief, and John Thompson, Bluffton Township Fire Chief.

Councilman Stewart chaired the meeting.

### ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**
  - Hauling Services for Solid Waste Department (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Republic Services in the amount of \$850,000 is for hauling services for the Solid Waste Department. This is an increase of \$1.00 per haul over fiscal year 2015, which totaled \$818,000. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste Hauling Services.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal for fiscal year 2016 to Republic Services, Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$850,000, for hauling services for the Solid Waste Department. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste Hauling Services. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal for fiscal year 2016 to Republic Services, Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$850,000, for hauling services for the Solid Waste Department. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste Hauling Services.

## **2. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Janitorial Services for County Facilities (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to A & B Cleaning Services, Inc. in the amount of \$585,828 is for janitorial services for County facilities. This renewal does not contain an increase over FY2015. Funding will come from the following accounts: 10001310-51210 Facilities Management, 51000011-51210 Lady's Island Airport, and 54000011-51210 Hilton Head Island Airport.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal, for fiscal year 2016, to A & B Cleaning Services, Inc., Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$585,828 for janitorial services for County facilities. Funding will come from the following accounts: 10001310-51210 Facilities Management, 51000011-51210 Lady's Island Airport, and 54000011-51210 Hilton Head Island Airport. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal for fiscal year 2016, to A & B Cleaning Services, Inc., Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$585,828 for janitorial services for County facilities. Funding will come from the following accounts: 10001310-51210 Facilities Management, 51000011-51210 Lady's Island Airport, and 54000011-51210 Hilton Head Island Airport.

### 3. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **Public Health Insecticides for Mosquito Control (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Clarke Mosquito Control Products, Inc., in the amount of \$315,000 is for public health insecticide for Mosquito Control. The state contract unit pricing has not increased as compared to FY2015. Funding will come from account 10001400-52320, Mosquito Control, Public Health Products.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal to Clarke Mosquito Control Products, Inc., St. Charles, Illinois, in the amount of \$315,000 for public health insecticides for Mosquito Control. Funding will come from account 10001400-52320, Mosquito Control, Public Health Products. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal to Clarke Mosquito Control Products, Inc., St. Charles, Illinois, in the amount of \$315,000 for public health insecticides for Mosquito Control. Funding will come from account 10001400-52320, Mosquito Control, Public Health Products.

### 4. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **Microsoft licensing, including structured query language (SQL) server licenses, for Beaufort County (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to CompuCom, originally provided in the amount of \$186,677, is for Microsoft licensing, including structured query language (SQL) server licenses, for Beaufort County. The remediation of the most recent Microsoft Exchange issues led to the ability to streamline our quantity of system users and it was determined that the Microsoft Enterprise Agreement renewal should be reduced to \$153,469. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110 Maintenance Contracts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal to CompuCom, Dallas, Texas in the amount of \$153,469 for Microsoft licensing, including structured query language (SQL) server licenses, for Beaufort County. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110 Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal to CompuCom, Dallas, Texas in the amount of \$153,469 for Microsoft licensing, including structured query language (SQL) server licenses, for Beaufort County. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110 Maintenance Contracts.

#### 5. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **Solid Waste Disposal (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to South Coast Logging in the amount of \$180,000 is for solid waste disposal. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Disposal.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal to South Coast Logging, Savannah, Georgia, in the amount of \$180,000 for solid waste disposal. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Disposal. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal to South Coast Logging, Savannah, Georgia, in the amount of \$180,000 for solid waste disposal. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Disposal.

#### 6. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **Property Assessment and Tax Software and Support for the Assessor, Auditor and Treasurer's Offices (> \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Manatron (Aumentum) in the amount of \$177,975 is for property assessment and tax software and support for the Assessor, Auditor and Treasurer's Offices. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, Assessor, Auditor and Treasurer, Maintenance Accounts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee approve and recommend Council award a contract renewal to Manatron (Aumentum), Chicago, Illinois, in the amount of \$177,975 for property assessment and tax software and support for the Assessor's, Auditor's and Treasurer's Offices. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, Assessor, Auditor and Treasurer, Maintenance Accounts. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council award a contract renewal to Manatron (Aumentum), Chicago, Illinois, in the amount of \$177,975 for property assessment and tax software and support for the Assessor's, Auditor's and Treasurer's Offices. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, Assessor, Auditor and Treasurer, Maintenance Accounts.

## 7. Consideration of Reappointments and Appointments

- Airports Board

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Caporale, that Committee approve and recommend Council nominate Harold Wallace, representing reside in close proximity (three-mile radius) of the Beaufort County Airport (Lady's Island), to serve as a member of the Airports Board. This is a partial-term appointment, which will expire February 2017 and take 6/11 votes to appoint. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council nominate Harold Wallace, representing active/recently retired commercial pilot, for appointment to serve as a member of the Airports Board. This is a partial-term appointment, which will expire February 2017 and take 6/11 votes to appoint.

## 8. Consideration / Contract Award

- Bluffton Township Fire District Fleet Replacement (> \$100,000)

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Dave Thomas, Purchasing Director, and Bluffton Township Fire Chief John Thompson, reviewed this item with the Committee. The Bluffton Township Fire District's (District) strategic five-year master plan identified the need to purchase a new fire engine for each year beginning in Fiscal Year 2015 through Fiscal Year 2024, with the exception of Fiscal

Years 2016 and 2023. The District realized a potential savings could occur if all identified units (ten) were replaced at one time. This would allow multiple unit discounts, prepayment savings and would help in standardizing our equipment operationally and mechanically. The Beaufort County Purchasing Department worked with the District to issue a Request for Proposal to evaluate fire truck vendors and select one that would be best suited. This fleet replacement is part of the capital plan that contains three projects. In FY2015, Council approved this capital plan and adopted ordinance 2015/3 to issue bonds in the amount of \$8.5 million to fund this capital plan.

Three companies submitted proposals and participated in an interview to present further details. The District recommends a contract award with Spartan Fire and Emergency Apparatus in the amount of \$4,126,920 to construct and deliver to the District ten new fire engines. Subsequently, the District is requesting approval to enter into a contract with Palmetto Fire Apparatus to purchase the current Bluffton engine fleet for \$425,000 with the full amount becoming due and payable to the District upon the delivery of the first new fire engine from Spartan Fire and Emergency Apparatus.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Caporale, that Committee approve and recommend Council approve a contract award to Spartan Fire and Emergency Apparatus, Inc., Roebuck, South Carolina, in the amount of \$4,126,920 for the purchase of ten fire trucks. Funding will come from Bluffton Township Fire District account 73040011-57800. Subsequently, Council approve the District entering into a contract with Palmetto Fire Apparatus to purchase the current Bluffton engine fleet for \$425,000. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council approve a contract award to Spartan Fire and Emergency Apparatus, Inc., Roebuck, South Carolina, in the amount of \$4,126,920 for the purchase of ten fire trucks. Funding will come from Bluffton Township Fire District account 73040011-57800. Subsequently, Council approve the District entering into a contract with Palmetto Fire Apparatus to purchase the current Bluffton engine fleet for \$425,000. Funding will come from Bluffton Township Fire District account 73040011-57800.

#### **9. Consideration / Proposed Hangar Rate Increases at HXD 3% and ARW 5%**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Jon Rembold, Airports Director, reviewed this item with the Committee.

#### Hilton Head Island Airport Hangar Rental Rate Increase

Mr. Rembold informed the Committee of his recommendation and the Airports Board's approval to increase the hangar rental lease agreements at Hilton Head Island Airport (HXD), effective August 1, 2015, to reflect a 3% increase in hangar rental rates. Currently, the base rental rate is \$406.65 and Signature Flight Support added 3% onto the rental rate for a total

monthly hangar lease payment in the amount of \$418.85. Due to the fact that the Airport will begin managing the hangar leasing program as of August 1, 2015, the monthly lease payments for tenants would remain the same amount of \$418.85 due to the 3% concession fee charged by Signature Flight Support being eliminated. Signature Flight Support currently retains 15% of the hangar revenue as a management fee. This is approximately \$1,700 per month. It is recommended that effective August 1, 2015, when the Airport begins managing the hangar leases, Signature Flight Support will be paid \$1,000 per month for a management fee to provide aircraft towing for the tenants. This will allow for an additional \$700 per month in revenue at the Hilton Head Island Airport.

#### Beaufort County Airport hangar Rental Rate Increase

Mr. Rembold informed the Committee of his recommendation and the Airports Board's approval to increase the hangar rental lease agreements at the Beaufort County Airport (ARW) to reflect a 5% increase in hangar rental rates. The new rate would be \$311 per month.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Fobes, that Committee approve and recommend Council approve a 3% increase in hangar rental rates at the Hilton Head Island Airport/HXD (a monthly rate of \$418.85) and a 5% increase in hangar rental rates at the Beaufort County Airport/ARW (a monthly rate of \$311.00). The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

Mr. Flewelling requested staff provide Council a copy of the current contract with Signature Flight Support.

**Recommendation:** Council approve a 3% increase in hangar rental rates at the Hilton Head Island Airport/HXD (a monthly rate of \$418.85) and a 5% increase in hangar rental rates at the Beaufort County Airport/ARW (a monthly rate of \$311.00).

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

##### **10. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Annual Support and License Agreement for Munis (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Tyler Technologies, in the amount of \$85,381, is for annual support and license agreement for Munis. Funding will come from the following accounts; 10001111-51110 Finance, 10001116-51110 Purchasing, 10001134-51110 Business License, 10001160-51110 Employee Services, 10001260-51110 Building Codes, 20010011-



51110 Local Accommodations Tax, 20020011-51110 Hospitality Tax, and 20100011-51110 Admission Fees.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Tyler Technologies, Dallas, Texas, in the amount of \$85,381 for annual support and license agreement for Munis. Funding will come from the following accounts; 10001111-51110 Finance, 10001116-51110 Purchasing, 10001134-51110 Business License, 10001160-51110 Employee Services, 10001260-51110 Building Codes, 20010011-51110 Local Accommodations Tax, 20020011-51110 Hospitality Tax, and 20100011-51110 Admission Fees. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Tyler Technologies, Dallas, Texas, in the amount of \$85,381 for annual support and license agreement for Munis. Funding will come from the following accounts; 10001111-51110 Finance, 10001116-51110 Purchasing, 10001134-51110 Business License, 10001160-51110 Employee Services, 10001260-51110 Building Codes, 20010011-51110 Local Accommodations Tax, 20020011-51110 Hospitality Tax, and 20100011-51110 Admission Fees.

#### **11. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Veterinary and Spay/Neuter Services (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to the Hilton Head Humane Association, in the amount of \$85,000, is for veterinary and spay/neuter services for the Beaufort County Animal Shelter. Funding will come from accounts 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Professional Services and 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Spay/Neuter.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to the Hilton Head Humane Association, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, in the amount of 85,000, for veterinary and spay/neuter services for the Beaufort County Animal Shelter. Funding will come from accounts 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Professional Services and 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Spay/Neuter. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to the Hilton Head Humane Association, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, in the amount of 85,000, for veterinary and spay/neuter services for the Beaufort County Animal Shelter. Funding will come from accounts 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Professional Services and 10001270-51160 Animal Control, Spay/Neuter.

## 12. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **Hazardous Waste Collection Services (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Care Environmental Corporation, in the amount of \$80,000, is for hazardous waste collection services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Professional Services.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Care Environmental Corporation, Dover, New Jersey, in the amount of \$80,000, for hazardous waste collection services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Professional Services. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Care Environmental Corporation, Dover, New Jersey, in the amount of \$80,000 for hazardous waste collection services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51160, Solid Waste, Professional Services.

## 13. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal

- **License Image Software/Aerial Photos (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Pictometry International Corporation, in the amount of \$70,444, is for license image software/aerial photos. Funding will come from account 10001152-51250, GIS, Aerial Photos.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Pictometry International Corporation, Rochester, New York, in the amount of \$70,444, for license image software/aerial photos. Funding will come from account 10001152-51250, GIS, Aerial Photos. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Pictometry International Corporation, Rochester, New York, in the amount of \$70,444 for license image software/aerial photos. Funding will come from account 10001152-51250, GIS, Aerial Photos.

#### **14. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Court Management System Support (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to South Carolina Judicial Department, in the amount of \$60,000, is for court management system support. Funding will come from account 10001030-51110 Clerk of Court, Maintenance Contracts and account 10001081-51110 Magistrate, Maintenance Contracts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to South Carolina Judicial Department, Columbia, South Carolina, in the amount of \$60,000, for court management system support. Funding will come from account 10001030-51110 Clerk of Court, Maintenance Contracts and account 10001081-51110 Magistrate, Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to South Carolina Judicial Department, Columbia, South Carolina, in the amount of \$60,000, for court management system support. Funding will come from account 10001030-51110 Clerk of Court, Maintenance Contracts and account 10001081-51110 Magistrate, Maintenance Contracts.

#### **15. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Electronic Waste Recycling Services (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Strickland Electric Recycling, in the amount of \$60,000, for electronic waste recycling services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51164, Solid Waste, Ewaste.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Strickland Electric Recycling, North, South Carolina, in the amount of \$60,000, for electronic waste recycling services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51164, Solid Waste, Ewaste. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Strickland Electric Recycling, North, South Carolina, in the amount of \$60,000 for electronic waste recycling services. Funding will come from account 10001340-51164, Solid Waste, Ewaste.

#### **16. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Hardware and Software Support and Training (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal to Hewlett-Packard Company, in the amount of \$54,022, is for hardware and software support and training. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, MIS, Maintenance Contracts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Hewlett-Packard Company, Roseville, California, in the amount of \$54,022, for hardware and software support and training. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, MIS, Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Hewlett-Packard Company, Roseville, California, in the amount of \$54,022 for hardware and software support and training. Funding will come from account 10001150-51110, MIS, Maintenance Contracts.

#### **17. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Official Records Software and Maintenance Support (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewals were discussed and voted on as Consent Agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This is a contract renewal to New Visions Systems in the amount of \$51,028 for official records software and maintenance support. Funding will come from account 10001122-51110, Register of Deeds, Maintenance Contracts.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to New Vision Systems, New Canaan, Connecticut, in the amount of \$51,028, for official records software and maintenance support. Funding will come from account 10001122-51110, Register of Deeds, Maintenance Contracts. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract to New Vision Systems, New Canaan, Connecticut, in the amount of \$51,028, for official records software and maintenance support. Funding will come from account 10001122-51110, Register of Deeds, Maintenance Contracts.

#### **18. Consideration / Fiscal Year 2016 Contract Renewal**

- **Hauling Services for Daufuskie Island (< \$100,000)**

Fiscal Year 2016 contract renewals were discussed and voted on as consent agenda items.

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** This contract renewal for Republic Services, in the amount of \$50,000, is for hauling services for Daufuskie Island. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Hauling Services.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Rodman, that Committee award a contract renewal to Republic Services, Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$50,000 for hauling services for Daufuskie Island. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Hauling Services. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract renewal to Republic Services, Beaufort, South Carolina, in the amount of \$50,000 for hauling services for Daufuskie Island. Funding will come from account 10001340-51165, Solid Waste, Solid Waste Hauling Services.

#### **19. Consideration / Contract Award**

- **Mosquito Control Department Two New 2015/2016 Chevrolet 4x4 ½-Ton Trucks from State Contract (< \$100,000)**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Dave Thomas, Purchasing Director, reviewed this item with the Committee. The Purchasing Department received a request from the Mosquito Control Department to purchase two new 2015 or 2016 Chevrolet Silverado 4x4 ½-ton trucks, with winches and tow packages, from Love Chevrolet, a State contract vendor. The trucks will be used to support Mosquito Control and Emergency Management. The new vehicles will replace a 2007 Ford F-150 4x4 ½ ton truck with 210,861 miles and a 1999 Dodge Ram 4x2 ½ ton truck with 173,314 miles. First Vehicles Services recommends replacing these vehicles due to high mileage and repair costs. Each truck will cost \$26,662 and will come from account 10001400-54000, Vehicle Purchases.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. McBride, that Committee award a contract to Love Chevrolet, Columbia, South Carolina in the amount of \$53,324 (\$26,662 each) for the purchase of two new 2015 or 2016 Chevrolet Silverado 4x4 ½-ton trucks, with winches and tow packages, to be used by Mosquito Control and Emergency Management. Funding will come from account 10001400-54000, Vehicle Purchases. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee approved the purchase of two new 2015 or 2016 Chevrolet Silverado 4x4 ½-ton trucks, with winches and tow packages, from Love Chevrolet, Columbia, South Carolina in the amount of \$53,324 (\$26,662 each) to be used Mosquito Control and Emergency Management. Funding will come from account 10001400-54000, Vehicle Purchases.

## 20. Consideration / Contract Award

- **Employee Health Benefit Consulting Services (< \$100,000)**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Dave Thomas, Purchasing Director, reviewed this contract with the Committee. The Purchasing Department received four responses to a Request for Proposal for Employee Health Benefit Consulting Services. The staff evaluation committee reviewed the responses and interviewed four firms. After the interviews, the Committee selected Wells Fargo Insurance Services as the number one ranked firm. There are no changes to the scope of services required, and the cost is \$20,000 less than last year. The vendor will provide benefit and consulting services on all lines of coverage. They will make recommendations and assist with plan design, plan changes, contract negotiations and open enrollment setup and processing. They will provide information and assistance with legal compliance, including the Affordable Care Act, as well as HIPAA compliance and market trends and opportunities. The contract term will cover the current fiscal year, and allow for three additional one-year renewals subject to Council approval. Funding will come from account 10001160-51160, Employee Services, Professional Services.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. McBride, seconded by Mr. Fobes, that Committee award a contract to Wells Fargo Insurance Services, Charleston, South Carolina, in the amount of \$65,000 to provide employee health benefit consulting services. Funding will come from account 10001160-51160, Employee Services, Professional Services. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract to Wells Fargo Insurance Services, Charleston, South Carolina, in the amount of \$65,000 to provide employee health benefit consulting services. Funding will come from account 10001160-51160, Employee Services, Professional Services.

## 21. Consideration / Contract Award

- **Three New Life-Pak 15 Cardiac Monitor/Defibrillators and Accessories for Emergency Medical Service Department (< \$100,000)**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Dave Thomas, Purchasing Director, reviewed this item with the Committee. The Purchasing Department received a request from the EMS Director to purchase three new Life-Pak 15 (LP15) cardiac monitor/defibrillators and accessories to be used by the EMS Department. The LP15 monitor-defibrillator is designed to help accurately diagnose and treat patients, with features such as easy and quick acquisition of baseline vital signs, 12-lead ECG and carbon monoxide monitoring. The three LP15 monitors will allow for the replacement of outdated cardiac monitors. The LP15's will be placed on the three busiest front line ambulances within the County and the old monitors will be traded in to Physio-Control for credit. Funding will come from 10001230-54200, EMS, Specialized Capital Equipment.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. McBride, that Committee award a contract to Physio-Control, Inc., Redmond, Washington, in the amount of \$99,327.77 for the purchase of three new Life-Pak 15 cardiac monitor defibrillators and accessories. Funding will come from 10001230-54200, EMS, Specialized Capital Equipment. The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch, Mr. Caporale, Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Fobes, Mr. McBride, Mr. Rodman and Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Status:** Committee awarded a contract to Physio-Control, Inc., Redmond, Washington; in the amount of \$99,327.77 for the purchase of three new Life-Pak 15 cardiac monitor defibrillators and accessories. Funding will come from 10001230-54200, EMS, Specialized Capital Equipment.

## 22. Consideration / Local 3% Accommodations Tax

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Joshua Gruber, Deputy County Administrator / Special Counsel, provided the Committee with a working list of potential Accommodations/Hospitality Tax Funded Projects. The list contained both projects the County is or has provided funding towards, as well as potential new projects, all of which would follow under the guidelines of Accommodations (local 3%) or Hospitality Tax Projects. The list contained the following projects:

- USCB Auditorium AV Replacement
- Arts Center of Coastal Carolina
- Hunting Island Life Guards

- Santa Elena Foundation
- Camp St. Mary's
- Spanish Moss Trail
- Fort Freemont Interpretive Center
- Boat Ramp – installation / repair
- Median Beautification
- Okatie Regional Park
- New Riverside Park
- Mitchellville
- Town of Bluffton requests
- Eagle's Field – renovations / enhancements
- Minor League Baseball Sports Complex.

After much discussion, the Committee decided the direction forward would be to obtain presentations from the various organizations to provide an overview of each of the projects.

**Status:** Information only.

### **23. Consideration of Reappointments and Appointments**

- **Tax Equalization Board**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Status:** No discussion or action taken on this item at this time.



## GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE

July 27, 2015

The electronic and print media duly notified in accordance with the State Freedom of Information Act.

The Governmental Committee met Monday, July 27, 2015 beginning at 2:30 p.m. in the Executive Conference Room, Administration Building, Beaufort County Government Robert Smalls Complex, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

### ATTENDANCE

Chairman Stu Rodman, Vice Chairman Rick Caporale, and Committee members Cynthia Bensch, Gerald Dawson, Brian Flewelling, Alice Howard and Jerry Stewart. Non-Committee members Steve Fobes, William McBride, Paul Sommerville and Tabor Vaux present. (Paul Sommerville, as County Council Chairman, serves as an *ex-officio* member of each standing committee of Council and is entitled to vote.)

County Staff: Allison Coppage, Assistant County Attorney; Joshua Gruber, Deputy County Administrator/Special Counsel; Thomas Keaveny, County Attorney; and Gary Kubic, County Administrator.

Public: Cary Crantford, Crantford Research; Frank Denmark; W.R. Skeet Von Harten, Military Enhancement Committee; Jim Wegmann, Military Enhancement Committee Chairman; Chairman; Blakely Williams, President/CEO Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce; Mig Williams; and Pastor Venus Young.

Media: Joe Croley, *Lowcountry Inside Track*.

Mr. Rodman chaired the meeting.

### ACTION ITEM

#### 1. Economic Development Discussion

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Committee Chairman Stu Rodman stated a resolution was approved to move forward with an Economic Development Commission, that it would rely heavily on public finance, and we would have to have product. The next step is for Committee to recommend to the Council adoption of a resolution authorizing the County Administrator to prepare the necessary documents to establish a nonprofit economic corporation to coordinate and implement economic development plans and initiatives for Beaufort County.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Flewelling, seconded by Mr. Dawson, that Committee approve and recommend to Council the adoption of a resolution authorizing the County Administrator to prepare the necessary documents to establish a nonprofit economic corporation to coordinate and implement economic development plans and initiatives for Beaufort County.

**Motion to amend by substitution:** It was moved by Mrs. Bensch, seconded by Mr. Caporale, that the Committee amend the last whereas from “one county council representative and two representatives appointed by the board” to “two county council representatives and one representative appointed by the board.” The vote: YEAS – Mrs. Bensch. NAYS – Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. The motion failed.

**Vote on main motion:** The vote: YEAS – Mr. Caporale, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. NAYS – Mrs. Bensch. ABSTAIN – Mr. Stewart. The motion passed.

**Recommendation:** Council adopt a resolution authorizing the County Administrator to prepare the necessary documents to establish a nonprofit economic corporation to coordinate and implement economic development plans and initiatives for Beaufort County.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **2. Community Issues**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Pastor Venus Young spoke before the Committee on several issues / concerns within the community. These issues / concerns are as follows:

- Young men and women walking around with visible under clothes displayed. The Town of Ridgeland passed an ordinance to prohibit such display.
- Breaking and entering of people’s homes. There are too many weapons on the streets.

**Status:** Information only.

### **3. Update / Military Enhancement Committee**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mr. Skeet Von Harten, who has served as a member of the Military Enhancement Committee (MEC) on and off since 1993, stated the current Committee is the best

he has ever seen. He introduced Mr. Jim Wegmann, MEC Chairman, and Mr. Cary Crantford, Crantford Research, who spoke before the Committee.

Mr. Wegmann provided the Committee with an overview of the MEC as well as military facts. The MEC is chartered to enhance the quality and value of the military installations of Beaufort County and lay the framework to defend our three military bases with regard to any threats, including base realignment and closure, and to establish procedures and contingency plans in the event one or more of these military installations is closed or realigned. The MEC is publicly funded, where the dollars go towards consulting services, as well as advocacy trips.

In March 2015, MEC met with economic and political leaders of Savannah, Ft. Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield to promote to Congress and the Pentagon the regional synergies among the military bases throughout South Carolina and Georgia to include the following: four major deep water ports, longest military operating areas in the Eastern United States, Townsend Bombing Range, live ordnance ranges at Ft. Stewart, and two of the three longest runways in the Eastern United States. This has been the first effort ever of a community group promoting an entire region, rather than areas.

Mr. Wegmann stated the annual economic impact of MCAS Beaufort, MCRD Parris Island and Naval Hospital Beaufort amounts to \$1.498 billion. Between the three installations in Beaufort County, there are 12,826 military-related jobs and \$704 million of labor income. He also provided the Committee with highlights of the installations. The MCAS Beaufort is the only F-35B Joint Strike Fighter Pilot Training Center in the world. We welcomed our first F-35B Squadron, VMFAT-501, in July of 2014. This year MCRD Parris Island will have its Centennial Celebration for 100 years of making Marines. In 2014, 15,820 recruits were trained at MCRD Parris Island.

Mr. Cary Crantford presented the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation on the MEC Confidential Community Survey. Crantford Research conducted a live operator telephone survey on residents of Beaufort County. The summary of findings is as follows:

- There are very few direct criticism or complaints about the military establishments in the Beaufort community. Specific concerns were noise and the fact that the presence of military establishments in the area makes the community a target.
- Two of the military establishments tested for awareness (Air Station and Parris Island) had a favorable awareness scores above 70%. The Navy Hospital was the least known entity of the establishments tested.
- Spending/economic impact of local military establishments is seen as having a major favorable impact on the economic wellbeing of the area. Military spending is rated as having a higher local impact than tourism, retiree and general business spending.
- Over 6 out of 10 local residents are aware that the federal government is engaged in considering base closings and restructuring.
- Less than 50% of all Beaufort County residents are aware that the BRAC process could make changes in local military establishments.

- Over 70% of all Beaufort County residents believe the local military establishments should be encouraged to expand as part of the country's military preparedness and because the establishments contribute significantly to the local economy.
- Residents are only somewhat likely to see base expansion as being a useful way to diversify the local economy.
- Only 8% of all residents believe the local military establishments should be closed to help reduce federal taxes.
- However, 46% of all residents agree that future local military growth should be limited in order to preserve land and reduce noise pollution.

**Status:** Information only.

#### 4. Pending Revisions to Animal Control Ordinance

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Mrs. Allison Coppage, Assistant County Attorney, reviewed the proposed animal control ordinance and the following changes which were discussed at the previous meeting (new text is underscored):

##### Section 14.27, Definitions

- Dub – to trim or remove

##### Section 14.32, Dangerous Animals

- Paragraph B - Declaration of a Dangerous Animal, Confinement Requirements, and Final Determination of Danger Animal Declaration:
  1. Declaration. An animal services officer or law enforcement officer, in his or her discretion, may declare an animal dangerous. Upon determination, the officer shall deliver written notice to the owner or any adult residing at the premises where the animal is located or by posting on the premises if no adult is present. The notice shall include a description of the animal, a hearing date, confinement requirements and registration requirements.
  2. Confinement Requirements and Registration. Every dangerous animal, as determined under this section, shall be confined by the owner within 72 hours of the notice of dangerous dog determination and until the final determination of the dangerous dog declaration:
  3. Final Determination of Dangerous Animal Declaration. Notice of a Declaration of a Dangerous Animal constitutes an initial determination that the animal is dangerous or potentially dangerous. A final determination shall be made by the Beaufort County Magistrate Court within thirty (30) days or as soon as practicable.
- New Section, Paragraph C - Exemptions. A dog working in a law enforcement capacity with a governmental agency and in the performance of the dog's official duties.

### **Section 14.35, Animal Cruelty**

- *New Section, Paragraph E, Unlawful Tethering* - No person owning or keeping a dog shall chain or tether a dog to a stationary object, including, but not limited to, a structure, dog house, pole, stake, or tree for longer than 24 consecutive hours. A tethering device employed shall not allow the dog to leave the owner's, guardian's or keeper's property. The tether shall be designed for dogs and devices not designed for tethering dogs shall not be used. No chain or tether shall weigh more than 1/8 of the dog's body weight. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a person from walking a dog on a handheld leash. No dog under the age of 6 months shall be tethered outside for any length of time, unless under direct supervision of an adult over the age of eighteen (18) years old.

### **Section 14.36, Sale of Animals, Pets or Livestock**

- *Paragraph C* – No person shall sell, offer for sale, or give away any animal, pet or livestock under five (5) weeks of age, except as surrender to the county animal services facility or to a licensed pet rescue organization.

### **Section 14.38, Impoundment**

- *Paragraph A* – Any pet or livestock found within the county in violation of the provisions of this chapter may be caught and impounded by BCAS. BCAS may, thereafter, make available for adoption or humanely euthanize impounded pets or livestock not positively identified or redeemed within five (5) working days.

### **Section 14.40, Adoption**

- *Paragraph D* – The county animal services director or designee shall have the authority to refuse adoption of any animal to any person deemed unable to provide proper shelter, confinement, medical care and food or to any person who has a past history of inhumane treatment of or neglect to pets or livestock. Any person seeking adoption of a pet or livestock more frequently than ninety (90) days from the last adoption shall be subject to refusal of adoption. Any person who has been refused adoption of a pet or livestock may appeal his case to the assistant county administrator for public safety. If any person surrenders an owned pet or livestock to the animal services department, they will not be able to adopt a pet or livestock for ninety (90) days from the date of the original surrender.

Mrs. Coppage noted that after researching the request from the previous meeting concerning the possibility of setting up a board, she learned of a Memorandum issued by Chief Justice Toll from 2009 wherein a County ordinance cannot create another tier of courts for infractions or ordinance violations. We have a unified judicial system. Local governments cannot delegate the responsibilities of such. The municipalities within Beaufort County may agree to allow enforcement of Beaufort County ordinances within the confines of the municipality. The magistrate court has countywide jurisdiction. The significance of this is if the municipalities adopt this ordinance, they can agree to allow a magistrate court to enforce it.

Mr. Fobes stated the municipalities do not have to agree, but they may agree.

Mrs. Coppage stated municipalities can choose not to agree. At that point the County would not provide animal control services within that jurisdiction.

Mr. Caporale spoke of the inconsistencies in animal services between the County and municipalities. Cases are treated differently. He felt that the adoption of the ordinance should be held in abeyance until the County has an opportunity to hear from the municipalities.

Mrs. Coppage stated that once Council has an ordinance, the intent is to reach out to the municipalities for comment.

Mrs. Bensch feels this ordinance needs to be held in abeyance because of a pending court case. She would like to thoroughly go through the working ordinance before moving forward.

Mr. Caporale wanted to know why there is only a five-year wait period for individuals who have been convicted of animal abuse. Mr. Rodman replied that it is merely a matter of policy.

**Motion:** It was moved by Mr. Dawson, seconded by Mrs. Howard, that Committee approve the revisions made within the working draft of the Animal Control Ordinance.

**Motion to postpone:** It was moved by Mrs. Bensch that Committee postpone adopting the revisions made to the working draft of the Animal Control Ordinance. The motion died for a lack of a second.

The vote: YEAS – Mr. Dawson, Mr. Flewelling, Mrs. Howard, Mr. Rodman, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Vaux. NAYS – Mrs. Bensch and Mr. Caporale. The motion passed.

**Status:** The Committee approved the revisions made to the Animal Control Ordinance and directed staff to begin engagement with municipalities.

