

From: Soura, Christian
To: Patel, SwatiSwatiPatel@gov.sc.gov
Date: 1/10/2013 9:42:09 AM
Subject: Fw: Funding for SFAA and POB

From: Ken Moffitt [mailto:KenMoffitt@scsenate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 08:27 AM
To: Soura, Christian
Cc: Paula Benson <PaulaBenson@scsenate.gov>
Subject: RE: Funding for SFAA and POB

I expect for the Subcommittee to be receptive to simplifying the language. We do not need legislative language or even suggestions for today. The simple directive to simplify the language will suffice.

From: Soura, Christian [mailto:ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 1:19 AM
To: asmlaw30@bellsouth.net; Ken Moffitt
Cc: Patel, Swati; Veldran, Katherine
Subject: RE: Funding for SFAA and POB

I went back through the Executive Budget / Strategic Planning language tonight. Given that (1) the subcommittee meeting is only a few hours away and (2) it sounds like youâ€™d rather make amendments to Â§11-11-10 through -90 that are more "conforming" than "comprehensive," I donâ€™t think itâ€™s worth trying to produce an amendment to these passages tonight for you to consider by 9:30. Especially since this process is likely to drag on for quite some time, with countless opportunities for later amendments.

I've typed-up some overly detailed notes on those sections that we can discuss if/when you're interested. As I said earlier, my general concern with this passage is that even with the proposed amendments, these sections largely aren't reflective of current practice, but they also don't push us as far as they could towards a better budgeting process than the one we have today. I also think there are implementation date issues that we can take-up later and I don't think would be controversial to address.

Developing a more formalized capital budgeting (and planning) process would be a real improvement, as would be the creation of a performance measurement initiative. The bill as currently drafted takes steps in both those directions. I think some fine-tuning is called for, but in the grand scheme of things, it can wait for another draft or two...and also for us to have another conversation about intent. Thanks.

CLS

Christian L. Soura
Deputy Chief of Staff

(803) 543-0792
ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov

From: Soura, Christian
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 11:39 PM
To: asmlaw30@bellsouth.net; Ken Moffitt
Cc: Patel, Swati; Veldran, Katherine
Subject: Funding for SFAA and POB

I tracked down the references tonight...

For SFAA, I think that Â§11-55-10(B)(3) and (D) are somewhat in conflict. The former states that the legislature "shall appropriate those funds necessary for the operations of the authority." The latter states that DoA must provide administrative support "at no cost to the authority" and then proceeds to list a whole range of items that this would include. This would leave DoA holding the bag for a significant portion of SFAA's costs. This is also a concern because SFAA could run up the tab, and DoA would have no ability to plan for that or to control those expenditures. (Page 105)

For POB, I read Â§11-35-315 to mean that DoA would have to pay for POB's costs (which would include the entire current BCB Procurement Division, if the intent of the bill isn't to put IT Procurement in DoA as Page 7 currently indicates), but again, without the ability to meaningfully plan for or control those expenditures. (Page 126)

DoA would be budgetarily culpable for both SFAA and POB, but without the ability to manage/control those costs. I'm concerned that this runs contrary to the overall theme that we're trying to improve accountability and management through this bill.

Anyway, thanks again for hearing us out today. I'll try to pull together some language on the budget/performance measurement/strategic planning stuff later tonight...

CLS

Christian L. Soura
Deputy Chief of Staff

(803) 543-0792
ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov