



# **RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

## **DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Bernice G. Scott	Kit Smith	Norman Jackson, Chair	Damon Jeter	Bill Malinowski
District 10	District 5	District 11	District 3	District 1

**JULY 22, 2008  
4:00 PM**

**2020 Hampton Street  
Council Chambers**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Regular Session: June 24, 2008

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

### **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

2. Request to negotiate a contract for the purpose of undertaking petroleum and hazardous substance Brownfield assessments at sites identified throughout the county (Vendor recommendation will be presented to council in September for approval)
3. Request to approve a construction contract with International Roofing for repairs and replacement of the Central Garage roof
4. An ordinance so as to create the Richland County Community Development Corporation and to provide for its membership, duties and powers

5. Request to establish a policy for conducting corridor studies with Neighborhood Improvement Program funds in conjunction with Central Midlands Council of Governments.
6. Request to negotiate a contract for the purchase of a new 911 system (Vendor recommendation will be presented to council in September for approval)
7. Request to approve a FILOT Supplement Policy for the Industrial Park Account

## **ADJOURNMENT**



# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Regular Session: June 24, 2008

## **Purpose**

The committee is requested to approve the minutes from the June 24, 2008 D&S Committee meeting.

## **Background / Discussion**

N/A

## **Financial Impact**

N/A

## **Alternatives**

1. Approve the minutes as submitted.
2. Approve the minutes with amendments.
3. Do not approve the minutes.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the committee approve the minutes.

**Recommended By:** Joe Cronin  
**Department:** Administration

**Date:** 05-20-2008

## **Reviews**

**Richland County Council  
Development and Services Committee  
June 24, 2008  
5:00 PM**



*In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.*

---

**Members Present:**

Chair: Norman Jackson  
Member: Bill Malinowski  
Member: Bernice G. Scott  
Member: Kit Smith

Absent: Damon Jeter

**Others Present:** Valerie Hutchinson, Joyce Dickerson, Michelle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Roxanne Matthews, Joe Cronin, Jennifer Dowden, Alesia Williams, Larry Smith, Teresa Smith, John Hixon, Sandra Hayes, Geo Price, Jennie Sherry-Linder, Amelia Linder, Frank Frierson, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:02 p.m.

The committee recessed at 5:04 p.m. and reconvened at 5:29 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**May 27, 2008 (Regular Session)** – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

## ITEMS FOR ACTION

**Request to close a road/easement located to the east and south of Covenant Road** – Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Ms. Smith, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

Mr. Malinowski moved to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for denial. The motion died for lack of a second.

The vote was in favor.

**Request to negotiate and award a professional services contract to the most responsive bidder for the removal and replacement of all HVAC controls and operating system for the Richland County Administration and Health Department Buildings** – Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Ms. Smith, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

### **Amendment of ordinances to support Richland County's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements**

- a. Chapter 12—Garbage, Trash & Refuse Ordinance
- b. Chapter 26—Land Development Ordinance

Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Ms. Smith, to defer this item until the July committee meeting.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

## ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

**Discussion of modifications to Hobart Road** – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Scott, to remove this item from the agenda until further action is taken by a Council member. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Discussion of a request to install a turn lane on Longtown Road for the Holly Ridge subdivision** – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Scott, to remove this item from the agenda until further action is taken by a Council member. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Discussion of location requirements for community residential care facilities** – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Scott, to remove this item from the agenda until further action is taken by a Council member. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Request to limit the number of daycares and nurseries in residential neighborhoods** – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Scott, to remove this item from the agenda until further action is taken by a Council member. The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Request to create a Community Development Corporation** – The committee directed staff to provide them additional information regarding this item.

**Report from the Citizens' Committee for Animal Issues regarding amendments to the county's vicious dog ordinance** – Ms. Mary Dennis Cauthen gave a brief presentation to the committee

**Request to impose fees and licensing requirements for sites with waste storage** – No action was taken.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:54.