##### **5. Request for Discussion Topics / Legislative Policy Issues**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Discussion:** Committee Chairman Stu Rodman provided the Committee with a copy of last year's legislative policy issues. He asked Committee members to begin thinking about issues they may want to move forward.

**Status:** Information only.

**6. Consideration of Reappointments and Appointments**  
**a. Burton Fire District Commission**

**Notification:** To view video of full discussion of this meeting please visit [http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](http://beaufort.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

**Status:** No action taken.

**DRAFT**

## BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

### Reappointments and Appointments August 10, 2015

#### 1. Community Services Committee

##### ① Airports Board

Nominated	Name	Position/Area/Expertise	Reappoint/Appoint	Votes Required	Term/Years	Expiration
07.27.15	Harold Wallace	Close proximity to Beaufort County Lady's Island Airport ARW	Appoint	6/11	Partial	Febuary 2017



**RESOLUTION NO:** \_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE  
THROUGH BLANKET BOND**

**WHEREAS,** South Carolina Code of Laws requires statutory bonds for certain County Officials and employees; and

**WHEREAS,** Beaufort County desires to supplement its existing bond coverages; and

**WHEREAS,** Section 12-13-20, SC Code of Laws, authorizes the use of a blanket bond to fulfill the bonding requirements set forth therein upon approval by County Council and County Attorney; and

**WHEREAS,** a blanket fidelity bond provides increased coverage at a lower rate and requires less administrative time and attention; and

**WHEREAS,** a blanket fidelity bond provides the County with a more convenient and efficient method of bonding County officials and employees; and

**WHEREAS,** a blanket fidelity bond covers the County positions, not just named individuals, and thus does not need to be repurchased with changes in officials and employees; and

**WHEREAS,** for a de minimis sum County can expand already existing coverage for its deputy sheriffs through the purchase of a blanket bond.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** by Beaufort County Council that the County Administrator and/or his designated representative is hereby authorized and empowered to execute any and all documents necessary to supplement existing coverages and to purchase blanket fidelity bond(s) in an amount meeting or exceeding the minimum value of the bond required by Section 23-13-20, South Carolina Code of Laws.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_\_ day of August, 2015.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
D. Paul Sommerville, Chairman

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Keaveny, II, Beaufort County Attorney

2015 /

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY ORDINANCE AS ADOPTED AUGUST 22, 2005 TO PROVIDE FOR AMENDMENT OF THE RATE STRUCTURE, ADJUST UTILITY RATES, AND TO MODIFY CERTAIN TERMS TO ACCURATELY REFLECT ADMINISTRATION STRUCTURE**

**WHEREAS**, Act 283 of 1975, The Home Rule Act, vested Beaufort County Council with the independent authority to control all acts and powers of local governmental authority that are not expressly prohibited by South Carolina law; and

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 99, Article II, "Stormwater Management Utility" was adopted on August 27, 2001 and was modified by ordinance on August 22, 2005; and

**WHEREAS**, Stormwater Management Utility was established for the purpose of managing, acquiring, constructing, protecting, operating, maintaining, enhancing, controlling, and regulating the use of stormwater drainage systems in the county; and

**WHEREAS, to meet the increasing demands on the Stormwater Management Utility in the areas of federally mandated municipal Separate Stormsewer Systems (MS4) permitting, capital project needs, and cost of service of operations and maintenance, as well as an evolving understanding of the impacts of the urban environment on water quality, the Stormwater Management Utility finds it necessary to amend the structure in which rates are determined and adjust the rates charged to the citizens of Beaufort County to meet said demands in a fair and equitable manner; and**

**WHEREAS**, the administrative structure of the Stormwater Management Utility needs to be amended to reflect the organization of the current administration; and

**WHEREAS**, Beaufort County Council believes to best provide for the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens it is appropriate to amend Chapter 99, Article II of the Beaufort County Code and to provide for additional terms to said Article; and

**WHEREAS**, text that is underscored shall be added text and text ~~lined through~~ shall be deleted text.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY BEAUFORT COUNTY COUNCIL**, that Chapter 99, Article II of the Beaufort County Code is hereby amended and replaced with the following:

Chapter 99 - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY

ARTICLE I. - IN GENERAL

Secs. 99-1—99-100. - Reserved.

ARTICLE II. - STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITY

Sec. 99-101. - Findings of fact.

The County Council of Beaufort County, South Carolina, makes the following findings of fact:

- (a) The professional engineering and financial analyses conducted on behalf of and submitted to the county properly assesses and defines the stormwater management problems, needs, goals, program priorities, costs of service, need for interlocal cooperation, and funding opportunities of the county.
- (b) Given the problems, needs, goals, program priorities, costs of service, needs for interlocal cooperation, and funding opportunities identified in the professional engineering and financial analyses submitted to the county, it is appropriate to authorize the establishment of a separate enterprise accounting unit which shall be dedicated specifically to the management, construction, maintenance, protection, control, regulation, use, and enhancement of stormwater systems and programs in Beaufort County in concert with other water resource management programs.
- (c) Stormwater management is applicable and needed throughout the unincorporated portions of Beaufort County, but interlocal cooperation between the county and the incorporated cities and towns within the county is also essential to the efficient provision of stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. Intense urban development in some portions of the county has radically altered the natural hydrology of the area and the hydraulics of stormwater systems, with many natural elements having been replaced or augmented by man-made facilities. Other areas of the county remain very rural in character, with natural stormwater systems predominating except along roads where ditches and culverts have been installed. As a result, the specific program, service, system, and facility demands differ from area to area in the county. While the county manages, operates, and improves stormwater programs, services, systems and facilities in the rural as well as urban areas, the need for improved stormwater management is greatest in the urban areas and nearby, including areas within incorporated cities and towns. Therefore, a stormwater utility service area subject to stormwater service fees should encompass, in so far as possible through interlocal agreements, the entirety of Beaufort County and the stormwater management utility service fee rate structure should reflect the amount of impervious area on individual properties and the runoff impact from water quantity and water quality.
- (d) The stormwater needs in Beaufort County include but are not limited to protecting the public health, safety, and welfare. Provision of stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities therefore renders and/or results in both service and benefit to individual properties, property owners, citizens, and residents of the county and to properties, property owners, citizens, and residents of the county concurrently in a variety of ways as identified in the professional engineering and financial analyses.
- (e) The service and benefit rendered or resulting from the provision of stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities may differ over time depending on many factors and considerations, including but not limited to location, demands and impacts imposed on the stormwater programs, systems, and facilities, and risk exposure. It is not practical to allocate the cost of the county's stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities in direct and precise relationship to the services or benefits rendered to or received by individual properties or persons over a brief span of time, but it is both practical and equitable to allocate the cost of stormwater management among properties and persons in proportion to the long-term demands they impose on the county's stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities which render or result in services and benefits.

- (f) Beaufort County presently owns and operates stormwater management systems and facilities that have been developed, installed, and acquired through various mechanisms over many years. The future usefulness and value of the existing stormwater systems and facilities owned and operated by Beaufort County, and of future additions and improvements thereto, rests on the ability of the county to effectively manage, construct, protect, operate, maintain, control, regulate, use, and enhance the stormwater systems and facilities in the county, in concert with the management of other water resources in the county and in cooperation with the incorporated cities and towns. In order to do so, the county must have adequate and stable funding for its stormwater management program operating and capital investment needs.
- (g) The county council finds, concludes, and determines that a stormwater management utility provides the most practical and appropriate means of properly delivering stormwater management services and benefits throughout the county, and the most equitable means to fund stormwater services in the county through stormwater service fees and other mechanisms as described in the professional engineering and financial analyses prepared for the county.
- (h) The county council finds, concludes, and determines that a schedule of stormwater utility service fees be levied upon and collected from the owners of all lots, parcels of real estate, and buildings that discharge stormwater or subsurface waters, directly or indirectly, to the county stormwater management system and that the proceeds of such charges so derived be used for the stormwater management system.
- (i) The county council finds that adjustments and credits against stormwater utility service fees are an appropriate means to grant properties providing stormwater management program services that would otherwise be provided by the county and will afford Beaufort County cost savings. These reductions will be developed by the Beaufort County engineer Stormwater Manager and will be reviewed on an annual basis to allow for any modifications to practices required by Beaufort County.

~~The county council finds that both the total gross area and impervious area on each property are the most important factors influencing the cost of stormwater management in Beaufort County and, the runoff impact from water quantity and water quality. In determining the basis for a stormwater management utility fee, the county council finds that it is appropriate to remove the amount of land area on each property that is designated as river or marsh as these areas are vital portions of the county's stormwater management program.~~

Sec. 99-102. - Establishment of a stormwater management utility and a utility enterprise fund.

There is hereby established within the Public Works Department Environmental Engineering Division of Beaufort County a stormwater management utility for the purpose of conducting the county's stormwater management program. The county administrator shall establish and maintain a stormwater management utility enterprise fund in the county budget and accounting system, which shall be and remain separate from other funds. All revenues of the utility shall be placed into the stormwater management utility enterprise fund and all expenses of the utility shall be paid from the fund, except that other revenues, receipts, and resources not accounted for in the stormwater management utility enterprise fund may be applied to stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities as deemed appropriate by the Beaufort County Council. The county administrator may designate within the stormwater management utility enterprise fund such sub-units as necessary for the purpose of accounting for the geographical generation of revenues and allocation of

expenditures pursuant to interlocal governmental agreements with the cities and towns of Beaufort County.

Sec. 99-103. - Purpose and responsibility of the utility.

The Beaufort County Stormwater Management Utility is established for the purpose of managing, acquiring, constructing, protecting, operating, maintaining, enhancing, controlling, and regulating the use of stormwater drainage systems in the county. The utility shall, on behalf of the county and the citizens of the county: administer the stormwater management program; perform studies and analyses as required; collect service fees; system development fees, in-lieu of construction fees and other funding as allowed by law, and obtain and administer grants and loans as authorized by the county council; prepare capital improvement plans and designs; perform routine maintenance and remedial repair of the stormwater systems; acquire, construct, and improve stormwater systems; acquire necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, rights-of-entry and use, and other means of access to properties to perform its duties; regulate the on-site control, conveyance, and discharge of stormwater from properties; obtain federal and state permits required to carry out its purpose; enter into operating agreements with other agencies; allocate funds pursuant to interlocal governmental agreements; educate and inform the public about stormwater management; and perform, without limitation except by law, any stormwater management functions and activities necessary to ensure the public safety, protect private and public properties and habitat, and enhance the natural environment and waters of the county.

Sec. 99-104. - Limitation of scope of responsibility.

The purpose and responsibility of the stormwater management utility shall be limited by the following legal and practical considerations.

- (a) Beaufort County owns or has legal access for purposes of operation, maintenance, and improvement only to those stormwater systems and facilities which:
  - (1) Are located within public streets, other rights-of-way, and easements;
  - (2) Are subject to easements, rights-of-entry, rights-of-access, rights-of-use, or other permanent provisions for adequate access for operation, maintenance, monitoring, and/or improvement of systems and facilities; or
  - (3) Are located on public lands to which the county has adequate access for operation, maintenance, and/or improvement of systems and facilities.
- (b) Operation, maintenance, and/or improvement of stormwater systems and facilities which are located on private property or public property not owned by Beaufort County and for which there has been no public dedication of such systems and facilities for operation, maintenance, monitoring, and/or improvement of the systems and facilities shall be and remain the legal responsibility of the property owner, except as that responsibility may be otherwise affected by the laws of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America.
- (c) It is the express intent of this article to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of all properties and persons in general, but not to create any special duty or relationship with any individual person or to any specific property within or outside the boundaries of the county. Beaufort County expressly reserves the right to assert all available immunities and defenses in any action seeking to impose monetary damages upon the county, its officers, employees and agents arising out of any alleged failure or breach of duty or relationship as may now exist or hereafter be created.

- (d) To the extent any permit, plan approval, inspection or similar act is required by the county as a condition precedent to any activity or change upon property not owned by the county, pursuant to this or any other regulatory ordinance, regulation, or rule of the county or under federal or state law, the issuance of such permit, plan approval, or inspection shall not be deemed to constitute a warranty, express or implied, nor shall it afford the basis for any action, including any action based on failure to permit or negligent issuance of a permit, seeking the imposition of money damages against the county, its officers, employees, or agents.

Sec. 99-105. - Boundaries and jurisdiction.

The boundaries and jurisdiction of the stormwater management utility shall encompass all those portions of unincorporated Beaufort County, as they may exist from time to time and such additional areas lying inside the corporate limits of those cities and towns in Beaufort County as shall be subject to interlocal agreements for stormwater management as approved by county council and participating municipal councils.

Sec. 99-106. - Definitions.

Unless the context specifically indicates otherwise, the meaning of words and terms used in this article shall be as set forth in S.C. Code § 48-14-20, and 26 S.C. Code Regulation 72-301, mutatis mutandis.

Abatement. Any action deemed necessary by the county or its officers or agents to remedy, correct, control, or eliminate a condition within, associated with, or impacting a stormwater drainage system or the water quality of receiving waters shall be deemed an abatement action.

Adjustments. Adjustments shall mean a change in the amount of a stormwater service fee predicated upon the determination reached by the ~~Beaufort County engineer~~ Stormwater Manager and referenced to the Adjustments and Credit Manual.

Bill Class. Every property falls into one of several bill classes. The bill class determines the fee calculation of that property.

Countywide Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance and Capital Projects. The County maintains some typically larger infrastructure within each of the four municipalities in addition to within the unincorporated area. The rate structure will allocate the costs for the County to maintain just the countywide drainage infrastructure across the entire rate base in all jurisdictions based on infrastructure linear feet per jurisdiction.

Customers of the stormwater management utility. Customers of the stormwater management utility shall be broadly defined to include all persons, properties, and entities served by and/or benefiting, directly and indirectly, from the utility's acquisition, management, construction, improvement, operation, maintenance, extension, and enhancement of the stormwater management programs, services, systems, and facilities in the county, and by its control and regulation of public and private stormwater systems, facilities, and activities related thereto.

Developed land. Developed land shall mean property altered from its natural state by construction or installation of improvements such as buildings, structures, or other impervious surfaces, or by other alteration of the property that results in a meaningful change in the hydrology of the property during and following rainfall events.

Exemption. Exemption shall mean not applying to or removing the application of the stormwater management utility service fee from a property. No permanent exemption shall be granted based on taxable or non-taxable status or economic status of the property owner.

Fixed costs. Costs associated with the public service provided equally to each property owner. These costs include, but are not limited to the following: billing and collections, data management and updating, programming, and customer support.

Gross Area. Gross area is the acreage of a parcel as identified by the Beaufort County Assessor records.

Hydrologic response. The hydrologic response of a property is the manner whereby stormwater collects, remains, infiltrates, and is conveyed from a property. It is dependent on several factors including but not limited to the size and overall intensity of development of each property, its impervious area, shape, topographic, vegetative, and geologic conditions, antecedent moisture conditions, and groundwater conditions and the nature of precipitation events. Extremely large undeveloped properties naturally attenuate but do not eliminate entirely the discharge of stormwater during and following rainfall events.

Jurisdictional Infrastructure Operations, Maintenance and Capital Projects. Each of the five jurisdictions maintains its own stormwater drainage infrastructure and funds those costs from utility revenue. Revenue from this fee component will be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

Impervious surfaces. Impervious surfaces shall be a consideration in the determination of the development intensity factor. Impervious surfaces are those areas that prevent or impede the infiltration of stormwater into the soil as it entered in natural conditions prior to development. Common impervious surfaces include, but are not limited to, rooftops, sidewalks, walkways, patio areas, driveways, parking lots, storage areas, compacted gravel and soil surfaces, awnings and other fabric or plastic coverings, and other surfaces that prevent or impede the natural infiltration of stormwater runoff that existed prior to development.

Minimum Charge. A charge that reflects the minimum amount of demand a property will place on the service provider.

