

From: Soura, Christian
To: 'KenMoffitt@scsenate.gov'KenMoffitt@scsenate.gov
CC: 'PaulaBenson@scsenate.gov'PaulaBenson@scsenate.gov
Date: 1/10/2013 8:45:56 AM
Subject: Re: Funding for SFAA and POB

That's fine - we can discuss in greater detail whenever's convenient. I imagine we'll have a while... Thanks.

CLS

From: Ken Moffitt [mailto:KenMoffitt@scsenate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 08:35 AM
To: Soura, Christian
Cc: Paula Benson <PaulaBenson@scsenate.gov>
Subject: RE: Funding for SFAA and POB

I have looked at this and I think that the answer is yes and no. My explanation and interpretation is too long to get across in an email this morning before we go into the subcommittee. I better understand what your concern is but I think that my interpretation of the language is different. I think this is something that can be worked through. However, I think that it is important to note that this identical language (relating to the SFAA) was in the Conference Report last year only it was directed to the SCAA "we just assumed that was a settled matter. Clearly, most everything with POB is new and we will have to work through that.

From: Soura, Christian [mailto:ChristianSoura@gov.sc.gov]
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