Submitted by,

Norman Jackson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Request to negotiate a contract for the purpose of undertaking petroleum and hazardous substance Brownfield assessments at sites identified throughout the county (Vendor recommendation will be presented to council in September for approval)

## **Purpose**

Council is requested to authorize the Procurement Director to negotiate a contract for the purpose of undertaking petroleum and hazardous substance Brownfield assessments at sites identified throughout the county. Following negotiations, this contract will be brought back to the full council for approval prior to being awarded by the Procurement Director.

## **Background / Discussion**

In April 2008, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced a grant award for 2, three-year Brownfield Assessment Projects to Richland County: \$200,000 for Hazardous Substances assessments and \$200,000 for Petroleum assessments. This award was announced by the county administrator during the April 15, 2008 meeting of Richland County Council.

The term of this project began July 1, 2008. The County is seeking a qualified and experienced environmental consultant to assist in completing the necessary site inventory and environmental assessment activities to make this a highly successful project.

Due to the need to award a contract by October 1, 2008 to keep the project on-time, Council is asked at this time to approve negotiation of a contract by the Procurement Director, based on the recommendation of the proposal review team. The proposal review team is made up of representatives from the following departments: Administration, Community Development, Finance, Planning, and Procurement.

If authorized by council, the Procurement Director will negotiate a contract with the most responsive, responsible and advantageous proposal for the county. The results of the negotiations and award recommendation will be brought back to council for approval. Because the A&F Committee will not meet again until September 23, 2008, staff is requesting approval from Council to bring the contract back for approval during the September 16, 2008 council meeting.

## **Financial Impact**

Funding for this project will be provided by the EPA, who, through a cooperative agreement with the Richland County, will provide \$400,000 for petroleum and hazardous substance Brownfield assessments at sites identified throughout the county. Therefore, there is no financial impact associated with this request.

## **Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to authorize the Procurement Director to negotiate a contract with the most qualified, responsive, responsible and advantageous proposal, for the purpose of undertaking petroleum and hazardous substance Brownfield assessments at sites identified throughout the county. The contract will be brought back to council for approval prior to being awarded by the Procurement Director.
2. Do not approve the request. This option will force a delay of full project implementation.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that council approve the request to authorize the Procurement Director to negotiate with the most qualified, responsive, responsible and advantageous proposal. Due to the October 1, 2008 deadline, and because the A&F Committee is not scheduled to meet again until September 23, 2008, it is also recommended that the Procurement Director also be authorized to bring the contract back to Council for approval during Council’s second regularly scheduled meeting on September 16, 2008.

**Recommended By:**

Staff / Brownfields Committee

**Department:**

Administration

**Date:**

07-11-2008

**Reviews**

**Finance**

**Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers

**Date:** 7/14/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Procurement**

**Reviewed by:** Rodolfo Callwood

**Date:** 7/17/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Legal**

**Reviewed by:** Larry Smith

**Date:** 7/18/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Administration**

**Reviewed by:** J. Milton Pope

**Date:** 7/18/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Recommend approval...



# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Request to approve a construction contract with International Roofing for repairs and replacement of the Central Garage roof

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this request is to seek County Council's approval to enter into a construction contract with the lowest most responsive bidder for the repairs and replacement of the Central Garage roof located on the Public Works compound.

## **Background / Discussion**

The Central Garage facility has two different types of roofing systems per original design. The primary section of the building has a gravel surface built-up roof and each of the adjacent sections have a metal roofing system. The county contracted a roofing consultant to do a comprehensive roof study on all of its existing facilities in 2006. During this study, the consultant found that this facility was a top priority among all of the other buildings and strongly recommended major repairs through partial component replacement by the end of calendar year 2008. During the timeframe between study completion, budgeting and design the roof has developed leaks resulting in water intrusion into the facility. All of the funding for this project was budgeted according to the estimates provided with the comprehensive roof study.

Engineering plans have been prepared and permitted for this roofing project. These plans were advertised and bids were received on July 2, 2008. The following is a list of bidders from the lowest to the highest:

1. International Roofing	\$ 109,823.00
2. Aquaseal	\$ 118,850.00
3. Roof Co.	\$ 131,113.00
4. Stanick Roofing	\$ 149,945.00

The roofing consultant has evaluated these bids and has recommended a contract be award to the lowest most responsive bidder, International Roofing, in the amount of \$109,823.00. There will be a five percent contingency included to cover any unanticipated obstacles bringing the total amount to \$115,314.15.

## **Financial Impact**

The recommended bid amount, with contingency, of \$115,314.15 is within the currently budgeted available funds to complete the repairs and replacement of the roof on this project.

## **Alternatives**

1. Award the construction contract to the lowest most responsive bidder so the repairs can be scheduled and stop water intrusion into the interior of the facility and the employee's offices.
2. Do not award the contract at this time and risk continued deterioration of the Central Garage facility.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of a construction contract to International Roofing, for the Central Garage Roof Repairs and Replacement project in the amount of \$115,314.15.

Item# 3

**Recommended By:**

John Mincy

**Department:**

Public Works

**Date:**

07-02-2008

**Reviews****Finance****Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers**Date:** 7/15/2008**Recommend:**Yes**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Funds were approved in the FY08 budget. Approval would require a rollover of the budget dollars from FY08 to FY09.

**Procurement****Reviewed by:** Rodolfo Callwood**Date:** 7/15/2008**Recommend:**Yes**Comments Regarding Recommendation:****Legal****Reviewed by:** Larry Smith**Date:** 7/16/2008**Recommend:**Yes**Comments Regarding Recommendation:****Administration****Reviewed by:** Tony McDonald**Date:** 7/16/2008**Recommend:**Yes**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Recommend approval of the proposed contract award and of the rollover of money from the FY 08 budget to fund the project.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

An ordinance so as to create the Richland County Community Development Corporation and to provide for its membership, duties and powers

## **Purpose**

The D&S Committee is requested to direct staff as to its preference with regards to creating a Community Development Corporation.

## **Background / Discussion**

This item was referred to the D&S Committee for consideration by Councilman Norman Jackson during the motion period on June 3, 2008.

Staff from the Community Development Department has prepared a memo outlining the purpose of Community Development Corporations, as well as a brief explanation of its pros and cons. (See attachment)

At the June Committee meeting, a question was asked regarding the cost of such a corporation. Based upon preliminary estimates from discussions with Benedict - Allen Community Development Corporation, the cost for such a venture would be approximately \$300,000 - 350,000 annually. This number is based on 4 employees. (The Benedict - Allen CDC has 7 employees with an annual budget of \$350,000. The City of Columbia's CDC has similar numbers.)

The ordinance to create such a corporation is attached by title only.

Staff is requesting direction from Council with regards to this item. If Council wishes to pursue the creation of a Community Development Corporation, it must direct staff to do so, and provide parameters for the creation of such a corporation, to include, but not be limited to, the powers and duties of the corporation, the number of corporation members, the makeup of the corporation, the funding of the corporation, the projects to be undertaken by the corporation, the partnerships to be considered (Benedict - Allen Community Development Corporation, Columbia Community Development Corporation, etc.)

## **Financial Impact**

Preliminary estimates are approximately \$300,000 - \$350,000 annually, with a projected staff of 4 - 7. Based upon the scope, as yet to be determined, this number could change. No budgeted funds exist for this item.

## **Alternatives**

1. Direct staff to proceed with the creation of a Community Development Corporation. Council must provide staff with direction regarding the parameters discussed above.
2. Do not direct staff to proceed with the creation of a Community Development Corporation at this time.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Recommendation**

This is a policy decision of Council. This item was forwarded by Councilman Norman Jackson during the Motion Period at the June 3, 2008 Richland County Council meeting.

Item# 4

**Recommended By:**  
Council Motion (Norman Jackson)

**Department:**  
County Council

**Date:**  
06-03-2008

## **Reviews**

### **Finance**

**Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers

**Date:** 7/15/2008

**Recommend:**No recommendation

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

This is a policy decision for Council. However if Council decision is to move forward, the County must consider not only the start-up and fieldwork cost but also the ongoing administrative costs associated with ensuring that the funds are handling according to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and in compliance with all Federal and State Laws for use of non-profit funds. Failure to properly fund the resources needed to ensure financial compliance could have a negative effect on the County's financial position.

### **Legal**

**Reviewed by:** Larry Smith

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:**No recommendation

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Council's discretion.

### **Administration**

**Reviewed by:** Tony McDonald

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:**No recommendation

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

The Council's guidance is requested as to whether it wishes to further explore the creation of a Community Development Corporation. If it is the Council's desire to proceed, staff will bring back more detailed information for the Council's consideration. I would reiterate the Finance Director's comments if this course of action is to be pursued.

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Members of Richland County Council

**Through:** Tony McDonald

**From:** Frank Frierson

**Date:** July 18, 2008

**Subject:** Examine Possible Creation of Community Development Corporation

---

At the June 3, 2008 Council meeting a motion was put forward by Councilman Norman Jackson to “Examine the possibility of Richland County creating a Community Development Corporation.”

A Community Development Corporation (CDC) is a broad term referring to not-for-profit organizations incorporated to provide programs, offer services and engage in other activities that promote and support a community. CDCs usually serve a geographic location such as a neighborhood, a town, or a county. They often focus on serving lower-income residents or struggling neighborhoods. They can be involved in a variety of activities including economic development, housing development, social services and development of community facilities. These organizations are often associated with the development of affordable housing.

The creation of a CDC is legally the same as any other non-profit entity organized under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Steps would include: develop a set of by-laws, file for incorporation with the state and once that is completed apply to the federal Internal Revenue Service for designation as a tax exempt non-profit organization. The IRS designation is necessary in order for the CDC to obtain grants and gifts from any government, corporate, foundation sources or from individuals.

Since the establishment of Richland County as an Entitlement Community (CDBG designation) and a Participating Jurisdiction (HOME designation) in 2002 the county has been awarded over \$9.6 million in CDBG funds, over \$3.7 million in HOME funds, and over \$149,000 in ADDI funds. During this period members of administration, council, and community development have discussed if the creation of a CDC would assist the county in expending these funds in a more efficient and timely manner and assist in establishing additional partnerships and funding sources.

The first step in creating a CDC is to decide on a mission. What does the County want to do accomplish with this organization? Does it want to provide affordable housing or focus on economic development or something else? Once the mission of the CDC is established then you can look at ways to provide funding that is tailored to your mission. The financial impact on the

County of creating a CDC could be considerable. There would be the need for office space (separate from the county), additional staff, start-up money, and a consistent funding source.

The alternatives to this proposal are for Richland County Council to:

1. Examine the possibility of creating a Community Development Corporation.
2. Do not examine the possibility of creating a Community Development Corporation.

***I recommend that Council examine the possibility of Richland County creating a Community Development Corporation.***

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY  
ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_-08HR

AN ORDINANCE SO AS TO CREATE THE RICHLAND COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND TO PROVIDE FOR ITS MEMBERSHIP, DUTIES AND POWERS.

# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Request to establish a policy for conducting corridor studies with Neighborhood Improvement Program funds in conjunction with Central Midlands Council of Governments.

## **Purpose**

This Request for Action is for Richland County Council to establish a policy for conducting corridor studies with Neighborhood Improvement Program funds in conjunction with Central Midlands Council of Governments.

The policy should state:

“With the assistance of Central Midlands Council of Governments, corridor studies within the unincorporated boundaries of Richland County will be conducted on roadways with regional significance and that are a part of the critical network of the SCDOT functional classification system. Studies on these roadways will include examining capacity enhancements, intersection improvements, congestion management, and enhancing transit access. Roadways within master planned communities will be given priority on studies as funds are available.”

## **Background / Discussion**

Staff was requested by Council to conduct a corridor study on Broad River Road within Councilwoman Joyce Dickerson’s district. Staff at that time saw the need to establish a policy to conduct corridor studies within Richland County so as to not show favoritism to any district.

## **Financial Impact**

Financial impact will be absorbed by the Richland County Neighborhood Improvement fund balance to conduct corridor studies within master planned communities as funding is available in conjunction with Central Midlands Council of Government.