MS4 Permit. Each jurisdiction within Beaufort County will be subject to the federally mandated MS4 permit requirements. Compliance requirements include, but are not limited to monitoring, plan review, inspections, outreach and public education,

Nonresidential properties. Properties developed for uses other than permanent residential dwelling units and designated by the assigned land use code in the Beaufort County tax data system.

Other developed lands. Other developed lands shall mean, but not be limited to, mobile home parks, commercial and office buildings, public buildings and structures, industrial and manufacturing buildings, storage buildings and storage areas covered with impervious surfaces, parking lots, parks, recreation properties, public and private schools and universities, research facilities and stations, hospitals and convalescent centers, airports, agricultural uses covered by impervious surfaces, water and wastewater treatment plants, and lands in other uses which alter the hydrology of the property from that which would exist in a natural state. Properties that are used for other than single family residential use shall be deemed other developed lands for the purpose of calculating stormwater service fees.

Residential dwelling classifications. The following categories will identify the appropriate dwelling unit classifications to be utilized in applying the stormwater utility fee structure to the designations contained in the Beaufort County tax data system:

Single-family

Apartments

Townhouses

Condominiums

Mobile Home

~~Mobile home parks~~

~~Mobile home lots~~

~~River areas. River areas shall be those areas of Beaufort County that have been delineated as rivers on the most current digital mapping on file in the Beaufort County Engineering Department. Where applicable, these areas shall be deducted from a property's total land area in determining its stormwater service fee.~~

Stormwater management programs, services, systems and facilities. Stormwater management programs, services, systems and facilities are those administrative, engineering, operational, regulatory, and capital improvement activities and functions performed in the course of managing the stormwater systems of the county, plus all other activities and functions necessary to support the provision of such programs and services. Stormwater management systems and facilities are those natural and man-made channels, swales, ditches, swamps, rivers, streams, creeks, branches, reservoirs, ponds, drainage ways, inlets, catch basins, pipes, head walls, storm sewers, lakes, and other physical works, properties, and improvements which transfer, control, convey or otherwise influence the movement of stormwater runoff and its discharge to and impact upon receiving waters.

Stormwater service fees. Stormwater service fees shall mean the service fee imposed pursuant to this article for the purpose of funding costs related to stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. These fees will be calculated based upon the ~~residential category for a parcel and/or the nonresidential parcel's impervious area, and/or the vacant/undeveloped land category.~~ impervious and gross area at an 80/20 allocation; storm water service fee categories; any State agricultural exemptions or caps; an account administrative fee, countywide jurisdiction operation maintenance and capital project fees; and jurisdictional operation, maintenance and capital project fee.

~~Stormwater service fee;~~ sSingle-family unit (SFU). The single-family unit shall be defined as the impervious area measurements obtained from a statistically representative sample of all detached single-family structures within Beaufort County. The representative value will be 4,906 square feet.



Stormwater service fee categories. The appropriate categories for determining SFUs will be as follows:

	SFU Calculation (SFUs equal)
<u>Tier 1</u> Single-family <u>Unit</u> (<=2,521 square feet)	Dwelling units x 0.5
<u>Tier 2</u> Single-family <u>Unit</u> (2,522 to 7,265 square feet)	Dwelling units x 1
<u>Tier 3</u> Single-family <u>Unit</u> (>=7,266 square feet)	Dwelling units x 1.5
<u>Mobile Home</u>	<u>Dwelling units x 0.36</u>
Apartments	Dwelling units x 0.39
Townhouses	Dwelling units x 0.60
Condominiums	Dwelling units x 0.27
<u>Mobile home parks</u>	<u>Dwelling units x 0.36</u>
<u>Mobile home lots</u>	<u>Dwelling units x 0.59</u>
<u>Nonresidential Commercial</u>	Impervious area x 4,906 sq. ft.*
<u>Residential/nonresidential vacant</u>	<u>Parcel area x SFU corrected factor</u>

\*Commercial billed at a rate of 1 SFU per 4,906 square feet or a portion thereof

~~Vacant/undeveloped land. All parcels containing no impervious area and not being defined as exempt will have the corrected SFUs calculated for the following property classification system (PCS) codes:~~

~~PCS 29~~

~~PCS 33~~

~~PCS 91~~

~~PCS 92~~

~~PCS 99~~

~~PCS-81~~

~~PCS-82~~

~~PCS-83~~

~~PCS-84~~

~~PCS-89~~

~~PCS-74~~

~~PCS-76~~

~~Appropriate residential PCS category~~

~~Variable Costs. An impervious and gross area rate structure that allocates some cost to each of the two variables based on the amount of impervious surface and gross area.~~

Sec. 99-107. - Requirements for on-site stormwater systems: enforcement, methods and inspections.

- (a) All property owners and developers of real property to be developed within the unincorporated portions of Beaufort County shall provide, manage, maintain, and operate on-site stormwater systems and facilities sufficient to collect, convey, detain, control, and discharge stormwater in a safe manner consistent with all county development regulations and the laws of the State of South Carolina and the United States of America, except in cases when the property is located within an incorporated city or town subject to an interlocal governmental agreement with the county for stormwater management and the city or town has regulations that are more stringent than the county, in which case the city's or town's development regulations shall apply. Any failure to meet this obligation shall constitute a nuisance and be subject to an abatement action filed by the county in a court of competent jurisdiction. In the event a public nuisance is found by the court to exist, which the owner fails to properly abate within such reasonable time as allowed by the court, the county may enter upon the property and cause such work as is reasonably necessary to be performed, with the actual cost thereof charged to the owner in the same manner as a stormwater service fee as provided for in this article.
- (b) In the event that the county shall file an action pursuant to subsection 99-107(a), from the date of filing such action the county shall have all rights of judgment and collection through a court of competent jurisdiction as may be perfected by action.
- (c) The county shall have the right, pursuant to the authority of this article, for its designated officers and employees to enter upon private property and public property owned by other than the county, upon reasonable notice to the owner thereof, to inspect the property and conduct surveys and engineering tests thereon in order to assure compliance with any order or judgment entered pursuant to this section.

Sec. 99-108. - General funding policy.

- (a) It shall be the policy of Beaufort County that funding for the stormwater management utility program, services, systems, and facilities shall be equitably derived through methods which have a demonstrable relationship to the varied demands and impacts imposed on the stormwater program, services, systems, and facilities by individual properties or persons and/or the level of

service rendered by or resulting from the provision of stormwater programs, systems and facilities. Stormwater service fee rates shall be structured so as to be fair and reasonable, and the resultant service fees shall bear a substantial relationship to the cost of providing services and facilities throughout the county. Similarly situated properties shall be charged similar rentals, rates, fees, or licenses. Service fee rates shall be structured to be consistent in their application and shall be coordinated with the use of any other funding methods employed for stormwater management within the county, whether wholly or partially within the unincorporated portions of the county or within the cities and towns. Plan review and inspection fees, special fees for services, fees in-lieu of regulatory requirements, impact fees, system development fees, special assessments, general obligation and revenue bonding, and other funding methods and mechanisms available to the county may be used in concert with stormwater service fees and shall be coordinated with such fees in their application to ensure a fair and reasonable service fee rate structure and overall allocation of the cost of services and facilities.

- (b) The cost of stormwater management programs, systems, and facilities subject to stormwater service fees may include operating, capital investment, and non-operating expenses, prudent operational and emergency reserve expenses, and stormwater quality as well as stormwater quantity management programs, needs, and requirements.
- (c) To the extent practicable, adjustments to the stormwater service fees will be calculated by the Beaufort County engineer Stormwater Manager in accordance with the standards and procedures adopted by the engineer's Stormwater Manager's office.
- (d) The stormwater service fee rate may be determined and modified from time to time by the Beaufort County Council so that the total revenue generated by said fees and any other sources of revenues or other resources allocated to stormwater management by the county council to the stormwater management utility shall be sufficient to meet the cost of stormwater management services, systems, and facilities, including, but not limited to, the payment of principle and interest on debt obligations, operating expense, capital outlays, nonoperating expense, provisions for prudent reserves, and other costs as deemed appropriate by the county council.

Beaufort County service fee rate will be based on impervious and gross area at an 80/20 allocation; storm water service fee categories; any State agricultural exemptions or caps; an account administrative fee, countywide jurisdiction operation maintenance and jurisdictional operation, maintenance and capital project fee. The rates are set by the Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study adopted July 2015.

The gross area charge is calculated in equivalent units as follows:

<u>First 2 acres</u>	<u>\$X per acre</u>
<u>For every acres above 2 acres and up to 10 acres</u>	<u>0.5 x \$X</u>
<u>For every acre above 10 acres, and up to 100 acres</u>	<u>0.4 x \$X</u>
<u>For every acre above 100 acres</u>	<u>0.3 x \$X</u>

Each municipal jurisdiction may have a different fee predicated upon the individual municipal jurisdiction's revenue needs. The following stormwater service fee rates shall apply: be adopted by

the municipal jurisdictions and may be amended from time to time by the individual governing body.

Jurisdiction	Annual Stormwater Service Fee (\$/SFU/year)
City of Beaufort	\$65.00
Town of Bluffton	-98.00
Town of Hilton Head Island	108.70
Town of Port Royal	-50.00
Unincorporated Beaufort County	-50.00

Sec. 99-109. - Exemptions and credits applicable to stormwater service fees.

Except as provided in this section, no public or private property shall be exempt from stormwater utility service fees. No exemption, credit, offset, or other reduction in stormwater service fees shall be granted based on the age, tax, or economic status, race, or religion of the customer, or other condition unrelated to the stormwater management utility's cost of providing stormwater programs, services, systems, and facilities. A stormwater management utility service fee credit manual shall be prepared by the ~~county engineer~~ Stormwater Manager specifying the design and performance standards of on-site stormwater services, systems, facilities, and activities that qualify for application of a service fee credit, and how such credits shall be calculated.

(a) Credits. The following types of credits against stormwater service fees shall be available:

- (1) Freshwater wetlands. All properties except those classified as detached single-family dwelling units may receive a credit against the stormwater service fee applicable to the property based on granting and dedicating a perpetual conservation easement on those portions of the property that are classified as freshwater wetlands and as detailed in the stormwater management utility service fee credit manual. The conservation easement shall remove that portion of the subject property from any future development. ~~Once this credit has been granted to a particular property, that portion of the property will be treated similar to the river and marsh areas and shall be deducted from the property's total land area in computing its stormwater service fee. This credit shall remain in effect as long as the conditions of the conservation easement are met.~~
- (2) Those properties that apply for consideration of an adjustment shall satisfy the requirements established by the Beaufort County ~~engineer~~ Stormwater Manager and approved reduced stormwater service fee.

(b) Exemptions. The following exemptions from the stormwater service fees shall be allowed:

- (1) Improved public road rights-of-way that have been conveyed to and accepted for maintenance by the state department of transportation and are available for use in common for vehicular transportation by the general public.
- (2) Improved public road rights-of-way that have been conveyed to and accepted for maintenance by Beaufort County and are available for use in common for vehicular transportation by the general public.
- (3) Improved private roadways that are shown as a separate parcel of land on the most current Beaufort County tax maps and are used by more than one property owner to access their property.
- (4) Railroad tracks shall be exempt from stormwater service fees. However, railroad stations, maintenance buildings, or other developed land used for railroad purposes shall not be exempt from stormwater service fees.
- (5) Condominium boat slips shall be exempt from stormwater service fees.

Sec. 99-110. - Stormwater service fee billing, delinquencies and collections.

- (a) Method of billing. A stormwater service fee bill may be attached as a separate line item to the county's property tax billing or may be sent through the United States mail or by alternative means, notifying the customer of the amount of the bill, the date the fee is due (January 15), and the date when past due (March 17 - see Title 12, Section 45-180 of the South Carolina State Code). The stormwater service fee bill may be billed and collected along with other fees, including but not limited to the Beaufort County property tax billing, other Beaufort County utility bills, or assessments as deemed most effective and efficient by the Beaufort County Council. Failure to receive a bill is not justification for non-payment. Regardless of the party to whom the bill is initially directed, the owner of each parcel of land shall be ultimately obligated to pay such fees and any associated fines or penalties, including, but not limited to, interest on delinquent service fees. If a customer is under-billed or if no bill is sent for a particular property, Beaufort County may retroactively bill for a period of up to one-year, but shall not assess penalties for any delinquency during that previous unbilled period.
- (b) Declaration of delinquency. A stormwater service fee shall be declared delinquent if not paid within 60 days of the date of billing or upon the date (March 17) of delinquency of the annual property tax billing if the stormwater service fee is placed upon the annual property tax billing or enclosed with or attached to the annual property tax billing.

Sec. 99-111. - Appeals.

Any customer who believes the provisions of this article have been applied in error may appeal in the following manner and sequence.

- (a) An appeal of a stormwater service fee must be filed in writing with the Beaufort County ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager or his/her designee within 30 days of the fee being mailed or delivered to the property owner and stating the reasons for the appeal. In the case of stormwater service fee appeals, the appeal shall include a survey prepared by a registered land surveyor or professional engineer containing information on the impervious surface area and any other feature or conditions that influence the development of the property and its hydrologic response to rainfall events.

- (b) Using information provided by the appellant, the county ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager (or his or her designee) shall conduct a technical review of the conditions on the property and respond to the appeal in writing within 30 days. In response to an appeal, the county public works director may adjust the stormwater service fee applicable to the property in conformance with the general purposes and intent of this article.
- (c) A decision of the county ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager that is adverse to an appellant may be further appealed to the county administrator or his designee within 30 days of the adverse decision. The appellant, stating the grounds for further appeal, shall deliver notice of the appeal to the county administrator or his designee. The county administrator or his designee shall issue a written decision on the appeal within 30 days. All decisions by the county administrator or his designee shall be served on the customer personally or by registered or certified mail, sent to the billing address of the customer. All decisions of the county administrator or his designee shall be final.
- (d) The appeal process contained in this section shall be a condition precedent to an aggrieved customer seeking judicial relief. Any decisions of the county administrator or his designee may be reviewed upon application for writ of certiorari before a court of competent jurisdiction, filed within 30 days of the date of the service of the decision.

Sec. 99-112. - No suspension of due date.

No provision of this article allowing for an administrative appeal shall be deemed to suspend the due date of the service fee with payment in full. Any adjustment in the service fee for the person pursuing an appeal shall be made by refund of the amount due.

Sec. 99-113. - Enforcement and penalties.

Any person who violates any provision of this article may be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000.00, or such additional maximum amount as may become authorized by state law, provided the owner or other person deemed to be in violation has been notified of a violation. Notice shall be deemed achieved when sent by regular United States mail to the last known address reflected on the county tax records, or such other address as has been provided by the person to the county. Each day of a continuing violation may be deemed a separate violation. If payment is not received or equitable settlement reached within 30 days after demand for payment is made, a civil action may be filed on behalf of the county in the circuit court to recover the full amount of the penalty. This provision on penalties shall be in addition to and not in lieu of other provisions on penalties, civil or criminal, remedies and enforcement that may otherwise apply.

Sec. 99-114. - Investment and reinvestment of funds and borrowing.

Funds generated for the stormwater management utility from service fees, fees, rentals, rates, bond issues, other borrowing, grants, loans, and other sources shall be utilized only for those purposes for which the utility has been established as specified in this article, including but not limited to: regulation; planning; acquisition of interests in land, including easements; design and construction of facilities; maintenance of the stormwater system; billing and administration; water quantity and water quality management, including monitoring, surveillance, private maintenance inspection, construction inspection; public information and education, and other activities which are reasonably required. such funds shall be invested and reinvested pursuant to the same procedures and practices established by Title 12, Section 45-70 of the South Carolina State Code for investment and reinvestment of funds.

County council may use any form of borrowing authorized by the laws of the State of South Carolina to fund capital acquisitions or expenditures for the stormwater management utility. County council, in its discretion and pursuant to standard budgetary procedures, may supplement such funds with amounts from the general fund.

Sec. 99-115. - ~~Initial study priorities for~~ Responsibilities of the stormwater management utility.

~~During the first three year period of t~~ The county stormwater management utility, ~~the utility~~ shall perform adequate studies throughout the area served by the utility to determine the following:

- (1) Baseline study of water quality in the receiving waters;
- (2) Identification of pollutants carried by stormwater runoff into the receiving waters;
- (3) Recommended mitigation efforts to address pollutants carried by stormwater runoff into the receiving waters;
- (4) Inventory of the existing drainage system;
- (5) Recommended maintenance practices and standards of the existing drainage system;
- (6) Identification of capital improvements to the system to include construction or installation of appropriate BMPs.
- (7) A five-year spending plan.
- (8) Ensure compliance with the federally mandated MS4 permit requirements
- (9) Efficient utility administration including but not limited to billing, collection, defining rate structures, data management and customer support.

~~The proposed five-year spending plan shall be appropriately revised to reflect this priority and timetable for completion.~~

Sec. 99-116. - Stormwater utility management board.

- (1) Purpose. In compliance with and under authority of Beaufort County Ordinance 2001/23, the Beaufort County Council hereby establishes the stormwater management utility board (hereinafter referred to as the "SWU board") to advise the council as follows:
  - (a) To determine appropriate levels of public stormwater management services for residential, commercial, industrial and governmental entities within Beaufort County;
  - (b) To recommend appropriate funding levels for provision of services in the aforementioned sectors;
  - (c) To advise the staff of the stormwater management utility on master planning efforts and cost of service/rate studies; and
  - (d) To support and promote sound stormwater management practices that mitigates non-point source pollution and enhances area drainage within Beaufort County.

Municipal councils are encouraged to organize similar boards to advise them on stormwater management programs and priorities within their boundaries.

In keeping with discussions held during the formation of the stormwater utility, it is anticipated that the municipalities will appoint staff professionals as their representative on the advisory board.

(2) Stormwater districts. Stormwater districts are hereby established as follows:

District 1 - City of Beaufort

District 2 - Town of Port Royal

District 3 - Town of Hilton Head Island

District 4 - Town of Bluffton

District 5 - Unincorporated Sheldon Township

District 6 - Unincorporated Port Royal Island

District 7 - Unincorporated Lady's Island

District 8 - Unincorporated St. Helena Island Islands East

District 9 - Unincorporated Bluffton Township and Daufuskie Island

(3) Membership.

(a) The SWU board is formed in accordance with Beaufort County Ordinance 92-28 and shall consist of a total of seven voting representatives from each of the following districts as noted below:

No. of Reps.	Stormwater District	Area
1	5	Unincorporated Sheldon Township
1	6	Unincorporated Port Royal Island
1	7	Unincorporated Lady's Island
1	8	Unincorporated St. Helena Island Islands East
2	9	Unincorporated Bluffton Township and Daufuskie Island
1	—	"At large"

All members of the SWU board will be appointed by county council and shall be residents of those districts or "at large" members from unincorporated Beaufort County.



(b) The SWU board shall also consist of one nonvoting (ex officio) representative from the following districts:

Stormwater District	Municipality
1	City of Beaufort
2	Town of Port Royal
3	Town of Hilton Head Island
4	Town of Bluffton

All ex officio members from municipalities shall be appointed by their respective municipal councils for four-year terms.

- (c) All citizen members shall be appointed for a term of four years. The terms shall be staggered with one or two members appointed each year.
- (d) While no other eligibility criteria is established, it is recommended that members possess experience in one or more of the following areas: Stormwater management (drainage and water quality) issues, strategic planning, budget and finance issues or established professional qualifications in engineering, construction, civil engineering, architectural experience, commercial contractor or similar professions.

(4) Officers.

(a) Officers. Selection of officers and their duties as follows:

1. Chairperson and vice-chair. At an annual organizational meeting, the members of the SWU board shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among its members. The chair's and vice-chair's terms shall be for one year with eligibility for reelection. The chair shall be in charge of all procedures before the SWU board, may administer oaths, may compel the attendance of witnesses, and shall take such action as shall be necessary to preserve order and the integrity of all proceedings before the SWU board. In the absence of the chair, the vice-chair shall act as chairperson.
2. Secretary. The county professional staff member shall appoint a secretary for the SWU board. The secretary shall keep minutes of all proceedings. The minutes shall contain a summary of all proceedings before the SWU board, which include the vote of all members upon every question, and its recommendations, resolutions, findings and determinations, and shall be attested to by the secretary. The minutes shall be approved by a majority of the SWU board members voting. In addition, the secretary shall maintain a public record of SWU board meetings, hearings, proceedings, and correspondence.
3. Staff. The ~~public works director~~ Stormwater Manager shall be the SWU board's professional staff.

- (b) Quorum and voting. Four SWU board members shall constitute a quorum of the SWU board necessary to take action and transact business. All actions shall require a simple majority of the number of SWU board members present.
  - (c) Removal from office. The county council, by a simple majority vote, shall terminate the appointment of any member of the SWU board and appoint a new member for the following reasons:
    - 1. Absent from more than one-third of the SWU board meetings per annum, whether excused or unexcused;
    - 2. Is no longer a resident of the county;
    - 3. Is convicted of a felony; or
    - 4. Violated conflict of interest rules according to the county-adopted template ordinance.Moreover, a member shall be removed automatically for failing to attend any three consecutive regular meetings.
  - (d) Vacancy. Whenever a vacancy occurs on the SWU board, the county council shall appoint a new member within 60 days of the vacancy, subject to the provisions of this section. A new member shall serve out the former member's term.
  - (e) Compensation. The SWU board members shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for such travel, mileage and/or per diem expenses as may be authorized by the SWU board-approved budget.
- (5) Responsibilities and duties.
- (a) Review and recommend to the county council for approval, a comprehensive Beaufort County Stormwater Management Master Plan and appropriate utility rate study which is in accordance with the South Carolina Stormwater Management and Sediment Reduction Act; and
  - (b) Review and comment to the county administrator on the annual stormwater management utility enterprise fund budget; and
  - (c) Cooperate with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC), Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), the Oversight Committee of the Special Area Management Plan (SAMP), the Beaufort County Clean Water Task Force as well as other public and private agencies having programs directed toward stormwater management programs; and
  - (d) Review and make recommendations concerning development of a multiyear stormwater management capital improvement project (CIP) plan; and
  - (e) Review and advise on proposed stormwater management plans and procurement procedures; and
  - (f) Provide review and recommendations on studies conducted and/or funded by the utility; and
  - (g) Review and advise on actions and programs to comply with regulatory requirements, including permits issued under the State of South Carolina National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Regulated Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4).

- (6) Meetings. Meetings of the SWU board shall be held as established by the SWU board on a monthly basis and a calendar will be prepared giving the date, time and location of such meetings. Additionally, meetings may be called by the chairperson or at the request of four SWU board members. The location of all SWU board meetings shall be held in a public building in a place accessible to the public. The following shall apply to the conduct of all meetings:
  - (a) Meeting records. The SWU board shall keep a record of meetings, resolutions, findings, and determinations. The SWU board may provide for transcription of such hearings and proceedings, or portions of hearings and proceedings, as may be deemed necessary.
  - (b) Open to public. All meetings and public hearings of the SWU board shall be open to the public.
  - (c) Recommendations or decisions. All recommendations shall be by show of hands of all members present. A tie vote or failure to take action shall constitute a denial recommendation. All recommendations shall be accompanied by a written summary of the action and recommendations.
  - (d) Notice and agenda. The SWU board must give written public notice of regular meetings at the beginning of each calendar year. The SWU board must post regular meeting agendas at the meeting place 24 hours before any meeting. Notices and agenda for call, special or rescheduled meetings must be posted at least 24 hours before such meetings. The SWU board must notify any persons, organizations and news media that request such notification of meetings.

(Ord. No. 2005/33, § 17, 8-22-2005; Ord. No. 2009/21, §§ I—VI, 5-26-2009)

Adopted this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
D. Paul Sommerville, Chairman

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Keaveny, II, County Attorney

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne M. Rainey, Clerk to Council

First Reading: July 27, 2015

Second Reading:

Public Hearings: July 27, 2015

Third and Final Reading:

Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study  
Final Report – Beaufort County  
July 10, 2015 with edits July 15, 2015

Prepared by Applied Technology & Management

Assistance from Raftelis Financial Consultants



## Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Background .....	3
Jurisdictional Cooperation .....	3
Utility background.....	4
Current Stormwater Utility Structure .....	5
Rate Structure .....	5
Business Processes.....	6
Rates .....	6
Beaufort County Stormwater Program.....	7
Rate Study Approach .....	8
Goals .....	8
Modeling.....	8
Data update .....	8
Rate Components .....	9
Fixed Costs .....	9
Variable Costs: Impervious Surfaces Area and Gross Parcel Area.....	9
Cost Allocability.....	9
Jurisdictional Infrastructure O&M.....	10
Jurisdiction Capital Projects.....	10
Debt.....	10
County-wide Infrastructure O&M .....	10
Utility Administration .....	11
MS4 Compliance.....	11
Individual Efforts .....	12
Cooperative Efforts .....	12
Modeled Options .....	12
Elements of Six Rate Structure Options.....	12
Options.....	12
Alternative Cost Sharing Approach.....	13
Modified Rate Structure .....	14
Fee Structure.....	14
Bill Class.....	14

Rate Structure Design ..... 15

    Impervious Area Units..... 15

    Gross Area Blocks..... 15

    Exempt Properties and Special Cases ..... 15

    Credit..... 15

Rate Study Results ..... 15

    Beaufort County..... 15

    General Impacts of Rate Structure Changes..... 17

Needed Ordinance Revisions ..... 17

    County..... 17

Ongoing Billing Data Maintenance ..... 18

Appendix A – Beaufort County Recommended Rates (Options A-F)..... 19

## Executive Summary

Beaufort County, in cooperation with the City of Beaufort, and the Towns of Bluffton, Hilton Head Island, and Port Royal retained Applied Technologies and Management (ATM) and its sub-consultant, Raftelis Financial Consultants to perform a rate study for the five stormwater utilities operated by the respective jurisdictions.

The County is facing a declining rate base driven by annexations, steeply mounting costs for maintaining county-wide drainage infrastructure and complying with new MS4 requirements, and in need of continued capital project construction. The municipalities also face challenges which vary by jurisdiction.

The rate analyses performed in support of this rate study included six options for each jurisdiction. The options vary the rate metrics (impervious area, fixed charges per ratepayer, gross area), vary the way that shared costs are allocated between jurisdictions (by impervious area or by account), accommodate the existing administrative charges paid by each jurisdiction to the County (currently at \$3.18 per SFU), accommodate the existing payments made by municipalities to the County for varying levels of water quality monitoring and public outreach, and accommodate a new charge by the County to each municipality for that municipality’s proportionate share of the entire County’s drainage infrastructure to be maintained by the County. The detailed description of the six options is as follows:

	<i>Overall Rate Structure</i>	<i>Debt Financing for Some Capital?</i>	<i>Method for Allocating Admin &amp; Reg Costs</i>	<i>Method for Allocating CWI O&amp;M Costs</i>	<i>Simplified Residential Rates</i>	<i>Alternative Cost Sharing Approach</i>
A	Current (Imp Area)	No	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
B	Current (Imp Area)	Yes	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
C	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
D	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
E	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
F	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional

In these evaluations, simplified residential rates means a series of flat rate charges for impervious area (three) similar to how the rate structure works now.

The recommended rate structure option from these evaluations is Option E. In this option jurisdictions can use debt financing for large capital projects, would share administrative costs allocated on a per-account basis, and would be assessed by the County a new County Stormwater Infrastructure (CWI) fee that will be placed on all County tax bills in September of this year. This new fee will assist the County with funding stormwater infrastructure maintenance and repairs with all areas of the County. This new fee was developed using a proportionate share of county-wide infrastructure costs allocated across impervious and gross area within the County, including the municipalities. This option results in the most affordable rates for the County over the coming five years

However, at this time the rate modeling done to date has been less detailed for the municipalities than it has for the County as the County is the only jurisdiction seeking to make rate structure changes immediately while the municipalities expect to not make changes until FY 2016-2017. Additional efforts between the consultants and the municipalities will complete this process over the next few months.

For the County, the existing rates are \$50 per SFU per year. Continuing with the current rate structure and without proportionate share funding from the municipalities for county-wide infrastructure operation and maintenance, these rates would need to escalate over the coming five years to \$120 per SFU per year by FY 2019-2020. This is a 140% increase.

Under the recommended option E, the rate structure will change to one with a fixed charge per account, plus a variable charge for impervious area and another variable charge for gross lot area. For a “tier 2” (average house) residence in the County on a lot smaller than 2 acres, the existing charge is \$50 per SFU per year. Under option E this charge would escalate to \$87 in year by FY 2019-2020. This is a 74% increase. While still large, it is much more reasonable than the “stay the course” option.

The County is responsible for funding 76.4% of all county-wide infrastructure (CWI) operation and maintenance under the CWI allocation used. Under the proposed rate structure, this is \$42.28 of the total \$87.00 annual charge for an average house on a lot smaller than 2 acres. The land areas within the four municipalities are will be assessed the remaining CWI funding, with the charge being based on the amount of existing stormwater infrastructure the County will maintain within each jurisdiction. For this fiscal year their CWI funding on an SFU basis is:

City of Beaufort	\$8.05 per SFU
Town of Port Royal	\$5.03 per SFU
Town of Bluffton	\$26.34 per SFU
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$7.66 per SFU



## Background

The Southern Coast of South Carolina has long been a desirable tourist destination and sought after place to live, in no small part due to the natural beauty surrounding the areas waterways. In recent years, Beaufort County has declared its intention to be a regional leader in environmental quality initiatives in order to promote this existing advantage. An important subset of environmental quality, especially in this region, is the effective management of stormwater runoff. Because the County is right on the coast, and is crossed by large water bodies otherwise, the imperative to manage stormwater runoff has immediate implications on water quality in the region, rather than somewhere downstream. Beaufort County and its underlying jurisdictions – the City of Beaufort, the Town of Port Royal, Town of Hilton Head Island, and Town of Bluffton – take this charge seriously, and have over time developed individual and cooperative programs to manage the public safety and water quality concerns related to stormwater runoff.

As these programs have matured over time, they have become more costly, and several jurisdictions now find themselves needing to evaluate their operating costs and investments in any needed capital improvement projects. The jurisdictions are interested in revising rates and exploring other financial tools to support program initiatives, especially capital spending, and have engaged Applied Technology & Management (ATM) and subcontractor Raftelis Financial Consultants (RFC) to conduct a rate structure analysis and rate studies similar to this study that was prepared for the County. This report summarizes the results of ATM's efforts on behalf of the County as work has not been completed for the four municipalities at this time.

## Jurisdictional Cooperation

Although historically each jurisdiction has managed stormwater concerns indirectly through individual development standards and environmental ordinances, the group has been working together for many years to manage storm drainage and ensure an improved standard of living for residents of the County. This relationship has become more explicit over time, through the development of inter-governmental agreements and memoranda of understanding, and through a closer working relationship among staff of each local government.

The most outstanding example of cooperation relates to the administration of the five separate utilities. Since 2001, when the utilities went into effect, the County has provided administrative services, including billing, billing data maintenance, and customer service, in exchange for a small portion of the fee revenues for each underlying jurisdiction.

The County has historically been a significant service provider for drainage maintenance activities to each of the underlying jurisdictions, offering a menu of drainage infrastructure cleaning, maintenance, and repair activities at hourly rates. The patchwork nature of the jurisdictional boundaries lends itself to a cooperative approach to these activities whenever possible to maximize efficiencies in equipment and staff time.

Three of the five jurisdictions participating in the regional stormwater utility has recently submitted a notice of intent to be permitted as a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) and regulated under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) MS4 permit. Permits are anticipated in September 2015. These permits will require strict management of activities that impact the quality of stormwater runoff, such as construction and industrial activities, as well as significant goals of public

education and outreach in order to bolster the general public's ability to and interest in managing stormwater runoff responsibly.

Under the new permits, the jurisdictions will be required to perform maintenance activities on existing stormwater drainage infrastructure (as is done now), monitor water quality at outfalls, inspect facilities and infrastructure, and provide education and outreach to citizens. The costs for these activities can be limited if they are performed in coordination between jurisdictions, either across the entire county or in more geographically distinct regions (such as North of the Broad River).

### Utility background

Each of the five jurisdictions has a separate stormwater utility, established by separate ordinance, allowing the jurisdiction to collect revenues dedicated to stormwater management activities. As mentioned above, each jurisdiction cooperates in the administration of the utility by funding a portion of the County staff and material costs, effectively creating a regional utility.

At the inception of the regional utility in 2001, each property was charged a stormwater fee (conveyed on the annual tax bill) based on the size of the property and a runoff factor associated with that type of property. At this time, all five jurisdictions were charging the same rate, such that a similar property in any jurisdiction would pay the same annual fee. By 2005, the County had access to aerial photography that allowed for a more reliable approach to fee calculation. Rather than use tabular property characteristics to develop the fee for an individual property, the fee could be calculated based on one characteristic that was deemed an important cost driver: impervious surface area. Some elements of the previous rate structure remained intact, but for developed properties, the utility replaced their existing rate structure with one based on impervious surface area as measured from aerial photography.

At its core, this is an industry standard approach to calculating stormwater fees. However, the data available to the County in 2005 were already several years out of date and of relatively poor quality (see Figure 1 below). In recent years, the County has been able to obtain much higher quality imagery on an annual basis and has been updating its impervious area measurements, the foundational billing data, as properties change.



Figure 1. Comparison of 2002 and 2015 Aerial Photography

## Current Stormwater Utility Structure

### Rate Structure

As defined by the ordinances passed in 2005, the jurisdictions share a rate structure, though each is allowed to charge rates necessary to generate the revenue needed within each individual jurisdiction. The current rate structure has three distinct parts: residential properties, nonresidential properties, and vacant lands. Because the stormwater fee is conveyed on the tax bill and the data should be related, every property falls into one of these three categories depending on its classification in the tax system. Generally, the basis for the rate is the amount of runoff a property generates, whether that be the result of impervious area or some other driver.

At the time of the last rate base and rate structure analysis, the median impervious surface area on single family residential properties was 4,906 square feet. This became the base unit (single family unit or SFU) for measuring impervious area on other types of properties as well. For property types within the tax system that have **residential** classifications, each equates to a distinct SFU equivalency factor in three “tiers.” Residential property with 2,521 square feet or less of impervious area is tier 1. Tier 3 is residential property with 7,266 square feet or more of impervious area, and all residential property between these two impervious measures is tier 2. The tier equivalent SFU factor is multiplied by the per SFU rate for encompassing jurisdiction results in the rate. This concept is called simplified residential rates and is recommended in the newly modeled rate structures described in this study. The residential property types and SFU equivalencies are as follows:

<b>Property Type</b>	<b>Equivalent SFUs</b>
<i>Tier 1 Single Family Unit (<math>\leq 2,521</math> square feet)</i>	0.50
<i>Tier 2 Single Family Unit (2,522 to 7,265 square feet)</i>	1.00
<i>Tier 3 Single Family Unit (<math>\geq 7,266</math> square feet)</i>	1.50
<i>Mobile Home</i>	0.36
<i>Apartment</i>	0.39
<i>Townhouse</i>	0.60
<i>Condominium</i>	0.27

Where a single property includes multiple residential units, the equivalent SFU is per unit, such that an apartment complex property with 100 units would be charged for 0.39 (SFUs per unit) times 100 (number of units) times the rate to calculate the final fee.

**Nonresidential** properties represent the simplest of area of the current rate structure. For every property not classified as residential or vacant in the tax system, the stormwater fee is calculated based on the amount of impervious surface area on that property. This amount, divided by the 4,906 square foot SFU and multiplied by the per SFU rate, results in the final fee. There is no rounding or other manipulation of data.

Finally, **vacant** lands are presumed to have no impervious area, and are therefore not charged on that basis. They do still have an impact on the stormwater system, however, and should be responsible for a portion of the costs. At present, the rate structure allows for 'runoff factors' to be applied to vacant lands, with different factors used depending on a matrix of classification including whether a property is classified as agriculture, forestry, disturbed, or undisturbed.

### Business Processes

In addition to the documented rate structure, there exist a number of business processes that have been developed over time to facilitate utility administration. Most of these processes are in line with the current ordinance but some have evolved to address data collection and maintenance difficulties that emerged from the existing rate structure. These include:

- the treatment of golf courses and parks as vacant land when in fact they may have a good deal of impervious area
- treatment of multi-use parcels (such as house and forested area on the same lot) as separate parcels with summed fees
- granting stormwater best management practices credit by overriding a property's fee to 1 SFU

During the course of these studies, the ATM team worked to identify any divergent business processes and compute updated metrics for the affected properties.

### Rates

With the same rate structure in place since 2005, each jurisdiction has experienced increased revenue requirements and subsequently higher rates over time. Table 1 is a summary of each jurisdiction's rate history per SFU over time.

Table 1. Stormwater Fee Rates over Time

	2005-2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012-2014
Beaufort County	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
City of Beaufort	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 105.00	\$ 105.00	\$ 105.00
Town of Port Royal	\$ 44.43	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
Town of Bluffton	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00	\$ 98.00
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$ 44.43	\$ 50.76	\$ 50.76	\$ 83.23	\$ 108.70	\$ 108.70	\$ 108.70

## Beaufort County Stormwater Program

Beaufort County’s stormwater program serves as the backbone for the programs in the other jurisdictions. The County has historically been financially responsible for maintenance and repair on county-wide infrastructure on and off County road rights of way, even within the municipal boundaries of underlying jurisdictions.

More recently, the County has become unable to adequately provide stormwater services throughout the entirety of the unincorporated county with the available funds. That is, maintenance activities in parts of the county, especially those pockets within other jurisdictions, have been neglected in favor of addressing needs that could be met more economically. The City and Towns have not been receiving the stormwater management services they have come to expect from the County, those the County also endeavors to provide, because of funding shortfalls.

The County is in a unique position in that its unincorporated area or its stormwater revenue base, is shrinking due to annexation, while its costs are still increasing. A notable portion of these costs are associated with managing water quality and drainage in rapidly growing regions just outside the underlying jurisdictional boundaries. Historically, some of these areas have been annexed into the adjacent Town or City. The County has continued to provide stormwater services as best possible in these areas but has not been able to keep up with the maintenance and repair needed.

There are a number of capital projects that have been identified by the County for completion in the next several years. While these are currently in unincorporated areas, they are either near to or surrounded by the municipalities such that the benefit is conferred well beyond the unincorporated region.

For these reasons and the new requirements soon to be imposed by the MS4 permit, the County has rapidly increasing costs paired with a declining revenue base. In recognition of this, the County was facing an enormous rate increase. Rather than simply adjust the rates in the unincorporated region, the County initiated a dialog with the City and Towns to discuss the growing county-wide infrastructure operation and maintenance needs. The jurisdictions began exploring a more collaborative and equitable approach to sharing the costs (and receiving the benefits) of these services.

## Rate Study Approach

The ATM team was contracted to assist Beaufort County Stormwater (County) with a detailed stormwater utility rate study. For the unincorporated County and each of the four municipalities, the team conducted a full accounting of planned stormwater program costs over the next five years, which are expected to increase driven by the combination of existing operations and maintenance activities, a significant capital project backlog, and emerging NPDES compliance needs. The rate study was performed concurrent with the budgeting process for the fiscal year that began July 1, 2015, and resulted in the development and consideration of a number of rate structure options, described below.

### Goals

The primary goal of the rate study was to model financially sufficient scenarios to support the jurisdictions' current and future stormwater programs. This included the following supporting objectives:

1. Determine the current and future (from MS4 compliance, jurisdictional growth, etc.) revenue requirements of each program;
2. Determine the most fair and reasonable way to recover revenues while balancing data maintenance efforts;
3. Facilitate future program visioning; and
4. Account for potential future collaboration and shared costs.

Through numerous meetings, extensive model development and refinement, and collaborative review of the results, the team and the project remained accountable to these goals throughout the process.

### Modeling

The primary deliverable from the rate study is a model that was developed to compare and contrast different financial scenarios for each of the jurisdictions. The model balances revenue requirements with funding from the stormwater fee and other possible sources. On the revenue requirements side, for each jurisdiction the ATM team considered existing revenue requirements, future MS4 permit related expenses, and capital needs. Revenue was modeled as the resulting revenue from several different rate structures as well as supplemental resources from bond issuances or other sources. With that basic structure in place, the model was refined to allow for allocation of costs across jurisdictions and rate components (see below for more information) in order to optimize rate equity.

The finalized model will be made available to each jurisdiction for ongoing use as a financial planning tool.

### Data update

Much of the impervious area data originally developed for the 2005 rate study was created using low-quality 2002 aerial imagery. With the possible shift in rates and rate structure, it was critical to have improved source data. As a part of the rate study, the ATM team conducted a targeted review update (where needed) of approximately 5,000 parcel polygons within the GIS and across all of the jurisdictions in order to update the rate base.

At the conclusion of the effort, RFC reviewed and updated the impervious features as necessary on a total of 5,937 parcel polygons, deriving the features using the newest available imagery from 2013.

## Rate Components

### Fixed Costs

Many costs associated with the administration of the utility have little to do with specific characteristics of the land. Rather, they represent a public service to which each property owner (account holder) has equal access. Billing and collections, data management and updating, programming, and customer support may fall within this category. These costs, then, are distributed evenly to each account holder by being allocable to a fixed charge per parcel.

### Variable Costs: Impervious Surfaces Area and Gross Parcel Area

Impervious area is the area of land covered by a hard surface through which rainwater cannot pass, such as building footprints and parking lots. The amount of impervious area on a parcel is most directly related to the quantity of stormwater to be handled by the system. For bare soil and vegetated ground cover, some water will infiltrate into the ground—even during heavy rain—rather than run across the surface. For impervious surfaces, on the other hand, water cannot infiltrate into the ground. For that reason, impervious surface causes the peak discharge volume of runoff from a parcel of land to be higher than it would otherwise. Regardless of how the land is managed, runoff tends to gather nutrients and other potential pollutants. Because virtually none of this runoff (and the pollutants it carries) soaks into the ground, runoff from impervious area carries a greater volume of harmful materials toward receiving waterbodies than pervious area.

One unique aspect of the stormwater utilities in these jurisdictions is the wide variety of land use represented within each jurisdiction. Gross area is included as a component of the stormwater fee to capture the costs not solely related to impervious area runoff. As opposed to impervious area, gross land area contributes proportionately more to the nutrients and pollutants that stormwater runoff may pick up and less to the sheer volume of runoff to be managed. As discussed, pervious land can absorb some of the water that falls on it, so it does not contribute as much to runoff. However, pervious land still contributes pesticides, fertilizers, leaves, and other undesirable materials to the runoff that does occur. As such, stormwater costs related to water quality and quantity (most O&M costs) are allocable in some portion to gross land area.

In the costs described below, allocability to impervious area and gross area represents a relationship between a particular cost and the demand for that cost caused by a higher volume of stormwater (including higher levels of pollution) to be managed. An impervious and gross area rate structure allocates some cost to each of the two variables, in this case either allocating 80% or 90% of the variable costs to impervious area, and the remaining costs to gross area. The gross area units would include a declining block, such that large properties have more units of gross area than small properties, but the increase in units of gross area as overall parcel size increase are blunted by the declining block.

### Cost Allocability

The proposed rate structures take into account a number of costs that vary by:

- Who provides the service,
- Who receives the service, and
- What drives the cost of the service (the existence of an account, impervious area or gross area)

This section describes the different elements of the jurisdictions' and utility's program costs and how they may be accommodated in the rate structures. The resulting modeled rates for each jurisdiction take into account the distribution of costs across all jurisdictions based on the chosen allocation scheme, and the particular rate base of that jurisdiction.

### Jurisdictional Infrastructure O&M

Each of the five jurisdictions maintains its own stormwater drainage infrastructure and funds those costs from utility revenue. These costs are driven by impervious area and gross area in the jurisdiction, which contribute to stormwater runoff and nutrient loading. As such, the impervious and/or gross area component of the fee will include these costs. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

### Jurisdiction Capital Projects

Each of the five jurisdictions has an independent capital plan, and can determine whether bond funding or pay as you go funding (or paying with available unencumbered funds) is appropriate or necessary. Capital financing has been "pay-as-you-go" for most jurisdictions. An alternative is for jurisdictions to borrow money to build capital projects and pay this back over time. This option is described in the definitions as debt.

The cost drivers for capital projects are similar to those for regular O&M, and are allocable to impervious and gross area within a jurisdiction. Debt service (in the case of bond funding) or cash contributions to capital projects are included in the impervious and/or gross area components of a fee. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

### Debt

For some of the jurisdictions, capital needs outpace the funds available through fee revenue. Issuing debt in the form of revenue bonds is a viable alternative to fund these projects, and in some cases may be the most appropriate option. Debt financing is appropriate for large physical assets with long expected lives, generally constructed improvements. Most notable, debt service creates a mechanism for future ratepayers to help fund the infrastructure from which they still benefit. The exceptional environmental quality found in this region is one of the primary reasons people choose to live and work here, and at its most basic, every investment made in capital projects supports that fundamental tenet. Through debt funding of capital projects, ratepayers of the future can pay back into the program that promotes this high quality of life.

Revenue bonding will not affect a jurisdiction's existing covenants or caps. With revenue bonds, the jurisdiction's stormwater utility will be solely responsible for servicing that debt, and there is no risk to the greater entity.

### County-wide Infrastructure O&M

The County maintains some larger drainage infrastructure within each of the four municipalities in addition to drainage infrastructure within the unincorporated area. County-wide infrastructure (defined as pipes and open ditches both in and out of rights of way that are owned or maintained by the County) maintenance costs have not been allocated to any ratepayers outside the unincorporated County to date. That is, revenue from fees charged to property owners in the unincorporated County have been funding infrastructure maintenance, repair, and replacement activities throughout all five jurisdictions.



Currently, these activities have been limited in the incorporated areas because funding levels, supported by the unincorporated ratepayers only, are insufficient. The modified rate structure will share the County's costs for County-wide infrastructure maintenance across all the unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County based on linear feet of pipes and open ditches in each jurisdiction.

The cost drivers for operation and maintenance of county infrastructure are very similar to those for the various jurisdictional stormwater infrastructure systems. These costs may be recovered through an impervious and/or gross area fee component, the revenue from which supports County efforts. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

The County's total budgeted County-wide infrastructure operation and maintenance cost is approximately \$3.5 million in FY2015-2016. A detailed analysis of the proportions of this County-wide infrastructure was prepared in 2015 by the County, and was used as the basis for the cost allocations to unincorporated areas of the County and to the municipalities. This inventory was conducted in GIS data layers and was made available to all jurisdictions by the County as part of this study. The analysis shows the proportions to be:

Unincorporated County	76.4%
City of Beaufort	3.4%
Town of Port Royal	1.0%
Town of Bluffton	11.1%
Town of Hilton Head Island	8.1%

Based on this proportional breakdown, the County intends to convey a separate charge (as a new line on the bill, not to be added to or combined with the City/Towns fees), that bills this amount per SFU or IA/GA unit, as the rate structure would require. Final fee amounts are discussed in the Modified Rate Structure section, below.

### Utility Administration

The County administers the cooperative utility for each of the five jurisdictions. Currently administrative fees are allocated across the impervious area rate base such that properties with a large number of SFUs of impervious area pay more in administrative fees than those with fewer SFUs.