## **Alternatives**

1. Approve the request to create a policy to govern the process of conducting corridor studies within Richland County and master planned communities.
2. Do not approve the request to establish a policy to conduct corridor studies within Richland County thus continuing disjointed planning efforts that appear to favor certain communities.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council approve the request to establish a policy to conduct corridor studies in conjunction with Central Midlands Council of Governments.

### **Recommended By:**

Tiaa B. Rutherford

### **Department:**

Planning and Development

### **Date:**

07-07-2008

## **Reviews**

### **Finance**

Item# 5



**Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers

**Date:** 7/14/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Based on the Planning Departments recommendation. Approved studies will require the identification of funding.

**Legal**

**Reviewed by:** Larry Smith

**Date:** 7/15/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Administration**

**Reviewed by:** Tony McDonald

**Date:** 7/15/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Request to negotiate a contract for the purchase of a new 911 system (Vendor recommendation will be presented to council in September for approval)

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to brief council on the progress of purchasing a new 911 system and to forward this information to the first meeting following Council's recess in August. The bids are being reviewed now and a vendor recommendation will be made during the full council meeting. This is a time sensitive procurement and Council's approval will be needed within several weeks. Council has previously appropriated the funds.

## **Background / Discussion**

Richland County is in the process of replacing the County's 911 system that serves the entire county including all municipalities, the University of South Carolina and Fort Jackson. The current system is over ten years old and must be replaced. The system will be linked to the new Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system that Council has previously authorized. It is important to begin the award process now so that when the vendor is selected, Council can make the award. This is a time sensitive procurement. Council will be presented with the vendor recommendation after all bids are evaluated and the finalists complete vendor presentations.

## **Financial Impact**

Funding for the 911 system has been previously approved by Council so no other funding will be required.

## **Alternatives**

1. Approve this report as information and forward to the first Council meeting in September.
2. Do not approve the report and resubmit to Council Committee in September.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that Council accept this report as information and forward to the first Council meeting in September.

### **Recommended By:**

Michael Byrd

### **Department:**

Emergency Services

### **Date:**

07-08-2008

## **Reviews**

### **Finance**

**Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers

**Date:** 7/14/2008

**Recommend:** Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

## **Procurement**

Item# 6

**Reviewed by:** Rodolfo Callwood

**Date:** 7/15/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Legal**

**Reviewed by:** Larry Smith

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

**Administration**

**Reviewed by:** J. Milton Pope

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:**Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Recommend approval...

# Richland County Council Request of Action

## **Subject**

Request to approve a FILOT Supplement Policy for the Industrial Park Account

## **Purpose**

Council is requested to approve the FILOT Supplement Policy for the Industrial Park Account.

## **Background / Discussion**

The Economic Development Committee reviewed the proposed FILOT Supplement Policy at its May 6, 2008 meeting.

The purpose of the FILOT Supplement Policy is to provide the Industrial Park Account with funds to perform the following Economic Development activities:

- Preparation For and Land Acquisition (Environmental Assessments, Site Evaluation, Master Plan, Purchase of Industrial Park property, Purchase of Business Park property, etc.)
- Property / Site Improvements or Expansion (Water, Sewer, Electricity, Natural Gas, Telecommunications, Rail, Clearing, Grading, Landscaping, Signage including Design / Engineering / Construction, etc.)
- Transportation Facilities
- Purchase / Acquisition of "Pollution Control Equipment" (Equipment required to meet federal and state environmental requirements)
- Engineering, Design, Construction, Construction Management, Improvements, Expansion of Spec Buildings
- Marketing
- Approved Training costs, including training facilities, not covered by the CATT
- Organizational / Agency Funding (Central SC Alliance, Engenuity, etc.)
- Small Business Development

The Economic Development Committee recommends the funds be used for all of the projects / types of projects listed above.

A table is attached that illustrates how various SC Counties apportion FILOT funds. The apportionment methods range from 0% - 5%, to a set dollar / mil amount. (See attachment)

The Economic Development Committee recommends 3% apportionment for the first year, to include businesses reporting from January 15, 2009 forward. This percentage will be reviewed during the FY 10 budget process.