Costs for this effort may be allocable to either the number of parcels or accounts for which data must be maintained, customer service must be provided, etc. These costs may instead be recovered via a fixed charge component charged to all utility customers. Alternatively, costs could be allocable to the impervious and/or gross area fee component if they are more closely related to the effort of maintaining the geospatial data or researching and addressing detailed questions from large, complex customers. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

### MS4 Compliance

The County will be subject to MS4 permit requirements beginning in late 2015. Some program elements are fulfilled by each individual jurisdiction while others are provided cooperatively. Any existing inter-governmental agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) may need to be revised if an alternate structure is chosen.

### Individual Efforts

Other MS4 permit compliance activities may be done separately by each jurisdiction, and provided only to that jurisdiction. These costs are allocable to the impervious and/or gross area fee component and revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the individual jurisdiction.

### Cooperative Efforts

#### *Monitoring*

The County currently provides monitoring efforts within the jurisdictions boundaries of the municipalities. This relationship could be expanded to other jurisdictions if desired. These costs would be driven by the number of accounts and would be included in the fixed charge component of the fee, only in the jurisdictions where the County provides this monitoring service. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

#### *Public Education/Outreach*

Currently, the jurisdictions participate in a cooperative public education and outreach scheme. Rather than implement separate agreements between each jurisdiction, this cost can be considered a per account cost and included in the fixed charge component of the fee, applicable to everyone in the County. Revenue from this fee component would be returned to the service provider, the County.

## Modeled Options

### Elements of Six Rate Structure Options

**Simplified residential rate:** Charge one of a series of flat rates, based on SFUs, to different classes of residential properties. This is how residential rates work in the current rate structure.

**Continued application of the agricultural use policy:** Properties legally under certain agricultural uses have limits placed on their stormwater fees by state law. The rate structure options will continue to follow this approach.

**Updated source data:** RFC reviewed and updated as necessary 5,937 parcel polygons with the newest available imagery from 2013. The results of this update were used to model both the modified rate structure options and the current rate structure options, which make use of the newly measured impervious features.

**Minimum charge:** A minimum charge is a rate structure feature whereby once the amount a property owes in annual stormwater fees is computed it is compared to the minimum charge and if less, the minimum charge is applied to the property. The minimum charge is set to reflect the minimum amount of demand a property can actually place on the jurisdiction providing service. The minimum charge is represented as a fixed fee component and is charged to every property.

### Options

- A. Current rate structure with updated source data; current approach for administrative fees based on impervious area units; compliance with current rate ordinance; pay-as-you-go capital financing

- B. Current rate structure with updated source data; current approach for administrative fees based on impervious area units; compliance with current rate ordinance; debt financing for some capital projects
- C. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to per-account basis; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; pay-as-you-go capital financing
- D. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to impervious and gross area; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; pay-as-you-go capital financing
- E. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area at 80/20 or 90/10 allocation; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to per account basis; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; debt for some capital financing
- F. Modified rate structure based on impervious and gross area at 80/20 or 90/10 allocation; continued use of simplified residential rates; continued application of agricultural use policy; County-wide administrative costs allocated to impervious and gross area; County-wide infrastructure maintenance costs allocated to impervious and gross area based on infrastructure miles per jurisdiction or other intra-jurisdictional allocation model; debt for some capital financing

#### Alternative Cost Sharing Approach

As an alternative to the modeled county-wide infrastructure charge, each underlying jurisdiction can work individually with the County to establish a level of service and cost for providing that service within the jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction is entitled to convey that fee to its customers in any reasonable manner, but must remit the appropriate amount to the County to receive the agreed upon services.

Table 2. Modeled Rate Structure Options

	<i>Overall Rate Structure</i>	<i>Debt Financing for Some Capital?</i>	<i>Method for Allocating Admin &amp; Reg Costs</i>	<i>Method for Allocating CWI O&amp;M Costs</i>	<i>Simplified Residential Rates</i>	<i>Alternative Cost Sharing Approach</i>
A	Current (Imp Area)	No	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
B	Current (Imp Area)	Yes	SFUs	Optional	Yes	Optional
C	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
D	Impervious & Gross Area	No	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
E	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Per account	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional
F	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Impervious & Gross Area	Impervious & Gross Area	Yes	Optional

### Modified Rate Structure

ATM modeled four of the six options based on a modified rate structure design that relies more heavily on measured impervious area data but retains the basic backbone of the existing rate structure.

### Fee Structure

The recommended fee includes three components: a fixed component to convey costs allocable by account, and two variable components: one based on gross area and one based on impervious area, to convey the costs that vary by property characteristic. With the exception of those explicitly exempt, every real property (which in some cases does not include land on the ground) has a stormwater fee calculated for it.

### Bill Class

Every property falls into one of several bill classes, which determine fee calculation for that property. Residential properties are treated in a similar manner as they are currently, with SFU equivalents to represent the impervious area on each type of residential property. Gross area and fixed fee components are added to this portion of the residential fee. Vacant property is not charged for any impervious area, measured or assumed. It is, however, charged for the gross land area of the parcel and the fixed component of the fee, as described below. Agricultural properties in the County are excluded from any fee changes by State law, and as such represent their own category of properties for which the current fee is carried forward. Exempt parcels are not charged any portion of the fee. Finally, all other properties are considered non-residential, non-vacant properties (herein called “commercial”), which are charged a per unit rate for impervious area, along with a fixed fee and gross area charge.

## Rate Structure Design

### Impervious Area Units

The existing impervious area unit of 4906 has been retained for maximum equity between residential and commercial bill classes in impervious area charge. Residential properties are charged for impervious area based on the factors existing in the current rates structure. Commercial properties are charged per 4,906 square feet unit, or part thereof, of impervious area. Under the modified rate structure design, 80% of variable costs are funded through gross area charges.

### Gross Area Blocks

A gross area fee component is included for all properties that have a real parcel and parcel area found in GIS. The gross area charge is calculated in equivalent units as follows:

- Every property is charged \$X for the first 2 acres of gross area. This means that every property getting a gross area fee is charged at least \$X.
- For every acre above 2 acres, and up to 10 acres, the property is charged  $.5 * \$X$  per acre.
- For every acre above 10 acres, and up to 100 acres, the property is charged  $.4 * \$X$  per acre.
- For every acre above 100 acres, the property is charged  $.3 * \$X$  per acre.

This declining block structure maintains the important rate base of large properties. Under the modified rate structure design, 20% of variable costs are funded through gross area charges.

### Exempt Properties and Special Cases

The modified rate structure design mirrors the current rate structure in exempt properties. Roads, railroads, private roads, and boat slip properties are exempt from stormwater fees. As described above, vacant (undeveloped) parcels are not exempt from the entire fee, but are not charged for the impervious area fee component.

### Credit

For properties receiving credit for BMPs, that credit can be carried forward in this modified rate structure.

## Rate Study Results

ATM developed a spreadsheet-based rate model tool to model the way the individual jurisdiction and County-wide costs impact rates. The comprehensive model can be manipulated to calculate rates for each of the six options described above, as well as allow for manual override of the calculated rates to predict the revenue generation and sufficiency of a particular rate structure and rate choice.

### Beaufort County

For the unincorporated County, Option E (see appendix A) results in rates for a fixed charge, an impervious area charge, and a gross area charge. This option would raise the annual charge for an average single family home on a 1 acre lot from the current \$50 per year to \$87 per year and the rate could be held stable for at least five years. All other options for the County result in less favorable rates. The fee charged to an average house on a one acre parcel in Beaufort County under the six options modeled as part of this rate study are as follows:

	Fiscal Year				
	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>Option A</b>	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$110	\$120
<b>Option B</b>	\$95	\$95	\$95	\$95	\$95
<b>Option C</b>	\$87	\$99	\$99	\$99	\$101
<b>Option D</b>	\$90	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$107
<b>Option E</b>	\$87	\$87	\$87	\$87	\$87
<b>Option F</b>	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$92

Therefore, ATM recommends rate structure option E for the County, under which administrative and regulatory compliance charges are allocated on a per account basis, infrastructure O&M costs are allocated based on the impervious and gross area, and two bond sales of \$5,000,000 occur in FY 2017 and FY 2019. Because the underlying jurisdictions are unlikely to adopt a rate structure change in the coming fiscal year, the existing \$3.18 per (paid) SFU administrative charge that has already been negotiated is retained.

The County is responsible for funding 76.4% of all county-wide infrastructure (CWI) operation and maintenance under the CWI allocation method used. Under the proposed rate structure, this is \$42.28 of the total \$87.00 annual charge for an average house on a lot smaller than 2 acres. The properties within the four municipalities are responsible for the remaining CWI funding, with the allocation based on the amount of infrastructure to be maintained that falls within each jurisdictional boundary, as described previously. For the next five fiscal years, the CWI funding within each jurisdiction’s boundaries on an SFU or IA/GA basis (depending on the rate structures chosen) are:

Table 3. County-wide Infrastructure Cost Breakdown by Jurisdiction

	FY 2015-2016	FY 2016-2017	FY 2017-2018	FY 2018-2019	FY 2019-2020
<b>CWI Cost Share on SFU Basis</b>					
Unincorporated County	\$ 41.75	\$ 42.93	\$ 43.42	\$ 44.80	\$ 45.44
City of Beaufort	\$ 8.05	\$ 8.97	\$ 8.92	\$ 9.04	\$ 9.01
Town of Port Royal	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.61	\$ 5.58	\$ 5.65	\$ 5.64
Town of Bluffton	\$ 26.34	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.19	\$ 29.60	\$ 29.50
Town of Hilton Head Island	\$ 7.66	\$ 8.54	\$ 8.49	\$ 8.61	\$ 8.58
<b>CWI Cost Share on IA/GA Unit Basis</b>					
Unincorporated County					
per IA Unit	\$ 37.41	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
per GA Unit	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
City of Beaufort					
per IA Unit	\$ 6.42	\$ 7.16	\$ 7.11	\$ 7.21	\$ 7.19
per GA Unit	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.34	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.35
Town of Port Royal					
per IA Unit	\$ 4.06	\$ 4.53	\$ 4.50	\$ 4.56	\$ 4.55
per GA Unit	\$ 1.01	\$ 1.13	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.14	\$ 1.14
Town of Bluffton					
per IA Unit	\$ 25.90	\$ 28.89	\$ 28.71	\$ 29.11	\$ 29.01
per GA Unit	\$ 3.26	\$ 3.64	\$ 3.62	\$ 3.67	\$ 3.66
Town of Hilton Head Island					
per IA Unit	\$ 6.09	\$ 6.79	\$ 6.75	\$ 6.85	\$ 6.82
per GA Unit	\$ 1.99	\$ 2.22	\$ 2.20	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.23

In the first planning year, several shared costs (those for the regional stormwater master plan, public education and outreach, and water quality monitoring) are funded via inter-governmental agreements with the responsible parties. In this year only, these are represented as separate revenues and the costs are not allocated to the jurisdictions based on SFU or IA/GA unit calculation.

### General Impacts of Rate Structure Changes

The recommended rate structure (Option E if capital intensive, Option C if not) incorporates a fixed charge per account (parcel), plus two variable charges: one for impervious area on the parcel and one for gross parcel area. It also continues the practice of using simplified residential rates for residential properties of varying types from single family detached through condominium units. Because the current billing practices for large undeveloped tracts include an impervious area estimation process while the new rates structures do not charge an impervious area fee if there is no impervious area present, the impervious charges may be divergent between the rate structures. However, the introduction of a gross area charge in the new rate structure modeled largely mimics the fee outcomes.

Using three rate metrics (fixed, impervious area, gross area) allows the fee to have components that relate to cost causation most directly and is generally preferred in utility ratemaking. For example, some administrative costs for billing and collections efforts relate much more to the existence of a bill than to the size of the bill. Paying these costs from an impervious area rate shifts costs to large ratepayers while paying these costs from a fixed charge, as recommended, allocates the costs more equally across all ratepayers.

### Needed Ordinance Revisions

#### County

If a new rate structure is adopted, significant revisions to the County's stormwater utility fee ordinance will be needed. While the revisions are outside the ATM team's scope of work, the team has identified the following categories to focus on:

1. The definitions for residential dwelling classifications and nonresidential properties will need to be revised according to the new rate structure, which does not strictly classify properties according to their land use code in the County tax data.
2. In the definitions and general funding policy section, the rate structure and fee calculation description will need to be updated (refer to Rate Structure Design section above).
3. The stormwater service fee rates for other jurisdictions should be removed and replaced with language that says the County will convey the fees for all jurisdictions until each has transitioned to the revised rate structure. The ordinance should state that the same rate structure will apply for all jurisdictions and should describe how the County will maintain stormwater billing data and conduct other administrative tasks. Once a jurisdiction has transitioned to the new rate structure, the jurisdiction should revise its own ordinance on stormwater service fee rates and execution of utility authority.
4. References to findings from the 2005 rate study should be eliminated or updated to reflect the current findings.

5. References to the stormwater utility's responsibilities and how it is managed will need to be revised to take into account the multijurisdictional nature of the utility and any changes to the way funding (especially for county-wide drainage infrastructure) occurs. The revisions can be based on current inter-governmental governmental agreements with the City and Towns.
6. After each jurisdiction transitions to a revised rate structure, the references to inter-governmental agreements on administrative fees in the County ordinance can be replaced with details on the actual fee component.

### Ongoing Billing Data Maintenance

Data maintenance processes for stormwater utility fee billing are crucial to enabling accurate and timely reporting and customer service. Parcel data from the five jurisdictions should be integrated and kept as current as possible for use in determining properties that are billable for the stormwater fee. A GIS layer representing impervious surfaces should be updated regularly in response to development, demolition, and recognition of incorrect data. Other County data sources such as building permit applications and changes in improvement values can also be utilized as triggers to begin or update stormwater billing.

The ATM team will provide technical guidance on data maintenance in a separate memorandum that will go into detail on digitization and GIS processes, triggers for new or changed development, and other processes for keeping stormwater billing data current.