The Economic Development Committee recommends that fee-in-lieu of tax payments made from companion counties to Richland County be included in the FILOT Supplement Policy.

The Economic Development Committee recommends no end date per se, although the set-aside will be reviewed during the FY 10 budget process for potential modifications.

## **Financial Impact**

The Economic Development Committee recommends 3% apportionment for the first year, to include businesses

reporting from January 15, 2009 forward. This percentage will be reviewed during the FY 10 budget process. Because the policy is prospective, the financial impact of the policy is not known at this time. One hundred percent (100%) of the revenues from organizations currently remitting FILOT payments will continue to be deposited in the County's General Fund.

**Alternatives**

1. Approve the FILOT Supplement Policy as presented.
2. Approve the FILOT Supplement Policy as amended.
3. Do not approve a FILOT Supplement Policy.
- 4.
- 5.

**Recommendation**

The Economic Development Committee recommends that Council approve the FILOT Supplement Policy as presented, and as follows:

- The Economic Development Committee recommends the funds be used for all of the aforementioned projects / types of projects.

- The Economic Development Committee recommends 3% apportionment for the first year, to include businesses reporting from January 15, 2009 forward. This percentage will be reviewed during the FY 10 budget process.

- The Economic Development Committee recommends that fee-in-lieu of tax payments made from companion counties to Richland County be included in the FILOT Supplement Policy.

- The Economic Development Committee recommends no end date per se, although the set-aside will be reviewed during the FY 10 budget process.

**Recommended By:**

Economic Development Committee

**Department:**

Council

**Date:**

**Reviews**

**Finance**

**Reviewed by:** Daniel Driggers

**Date:** 7/15/2008

**Recommend:**No recommendation

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

This is a policy decision for Council. The policy will not generate new revenue but will redirect funds that would normally go to fund County general operating cost such as EMS, Sheriff and Detention Center operations. If the policy was active during FY08, the 3% would have equated to approximately \$75k transferred from the GF to Economic Development. For the past 3 years E/D costs have averaged \$90k/yr. Currently Economic Development activity is funded from the proceeds of the sale of lots at County Industrial Parks. The balance in the E/D fund at 6/30/07 was \$1.3 million.

**Legal**

**Reviewed by:** Larry Smith

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:**No recommendation

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

Council's discretion.

**Administration**

Item# 7

**Reviewed by:** J. Milton Pope

**Date:** 7/16/2008

**Recommend:** Yes

**Comments Regarding Recommendation:**

The above request was unanimously approved and recommended to Council by the Economic Development Committee.

<b>County</b>	<b>Apportioned to Economic Development</b>	<b>Apportionment Method</b>
Aiken	None	No set method-goes to county General Fund.
Anderson	Equivalent of 3 mils for infrastructure fund	After funds for economic development, apportioned based on the property tax
Berkeley	5%	After 5% for economic development, apportioned based on the property tax
Charleston	5%	After 5% for economic development, apportioned based on the property tax
Colleton	For investments greater than \$45 million, 5%	After 5% for economic development (if applicable), apportioned based on the property tax
Dorchester	5%	After 5% for economic development, apportioned based on the property tax
Jasper	None	Not based on property tax. Each FILOT handled differently. On one FILOT, the county has pledged a portion of proceeds to pay for bonds to fund schools. On another, the county has pledge support for a new county building. A certain percentage of each FILOT goes to the school board.
Greenville	5% of county portion	Based on the property tax
Kershaw	A set amount of \$100,000 is equally divided out and paid from 12 existing fees.	After amount paid out to economic development, apportioned based on the property tax
Lancaster	None	Based on the property tax
Lee	None	No set method – goes to County general fund
Marion	None	Based on the property tax
Oconee	1 mil for infrastructure on normal property tax	No set method – goes to county general fund. County is in process of working out with schools a time agreement (from 1 – 5 years) of allocating new FILOT payments toward infrastructure.
Richland	None	No set method-goes to county General Fund.
Spartanburg	None	Apportioned based on the property tax.