Appendix A – Beaufort County Recommended Rates (Options A-F)

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option A

		FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
<b>Rate Base</b>						
1.00%	Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50%	Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00%	Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>						
	Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
	County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
	Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
	County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
	County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
	County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
	Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
	Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,454,173	\$ 5,006,219	\$ 5,036,747	\$ 6,701,026
<b>Debt Service</b>						
	Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
	Actual Coverage					
<b>Current RS Fee Alternative</b>						
	Impervious Area Units	60,927	60,622	60,319	60,017	59,717
	Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 120.00
	Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 41.75	\$ 42.93	\$ 43.42	\$ 44.80	\$ 45.44
	Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Anticipated Unincorporated County Fee Billings	\$ 6,092,675	\$ 6,062,211	\$ 6,031,900	\$ 6,601,915	\$ 7,166,079
	Collection Factor	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%
<b>Revenues</b>						
	Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 5,727,114	\$ 5,698,479	\$ 5,669,986	\$ 6,205,800	\$ 6,736,114
	Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
	Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
	Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
	Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
	Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
	Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
	Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
	Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>						
	FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 506,876	\$ (51,158)	\$ (194,686)	\$ 145,379
	Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
	Total Revenues	\$ 6,182,976	\$ 5,980,479	\$ 5,952,025	\$ 6,487,911	\$ 7,020,984
	Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 72,797	\$ (558,034)	\$ (143,528)	\$ 340,065	\$ (801,494)
	FY End Fund Balance	\$ 506,876	\$ (51,158)	\$ (194,686)	\$ 145,379	\$ (656,115)

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option B

		FY 2015-2016 Current RS	FY 2016-2017 Current RS	FY 2017-2018 Current RS	FY 2018-2019 Current RS	FY 2019-2020 Current RS
<b>Rate Base</b>						
1.00%	Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50%	Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00%	Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>						
	Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
	County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
	Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
	County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
	County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
	County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
	Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
	Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
	Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,454,173	\$ 5,006,219	\$ 5,036,747	\$ 6,701,026
<b>Debt Service</b>						
	Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
	Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
	Actual Coverage		8.46	4.23	2.46	1.69
<b>Current RS Fee Alternative</b>						
	Impervious Area Units	60,927	60,622	60,319	60,017	59,717
	Fee	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00
	Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ 41.75	\$ 42.93	\$ 43.42	\$ 44.80	\$ 45.44
	Override Countywide Infrastructure Charge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Anticipated Unincorporated County Fee Billings	\$ 5,788,041	\$ 5,759,101	\$ 5,730,305	\$ 5,701,654	\$ 5,673,146
	Collection Factor	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%
<b>Revenues</b>						
	Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 5,440,759	\$ 5,413,555	\$ 5,386,487	\$ 5,359,555	\$ 5,332,757
	Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
	Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
	Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
	Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
	Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
	Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
	Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
	Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>						
	FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 220,520	\$ 4,231,377	\$ 3,511,979	\$ 7,567,243
	Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,684,698	\$ 6,387,923	\$ 6,586,402	\$ 8,407,219
	Total Revenues	\$ 5,896,621	\$ 10,695,555	\$ 5,668,526	\$ 10,641,665	\$ 5,617,627
	Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (213,559)	\$ 4,010,857	\$ (719,398)	\$ 4,055,264	\$ (2,789,592)
	FY End Fund Balance	\$ 220,520	\$ 4,231,377	\$ 3,511,979	\$ 7,567,243	\$ 4,777,650

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option C

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
<b>Rate Base</b>					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 639,616	\$ 589,928	\$ 625,797	\$ 652,451
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,470,096	\$ 5,021,894	\$ 5,052,173	\$ 6,716,452
<b>Debt Service</b>					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
<b>Revised RS Stormwater Fee</b>					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 11.74	\$ 12.44	\$ 11.66	\$ 12.15	\$ 12.53
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ 2.81	\$ 2.74	\$ 2.80	\$ 2.84	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ 8.93	\$ 9.70	\$ 8.85	\$ 9.30	\$ 9.60
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 14.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 61.49	\$ 69.22	\$ 63.61	\$ 63.82	\$ 88.67
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 37.41	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 24.07	\$ 30.74	\$ 24.70	\$ 23.67	\$ 47.94
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 65.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.05	\$ 8.36	\$ 8.43	\$ 11.77
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 3.13	\$ 4.02	\$ 3.24	\$ 3.13	\$ 6.36
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,364,442	\$ 6,017,238	\$ 5,995,803	\$ 5,974,702	\$ 6,154,736
<b>Revenues</b>					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,881,642	\$ 5,535,859	\$ 5,636,055	\$ 5,616,220	\$ 5,785,452
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 48,230	\$ 45,825	\$ 43,421	\$ 43,421
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 712,776	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 374,179	\$ 442,442	\$ 1,059,103	\$ 1,625,649
Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total Revenues	\$ 6,050,280	\$ 6,606,775	\$ 6,712,213	\$ 6,714,392	\$ 6,893,978
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (59,900)	\$ 68,263	\$ 616,661	\$ 566,546	\$ (928,500)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 374,179	\$ 442,442	\$ 1,059,103	\$ 1,625,649	\$ 697,149

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option D

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
<b>Rate Base</b>					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,454,173	\$ 5,006,219	\$ 5,036,747	\$ 6,701,026
<b>Debt Service</b>					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage					
<b>Revised RS Stormwater Fee</b>					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 72.77	\$ 80.63	\$ 74.38	\$ 75.21	\$ 100.57
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.19	\$ 2.24	\$ 2.28	\$ 2.34
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 8.58	\$ 9.22	\$ 8.53	\$ 9.11	\$ 9.56
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 37.41	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 24.07	\$ 30.74	\$ 24.70	\$ 23.67	\$ 47.94
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 80.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 95.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 9.47	\$ 10.54	\$ 9.78	\$ 9.94	\$ 13.35
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.29	\$ 0.29	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.31
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.21	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.27
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 3.13	\$ 4.02	\$ 3.24	\$ 3.13	\$ 6.36
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,396,494	\$ 5,905,440	\$ 5,870,700	\$ 5,836,240	\$ 6,269,372
<b>Revenues</b>					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,910,810	\$ 5,433,005	\$ 5,518,458	\$ 5,486,066	\$ 5,893,210
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 712,776	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 403,347	\$ 384,679	\$ 899,417	\$ 1,351,236
Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total Revenues	\$ 6,079,448	\$ 6,519,844	\$ 6,610,291	\$ 6,599,664	\$ 7,017,162
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (30,732)	\$ (18,668)	\$ 514,739	\$ 451,819	\$ (805,316)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 403,347	\$ 384,679	\$ 899,417	\$ 1,351,236	\$ 545,920

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option E

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
<b>Rate Base</b>					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 639,616	\$ 589,928	\$ 625,797	\$ 652,451
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,470,096	\$ 5,021,894	\$ 5,052,173	\$ 6,716,452
<b>Debt Service</b>					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage		10.45	5.64	3.47	2.48
<b>Revised RS Stormwater Fee</b>					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ 11.74	\$ 12.44	\$ 11.66	\$ 12.15	\$ 12.53
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ 2.81	\$ 2.74	\$ 2.80	\$ 2.84	\$ 2.93
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ 8.93	\$ 9.70	\$ 8.85	\$ 9.30	\$ 9.60
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00	\$ 12.00
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 61.49	\$ 71.38	\$ 67.96	\$ 70.37	\$ 97.44
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 37.41	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 24.07	\$ 32.90	\$ 29.04	\$ 30.22	\$ 56.71
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 8.00	\$ 9.34	\$ 8.93	\$ 9.30	\$ 12.94
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 3.13	\$ 4.30	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.99	\$ 7.53
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,364,442	\$ 5,344,144	\$ 5,324,099	\$ 5,304,356	\$ 5,284,872
<b>Revenues</b>					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,881,642	\$ 4,916,612	\$ 5,004,653	\$ 4,986,095	\$ 4,967,780
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 48,230	\$ 45,825	\$ 43,421	\$ 43,421
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 712,776	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 374,179	\$ 4,677,010	\$ 4,369,898	\$ 8,867,764
Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,684,698	\$ 6,387,923	\$ 6,586,402	\$ 8,407,219
Total Revenues	\$ 6,050,280	\$ 10,987,529	\$ 6,080,812	\$ 11,084,267	\$ 6,076,305
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (59,900)	\$ 4,302,831	\$ (307,112)	\$ 4,497,865	\$ (2,330,914)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 374,179	\$ 4,677,010	\$ 4,369,898	\$ 8,867,764	\$ 6,536,850

# Beaufort County Stormwater Rate Study Report

July 17, 2015

Beaufort County  
Summary Sheet  
Option F

	FY 2015-2016 Revised RS	FY 2016-2017 Revised RS	FY 2017-2018 Revised RS	FY 2018-2019 Revised RS	FY 2019-2020 Revised RS
<b>Rate Base</b>					
1.00% Accounts	65,314	65,967	66,627	67,293	67,966
-0.50% Billable IA Units	54,388	54,116	53,845	53,576	53,308
-1.00% Billable Equivalent GA Units	104,545	103,500	102,465	101,440	100,426
<b>Costs</b>					
Administration (50250012)	\$ 360,495	\$ 363,725	\$ 368,737	\$ 373,179	\$ 379,546
County Portion: Administration	\$ 183,255	\$ 148,378	\$ 150,699	\$ 152,416	\$ 156,023
Regulatory Compliance (50250013)	\$ 620,242	\$ 687,847	\$ 635,754	\$ 669,218	\$ 695,872
County Portion: Regulatory Compliance	\$ 583,300	\$ 623,693	\$ 574,254	\$ 610,371	\$ 637,025
County-Wide Infrastructure O&M (50250011)	\$ 3,492,833	\$ 3,407,621	\$ 3,428,602	\$ 3,520,449	\$ 3,552,600
County Portion: County-Wide Infrastructure	\$ 2,543,648	\$ 2,602,782	\$ 2,618,807	\$ 2,688,961	\$ 2,713,518
Capital Purchases & Projects	\$ 1,636,609	\$ 2,079,320	\$ 1,662,460	\$ 1,585,000	\$ 3,194,460
Total County Costs (excl. debt service)	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,538,513	\$ 6,095,553	\$ 6,147,846	\$ 7,822,478
Total County Costs excl. Shared Services Payable by Others (excl. debt service)	\$ 4,946,813	\$ 5,454,173	\$ 5,006,219	\$ 5,036,747	\$ 6,701,026
<b>Debt Service</b>					
Annual Debt Service	\$ -	\$ 146,185	\$ 292,371	\$ 438,556	\$ 584,741
Coverage Goal	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Actual Coverage		10.69	5.72	3.50	2.80
<b>Revised RS Stormwater Fee</b>					
Fixed Cost per Account, Calc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, admin portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, regulatory compliance portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost per Account, CWI portion:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fixed Cost Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Fixed Cost per Account, Override	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Variable Costs, IA Proportion	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Variable Costs, GA Proportion	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 72.77	\$ 82.80	\$ 78.73	\$ 81.76	\$ 109.34
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 2.70	\$ 2.19	\$ 2.24	\$ 2.28	\$ 2.34
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 8.58	\$ 9.22	\$ 8.53	\$ 9.11	\$ 9.56
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 37.41	\$ 38.48	\$ 38.91	\$ 40.15	\$ 40.72
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 24.07	\$ 32.90	\$ 29.04	\$ 30.22	\$ 56.71
IA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, IA Unit Fee Override	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Calc	\$ 9.47	\$ 10.83	\$ 10.35	\$ 10.80	\$ 14.51
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, administrative portion:	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.29	\$ 0.29	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.31
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, reg compliance portion:	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.21	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.27
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, CWI portion:	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.03	\$ 5.11	\$ 5.30	\$ 5.40
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee, Other County costs portion:	\$ 3.13	\$ 4.30	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.99	\$ 7.53
GA Collection Rate	91%	92%	94%	94%	94%
Variable Costs, GA Unit Fee Override	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 12.00
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Billings	\$ 5,396,494	\$ 5,364,280	\$ 5,332,250	\$ 5,300,480	\$ 5,469,752
<b>Revenues</b>					
Anticipated Unincorp County Fee Revenue	\$ 4,910,810	\$ 4,935,138	\$ 5,012,315	\$ 4,982,451	\$ 5,141,567
Anticipated Revenue from other Jurisdictions					
Administrative Fee	\$ 177,240	\$ 215,346	\$ 218,038	\$ 220,764	\$ 223,523
Regulatory Compliance	\$ -	\$ 64,154	\$ 61,500	\$ 58,847	\$ 58,847
Countywide Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 712,776	\$ 804,840	\$ 809,795	\$ 831,488	\$ 839,082
Current Shared Services IGA for SMP Update	\$ 236,409				
Current Shared Services IGA for WQ Monitoring & PE/PO	\$ 36,942				
Interest	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Project Cost Shares	\$ 2,771				
Bond Issuance Proceeds	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ -
<b>Fund Balance</b>					
FY Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 434,079	\$ 403,347	\$ 4,740,626	\$ 4,456,851	\$ 8,966,500
Total Costs	\$ 6,110,180	\$ 6,684,698	\$ 6,387,923	\$ 6,586,402	\$ 8,407,219
Total Revenues	\$ 6,079,448	\$ 11,021,977	\$ 6,104,148	\$ 11,096,050	\$ 6,265,519
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ (30,732)	\$ 4,337,279	\$ (283,775)	\$ 4,509,648	\$ (2,141,700)
FY End Fund Balance	\$ 403,347	\$ 4,740,626	\$ 4,456,851	\$ 8,966,500	\$ 6,824,799

**AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE PROHIBITING THE IMPORTATION OF EXOTIC ANIMALS WITHIN BEAUFORT COUNTY**

**WHEREAS**, the Beaufort County Code does not currently prohibit the keeping, maintenance, possession, or control of exotic animals; and

**WHEREAS**, the Beaufort County Council has determined that a potential threat - currently exists to the safety and welfare of the citizens of Beaufort County in that such exotic animals are currently are or may soon be brought into the County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council has further determined that prohibiting the importation of exotic animals is in the best interests of the citizens of the County and necessary to protect the safety and welfare of the public; and

**WHEREAS**, S.C. Code Ann. §4-9-130 authorizes the enactment of emergency ordinances by County Council to address public emergencies affecting the life, health, safety or the property of the people of Beaufort County; and

**WHEREAS**, County Council has determined that an identifiable and ongoing emergency situation exists and that increasing the population of exotic animals in the County will affect - public safety;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, for the reasons set forth above, and in the interests of public safety and welfare of the citizens of Beaufort County, the Council hereby declares the existence of such an emergency in the County; and furthermore

BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED by the Beaufort County Council as follows:

1. *Definition.* An “exotic animal” shall be defined as one which would ordinarily be confined to a zoo, or one which would ordinarily be found in the wilderness of this or any other country or one which is a species of animal not indigenous to the United States or to North America, or to one which otherwise causes a reasonable person to be fearful of significant destruction of property or of bodily harm and the latter includes, but would not be limited to, such animals as monkeys, raccoons, squirrels, ocelots, bobcats, lions, tigers, bears, wolves, hybrid wolves, and other such animals or one which causes



zoonotic diseases. Such animals are further defined as being those mammals or those nonvenomous reptiles weighing over 50 pounds at maturity which are known at law as *Ferae naturae*. Wild or exotic animals specifically do not include animals of a species customarily used in South Carolina as ordinary household pets, animals of a species customarily used in South Carolina as domestic farm animals, fish contained in an aquarium, birds or insects.

2. *Unlawful Act*. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to import into Beaufort County, any venomous reptile or any other exotic animal.

This ordinance is effective immediately upon enactment and shall automatically expire on the sixty first (61) day following the date of enactment.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
D. Paul Sommerville, Chairman

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Keaveny, II, County Attorney

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne M. Rainey, Clerk to Council

Third and Final Reading:

**ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE DECLARING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND AUTHORIZING BEAUFORT COUNTY ADMINISTRATION TO TRANSFER REAL PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS TMP: R120 008 000 0210**

**WHEREAS**, Beaufort County is the owner of real property located at 1603 Ivy Lane, Beaufort, South Carolina specifically identified a TMP: R120 008 000 0210; and

**WHEREAS**, the property was previously utilized by Beaufort County Disabilities and Special Needs as a housing facility; and

**WHEREAS**, Beaufort County Disabilities and Special Needs discontinued the use of the property, thereby leaving the property unoccupied; and

**WHEREAS**, an appraisal conducted on June 10, 2014 stated that while there was no apparent friable asbestos observed, that all or part of the improvements were constructed before 1979 when asbestos was a common building material; and

**WHEREAS**, based on the appraisal dated June 10, 2014 the property is in need of certain remediation; and

**WHEREAS**, LowCountry Habitat for Humanity is a non-profit corporation located in Beaufort, South Carolina that seeks to provide affordable housing for Beaufort County citizens; and

**WHEREAS**, Beaufort County Council has determined that it is in the best interests of the citizens of Beaufort County to declare the above-described property as surplus property and to transfer the property to LowCountry Habitat for Humanity for remediation and the promotion of affordable housing; and

**WHEREAS**, S.C. Code Ann. § 4-9-130 requires that the transfer of any interest in real property owned by the County must be authorized by the adoption of an Ordinance by Beaufort County Council.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** Be it Ordained by Beaufort County Council, that the above-described property is declared surplus property and the County Administrator is hereby authorized to transfer the property identified as TMP: R120 008 000 0210 to LowCountry Habitat for Humanity for remediation and the promotion of affordable housing.

**ADOPTED BY BEAUFORT COUNTY COUNCIL, BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA,  
ON THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.**

COUNTY COUNCIL OF BEAUFORT COUNTY

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
D. Paul Sommerville, Chairman

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Keaveny, II, County Attorney

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne M. Rainey, Clerk to Council

First Reading: June 22, 2015  
Second Reading: July 7, 2015  
Public Hearing:  
Third and Final Reading: