

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Kit Smith, Chair
District 5

Mike Montgomery
District 8

Paul Livingston
District 4

Joseph McEachern
District 7

Valerie Hutchinson
District 9

*September 27, 2005
4:00 pm*

**Richland County Council Chambers
County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street**

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes – July 26, 2005: Regular Session Meeting [Pages 3 – 5]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

A. Resolution to Allocate Military Forest Funds
[Pages 6 – 8]

B. Ordinance Placing a Time Limit on Refunds of Overpaid Taxes
[Pages 9 – 12]

C. Construction Contract: Building Renovations for the Dutch Fork Magistrate and Sheriff's Region 4 Headquarters
[Pages 13 – 14]

D. Microsoft Software Assurance
[Pages 15 – 16]

E. Garbage Service Issues

1. Solid Waste Collector Rate Increases
[Pages 17 – 19]

2. Amended Contract Terms for Johnson's Garbage Service

F. Animal Services
[Pages 20 – 29]

G. Sheriff's Requests:

- 1. Matching Funds for Personnel Grants**
[Pages 30 – 33]
- 2. Matching Funds for COPS Secure Our Schools Grant**
[Pages 34 – 36]

H. Olympia TIF

II. Items for Discussion / Information

A. TIF Progress Report

III. Items Pending Analysis

- A. Request for New Department and Budget: Business Service Center**
[Pages 37 – 41]
- B. Community Development: Proposed Regional Affordable Housing Trust Fund**
[Pages 42 – 48]
- C. Ordinance to Establish a Bond Review Committee**
- D. Prescription Discount Card**
[Page 49]
- E. Sheriff's Requests**
 - 1. SRO Budget Amendment**
[Pages 50 – 51]
 - 2. Expenditure Request**
[Pages 52]
 - 3. Budget Amendment for Fuel Costs**
[Pages 53]

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005
6:00 P.M.**

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.



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE
JULY 26, 2005
6:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair	Kit Smith
Member	Joseph McEachern
Member	Paul Livingston
Member	Valerie Hutchinson

MEMBER ABSENT- Mike Montgomery (business trip)

OTHERS PRESENT – T. Cary McSwain, Amelia Linder, Larry Smith, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Ashley Jacob, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sherry Wright-Moore, Roxanne Matthews, Joe Cronin, Chris Eversman, Chief Harrell, Michael Criss, Marsheika Martin, Susan Britt, Andy Metts

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to adopt the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Smith stated a report from the auditor need to be added to the agenda.

Mr. McEachern moved, and it was seconded, to adopt the agenda as amended. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Distribution of Military Forest Funds

Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation that money be directed to maintain high priority to roads with students that live on them.

Ms. Smith requested for staff to come up with a list of roads before action is taken.

After discussion, Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to defer to the September committee meeting, inform the school districts of the County's intent and have a list of the targeted roads before final action is made. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Bond Review Committee

Ms. Smith stated the staff has drafted a title only ordinance. She stated the recommendation from the Legal Department is if it is approved for it to be formalized with an ordinance by setting up the committee and doing their terms, etc.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward to Council in September to endorse the concept and then forward back to the A&F Committee for the details of the Bond Review Committee to be worked out. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Citizen's request: Assessment ratio refund (Mr. Henry Hennigan)

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward to full Council with a recommendation for denial. The vote in favor was unanimous.

REPORT FROM THE AUDITOR

Mr. Bob Milhous of Milhous and Associates gave a brief update to the Committee regarding the TIF.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to go into Executive Session to discuss the report from the Auditor. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:17 p.m. and came out at approximately 6:31 p.m.

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to come out of Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. McEachern moved to accept the discussion for information from the attorneys and administrative staff and ask that this move forward and bring back any legal and financial updates in September. Ms. Hutchinson seconded.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:33 p.m.

Submitted by,

Kit Smith
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Distribution of Military Forest Funds

A. Purpose

The Richland County Treasurer has received three checks from the Office of the State Treasurer for Military Forest Funds. These funds are generated based on the net proceeds from the sale of forest products extracted from Fort Jackson and other military installations located within Richland County. The total amount of forestry funds available for allocation by County Council is \$51,386.63

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Treasurer currently has a total of \$51,386.63 in Military Forest Fund monies, which was received from the Office of the State Treasurer, as payment based on the net proceeds from the sale of forest products extracted from Fort Jackson and other military installations located within Richland County.

Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §2665(e)(2), "the amount paid to a State pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be expended as the State legislature may prescribe **for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county** or counties in which the military installation or facility is situated."

Since the South Carolina Legislature has not enacted, to date, any law prescribing how these funds are to be allocated, the specific amounts to be allocated for the benefit of public schools and public roads of Richland County are at the discretion of Richland County Council.

The last time that Richland County Council allocated military forestry funds was on April 3, 2001. The resolution passed in 2001 allocated a total amount of \$44,596.92, of which 70% was apportioned to Richland School District One, Richland School District Two, and Richland-Lexington School District Five (according to the respective student population of each district). The remaining 30% was transferred to the General Fund of Richland County to be used for the construction of new roads and/or improvement of public roads within the county.

A memo from the former Director of Public Works, Chris Eversmann, indicated that the county currently has the following unfunded public road-related projects which would be eligible for forestry funds: Remedial road work on Twisted Hill Road, traffic calming in critical neighborhoods, and the RC Transportation Study.

The resolution currently before Council uses the same 70/30 allocation ratio used in 2001; however, council may adjust these proportions at its discretion.

C. Financial Impact

A total of \$51,386.63 will be divided according to a ratio set forth by Council for the benefit of public schools and public roads. Because these funds are distributed by the Military Forest Fund, via the State Treasurer, there are no costs to the County associated with this request

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the resolution allocating \$51,386.63, of which 70% will be apportioned to public schools, and the remaining 30% for the construction and/or improvement of public roads.
2. Approve the resolution allocating \$51,386.63 for the benefit of public schools and public roads using a ratio of 50% for each.
3. Do not approve the resolution allocating Military Forestry Funds for public schools and roads.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve either the first or second alternative.

Recommended by: Staff

Department: Administration

Date: July 6, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 7/19/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No conclusive recommendation made, therefore left to Council discretion.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 7/21/05

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend alternative 1 or 2.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 7/22/05

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that the Military Forest Funds be allocated on an equal basis between schools and roads, with 50% going to the schools and 50% going to roads.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

A RESOLUTION OF THE
RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

A RESOLUTION TO ALLOCATE MILITARY FOREST FUNDS

WHEREAS, the State of South Carolina receives forty percent (40%) of the net proceeds from the sale of forest products on land owned or leased by a military department; and

WHEREAS, the Office of the State Treasurer issues a check to Richland County annually, representing a share of federal monies generated at Ft. Jackson and at other military installations located within the County; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Treasurer currently has a total of \$51,386.63 in Military Forest Fund monies, which was received from the Office of the State Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §2665(e)(2), “the amount paid to a State pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the county or counties in which the military installation or facility is situated”; and

WHEREAS, the South Carolina Legislature has not enacted, to date, any law prescribing how these funds are to be allocated, so that allocation must be determined for the benefit of both the public schools and public roads of Richland County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Richland County Council does hereby allocate the Military Forest Funds of \$51,386.63 as follows:

70% to Richland School District One, Richland School District Two, and Richland/Lexington School District Five, to be apportioned according to the respective student population of each school district; and

30% to be transferred to the General Fund of Richland County, to be used for the construction and/or improvement of public roads within the County.

ADOPTED THIS the ____ day of _____, 2005.

Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair
Richland County Council

Attest: _____
Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Ordinance Placing a Time Limit on Refunds of Overpaid Property Taxes

A. Purpose

Consistent with the discretion granted to county governments over this issue by state law, this ordinance would establish a time limit as to how long a taxpayer has to request a refund for overpaid property taxes.

B. Background / Discussion

Pursuant to Sections 12-43-220(c)(1) and (2) of the S.C. Code of Laws, as amended, if a taxpayer finds that he or she has overpaid his or her property taxes because the property was eligible for the legal residence assessment, the County is required to refund to the taxpayer, so long as the refund request is made within three years of the date that a return is filed (if a return is required) or two years from the date upon which the taxes were paid.

While state law requires that refunds for overpayment of taxes must be made by the county on requests made within the required time period, the state also gives counties the discretion to refund the *county portion* (emphasis added) of taxes paid in years beyond that period.

In recent months, a number of constituent requests have been brought before Council regarding refunds on the county portion of overpaid property taxes paid more than two years before the request was made. In each of these cases, the homeowner was paying taxes based on a 6% assessment ratio while the property was eligible for a 4% ratio. In each case, refunds were issued by the Treasurer's Office, as required by state law, for overpayments made within the past two years. Each of these homeowners, however, appealed to Council for refunds on overpayments made beyond two years ago, including one request based on an overpayment made 18 years ago. All requests were denied by Council.

This ordinance would establish a policy that would eliminate the need for refund requests to continue to go before Council. The ordinance codifies that "a claim for a refund must be filed with the County Assessor within three years from the time the return was filed, or two years from the date the tax was paid, whichever is later. In no event shall a refund be granted beyond this period of time."

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Adopt an ordinance placing a time limit on requests for refunds of overpaid taxes.
2. Do not adopt an ordinance placing a time limit on requests for refunds of overpaid taxes.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt an ordinance codifying the time limitation consistent with state law.

Recommended by: Staff **Department:** Administration **Date:** July 27, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal

Date: 9/16/2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/16/2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 9/19/20

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives are legally sufficient; this request is at the discretion of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Ashley Jacobs

Date: 9/19/2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that Council adopt an ordinance codifying the time limitation consistent with the state statute.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-05HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 23, TAXATION; ARTICLE I, IN GENERAL; SECTION 23-5, REFUND OF OVERPAYMENTS; SO AS TO LIMIT THE PERIOD OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS FOR PROPERTY TAX REFUNDS TO THE STATUTORY LIMIT OF THREE YEARS FROM THE TIME THE RETURN WAS FILED OR TWO YEARS FROM THE DATE THE TAX WAS PAID, WHICHEVER WAS LATER.

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY:

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 23, Taxation; Article I, In General; Section 23-5, Refund of Overpayments; is hereby amended by the addition of a new subsection to read as follows:

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12-43-220 (c)(3) of the S.C. Code of Laws, as amended (and consistent with the provisions of Section 12-54-85(F) of the S.C. Code of Laws, as amended), if a taxpayer believes that he or she has overpaid his or her property taxes because the property was eligible for the legal residence assessment pursuant to Sections 12-43-220(c)(1) and (2) of the S.C. Code of Laws, as amended, a claim for a refund must be filed with the County Assessor within three years from the time the return was filed, or two years from the date the tax was paid, whichever is later. In no event shall a refund be granted beyond this period of time.

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances Repealed. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective from and after _____, 2005.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE _____ DAY

OF _____, 2005

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading:
Second Reading:
Public Hearing:
Third Reading:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Construction Contract – Building Renovations for the Dutch Fork Magistrate and Sheriff’s Region 4 Headquarters

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to obtain County Council approval for the award of a contract in the amount of \$387,000.00 to Monteray Construction Company, Inc. The construction project will renovate the Beatty Road Building (Old Bell South Building) for the Dutch Fork Magistrate and for the Sheriff’s Region 4 Headquarters.

B. Background / Discussion

Judge Maurer will use part of the facility for Magistrate services serving the Dutch Fork area.

Sheriff Lott will use part of the facility as Region 4 Headquarters and vehicle storage.

John Bowman Architect, P.A., Inc. developed construction drawings and specifications for the Dutch Fork Magistrate/Sheriff Substation.

C. Financial Impact

Bids for the Dutch Fork Magistrate/Sheriff Substation were received on August 10, 2005. The results of the bids were as follows:

Contractor	Total Bid
Accent Contracting Inc.	\$412,990.00
Lucas Alexander, LLC	\$491,999.00
MAR Construction	\$426,800.00
Monteray Construction Company, Inc.	\$387,000.00

Monteray Construction has been determined to be the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder for this project.

Funds for this project will be available after reallocation of the Magistrate Bond.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to award the contract to Monteray Construction in the amount of \$387,000.00 for the renovation of the Dutch Fork Magistrate/Sheriff Substation utilizing an existing County building (Beatty Road). Enhancing our Magistrate and Sheriff functions in the Dutch Fork area.
2. Do not approve the award of contract to Monteray Construction and forfeit the opportunity to construct Dutch Fork Magistrate/Sheriff Substation leaving the Beatty Road building unoccupied.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council award the contract to Monterey Construction Company, Inc. in the amount of \$387,000.00 for construction of the new Fire Station Additions.

Recommended by: Chief Hubert Harrell, RCSD **Date:** September 9, 2005
Judge William Womble
Judge Mel Maurer

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal Date: 9/16/2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 9/20/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: 2nd issue of bonds closed on 9/16, funds will be available within 30 days of the 16th.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 9/20/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 9/21/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope Date: 9-21-05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: The Dutch Fork Magistrate has been displaced for nearly one year now and with Committee and Council approval, staff will work with the Architect and construction company to expedite the renovation process.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Microsoft Software Assurance - Countywide

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a “Software Assurance” purchase on the Microsoft Enterprise Agreement for licenses owned by the County.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Wide Area Network and Local Area Networks (WAN/LAN) currently consist of 40 servers and approximately 1100 PCs.

In order to comply with federal copyright law, Richland County must have Microsoft licenses for all County servers and all County PCs. Licensing is required for operating systems as well as software applications (such as MS Office).

In the last few years, Microsoft modified its licensing requirements, and it has been increasing its enforcement efforts. Richland County received the same “Microsoft letter” that our neighboring counties received, which outlines a mandatory copyright compliance program. If Richland County were to decide not to participate in the copyright compliance program, the County would put itself at risk for fines and penalties of up to \$150,000 per incident.

Four years ago, the IT Department included a budget request to begin a three year Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft to bring the County into full copyright compliance. During that three year period we were able to achieve compliance with Microsoft’s copyright policies. The County now owns the software license for Microsoft OS and Office products used by County employees for versions current as of 06/30/05.

However, in an effort to maintain Federal Copyright compliance on software versions used by the County that come out after 06/30/05, we must continue our Microsoft Enterprise Agreement through the purchase of Software Assurance. Software Assurance is a maintenance agreement that allows the County to use the latest versions of Microsoft software products as they are made available. This will keep the software technology at Richland County current. The Council is requested to approve the purchase of a Microsoft “Software Assurance” from the vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$116,290.

C. Financial Impact

There are sufficient funds in the account 1870.5471 designated this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to purchase Microsoft Software Assurance from vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$116,290. This will allow the county to maintain Microsoft Copyright compliance.

2. Do not approve the request. This would mean that the County chooses to stop participating in the copyright compliance program.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase Microsoft Software Assurance from vendor ASAP SOFTWARE on South Carolina State Contract in an amount not to exceed \$116,290.

Recommended by: Janet Claggett **Department:** Information Technology **Date:** 9/7/2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal Date: 9/16/2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 9/16/2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are available in FY 06

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 9-19-05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 9/20/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 9/20/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the proposed purchase of software licenses to ensure that the County remains in compliance with all applicable copyright laws. Funds have been budgeted for this purpose; no additional funding is required.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Solid Waste Collection Contractor Fuel Subsidy Increase Request

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve an increase in the fuel allowance cap from a maximum of 7.5% to 10.0% of the base curbside rate for all Solid Waste Collection Contracts. This percentage fluctuates up and down in accordance with the Fuel Price Index.

B. Background / Discussion

Currently all Solid Waste Collection Contracts allow for a maximum increase of 7.5% to the base rate per residence to offset the variations in fuel costs. The 7.5% maximum is based on fuel reaching \$1.75/gallon. Unfortunately, fuel prices have risen above this cap for over 6 months. The contractors met with the Procurement Director and Contracting Officer's Representative and Administration September 19, 2005 and requested assistance.

Following analysis of fuel consumption figures provided by the solid waste collection contractors it became apparent that the current subsidy of increasing each contract by 1% for each ten cent increase in fuel prices is excessive. The analysis showed that an increase of twenty cents in fuel equates to 1% in base contract on average for those collectors responding to the request for fuel consumption figures. Based upon these calculations Richland County is already subsidizing fuel for the solid waste collection contractors to a rate of \$2.50/gallon at 7.5%.

Although the rate is subsidized to \$2.50/gallon, recently we have seen regional price increases to \$3.00/gallon. The request to increase the fuel cap from 7.5% to 10.0% would cover increases to \$3.00/gallon. Staff also recommends that the subsidy be adjusted monthly instead of semi-annually. This would provide immediate relief to the contractors as fuel prices increase and cost saving to Richland County when prices decrease.

Richland County Council is asked consider to two options to provide relief at current fuel prices:

- Option 1 is to use the revised analysis to allow for the subsidy of 1% increase in base contract per twenty cents increase in fuel prices. The adjustments would be made for every ten cents increase in fuel. Ten cents fuel increase equals 0.5% increase in base contract up to \$3.00/gallon.
- Option 2 is to allow the current system of subsidy to remain in place up to \$1.75/gallon. \$1.75 gallon equals 7.5% increase in base contract. To account for the remaining increase in fuel prices Richland County would add a subsidy of 0.2% to each base contract per ten cents increase in fuel prices above \$1.75/gallon up to \$3.00/gallon. This would raise the cap of the subsidy to 10.0%.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact of increasing the fuel cap from 7.5% to 10.0% for all Solid Waste Collection contracts is \$253,625 with implementation starting September 2005 and continuing through June 2006. The reallocation of special contracts funds from landfill disposal fees at the Richland County C&D Landfill and postponed construction activities will allow for the implementation for this increase without a request for additional funds in the 2006 Budget.

D. Alternatives

INCREASE FUEL ALLOWANCE CAP FROM 7.5 TO 10.0%

1. Option 1 changes the current system of subsidy to 1% increase to base contract for every twenty cents in fuel prices above \$1.00/gallon up to \$3.00/gallon. This provides for a cap of 10.0% for increased fuel costs, however does change the existing contract conditions.
2. Option 2 keeps the current subsidy in place up to \$1.75/gallon, and modifies the compensation rate for fuel increases above \$1.75/gallon. The modified compensation would be a 0.2% increase to base contract for every ten cents increase in fuel prices from \$1.75/gallon to \$3.00/gallon. The option provides for a 10.0% cap with only a modification for fuel increases above \$1.75/gallon which would not change the current contract conditions.
3. Option 3 is to not approve the fuel subsidy increase from 7.5% to 10.0%.

E. Recommendation

Alternative 2 is recommended.

Recommended by: Bobby Banks **Department:** Public Works **Date:** 9/16/05

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal Date: 9/20/2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 9/21/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommendation is in support of Public Works request however the impact of the funding method should be reviewed. The fuel subsidy would support the Solid Waste Collection Division which is funded through user fees with the current rate for roll-cart service at \$168/year. The funding proposal would utilize an internal loan from the landfill division which is supported by taxes and other revenues. In order to maintain balance in the fund the loan would need to be recovered in the next fiscal year. Assuming the same historical growth in revenue and cost, the additional \$254k will translate into an approximate \$3-4 increase in roll-cart service rate

for FY 07. Another major consideration that may impact the collection rate in FY 07 is that the budget will include the renewal of six of the eight Collection Contracts.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 9/22/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: All of the alternatives presented above are legally sufficient, provided that the Solid Waste Services Collection contracts are amended by the mutual agreement of the parties.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 9/22/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that this item be deferred so that administration can review the funding impact and engage in further study in conjunction with solid waste collectors.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Animal Care Sheltering/Holding

A. Purpose

Richland County Council is requested to approve and adopt a position/option regarding the sheltering of animals impounded by the Richland County Animal Care Department.

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County employs 12 Full-Time employees (FTE's) in the Animal Care Department. The Department's mission is to manage, control and enforce the laws of the State and County regarding domesticated pets in the unincorporated limits of Richland County. The Department of Animal Care's adopted FY 05/06 budget is \$878,602. \$332,241 of the total is budgeted for private boarding, veterinary services, Project Pet Adoptions and City of Columbia euthanasia and disposal cost.

Animal Care Expenses

Private Boarding Facility

\$6.50 per day for canine housing

\$2.00 per day for feline housing

City of Columbia Expenses

\$9.50 per animal per day holding

\$15.00 Euthanasia and disposal fee

Veterinarian fees are paid on an as need basis to sick and or injured animals (by agreement)

Richland County Animal Care has impounded over 16,000 dogs and cats, handled nearly 40,000 citizen's complaints and traveled nearly 450,000 miles patrolling Richland County in the past three fiscal years (attachment #1).

Richland County has not had a "stable" sheltering location in the past six years and the need for a permanent sheltering arrangement is long overdue. Richland County has been discussing and or negotiating with the City of Columbia over the past ten years to merge the sheltering function of the Animal Care operation with limited success. According to City of Columbia staff they do not have the present capacity to hold County Animals and therefore the County has subcontracted with a private boarding facility to hold all impounded County animals (attachment #2).

Richland County must make a final determination on the permanent arrangement for the housing and humane treatment of impounded animals. The following are three options for consideration:

Option #1

Richland County can construct its own Animal Holding facility. This facility would house all unincorporated animals as well as other animals as stipulated in Intergovernmental Agreements approved by Richland County Council. The County would co-locate this facility with an existing County property to eliminate any land acquisition cost. It is estimated that the County could construct such a facility for approximately \$1.5 million (**exact cost will not be available until the County hires an Architect to provide design built drawings and cost estimates**). The \$1.5 million is based upon previous research and construction estimates. The \$1.5 million does not include a one time \$300,000 contribution to Project Pet. Project Pet is prepared to expand its relationship with Richland County to provide an adoption component to the County’s holding facility. Project Pet has plans to adopt up to 2,000 dogs and cats per year from Richland County that are presently being euthanized (attachment #3).

County operating cost will increase approximately \$70,000 per year (reoccurring cost) with the addition of 1 new FTE (Shelter Manager). Other costs can be absorbed into our existing operations cost and augmented by inmate labor to provide holding facility maintenance services (except utility cost).

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated County Construction	\$1,500,000.00 (one time cost)
Project Pet Adoption Construction	\$ 300,000.00 (one time cost)
New Operating expenses	\$ 70,000.00 (1FTE) reoccurring
Utility expenses	\$ 12,500.00 (estimated)
Capital Equipment	\$ 250,000.00 (one time cost)
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 2,875,000 (attachment #4)

Option #2

Richland County could enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Columbia to add an additional section on the existing City Animal Shelter for a cost of approximately \$820,000. In addition to the construction cost a charge of \$9.50 per day per animal and a \$15.00 euthanasia and disposal fee would be assessed to the County.

These costs include an annual estimate of animals (dogs/cats) that are picked up in the County and brought to the City Shelter by persons other than Animal Care employees. The City of Columbia charges Richland County for all animals brought to the City facility from the County (except within the incorporated limits of the City).

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated County Construction	\$ 820,000.00 (one time cost)
Adoption Construction	\$ - 0 -
New Operating cost	\$ 350,000
Stray Animals (picked up by persons other than RCAC)	\$ 15,000–20,000 (added above)
Utility Expenses	\$ - 0 –
Capital Equipment	\$ - 0 –
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 4,320,000 (attachment #4)

Option #3

Privatize the Animal Sheltering for Richland County. The Richland County Procurement Department has published two Requests for proposals in the last several years and no private vendors responded.

Richland County Administration has however recently had discussions with a private vendor that is interested in a contractual relationship with the County if they could procure a long term contract to protect the investment they would have to make.

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated Construction	\$ - 0 -
Adoption Construction	\$ - 0 -
New Operating expenses	\$ 480,000
Utility expenses	\$ - 0 -
Capital Equipment	\$ - 0 -
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 4,800,000 (attachment #4)

C. Financial Impact

See the above options and cost estimates

D. Alternatives

1. Approve Option #1; this option would approve constructing a County owned facility.
2. Approve Option #2; this option would allow for a contractual Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) Richland County and the City of Columbia.
3. Approve Option #3; this option would direct staff to re-issue an RFP for the privatization of Animal Care services. The County will have to either create a separate IGA or agreement to manage pet adoption and animal care euthanasia.

E. Recommendation

Administrative Staff and the Animal Care Director recommend option #1. Option #1 provides the most cost effective financial option for Richland County over the next twenty years, and the construction and partnership with Project Pet will address the long term solution to pet population reductions.

Recommended by: J. Milton Pope **Department:** Administration **Date:** 9-20-05

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal

Date: 9/20/2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 9/21/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Given the time constraints on the ROA process we were unable to give due diligence to reviewing all options thoroughly therefore no recommendation can be provided.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 9/22/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: All three alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore this request is at the discretion of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Milton Pope Date: 9/22/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Staff recommends approval of Option #1

Department of Animal Care										
Monthly Report										
June-05										
CURRENT		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS		
2004-2005		2003-2004		2002-2003		2002-2001		2000-2001		
This Month	Y-T-D	This Month	Y-T-D	This Month	Y- T-D	This Month	Y-T-D	This Month	Y-T-D	
Complaints										
Complaints Received	1182	13105	1416	13857	1360	12955	1043	12407	1,177	11,213
Complaints Handled	1110	12869	1460	13803	1280	12614	1030	12234	1,172	11,932
Miles Traveled	14113	172728	18,750	162,345	12,643	111,536	20634	238955	14,572	166,406
Animals Impounded										
Dogs	368	3630	360	3689	313	3006	255	3695	348	3,558
Cats	225	2029	207	1857	180	1625	208	1981	188	1,666
Others	0	65	7	45	4	112	5	141	12	117
Total Animals Impounded	593	5724	574	5591	497	4743	468	5817	548	5,291
Dead Animals Picked Up	13	201	38	260	16	199	21	239	37	328
Animals Submitted to Project Pet										
Dogs Submitted to Project Pet	3	114	7	99	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cats Submitted to Projec Pet	4	48	0	19	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Animal Submitted	7	162	7	118	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quarantines										
Dogs	1	106	5	65	4	58	6	65	4	79
Cats	2	37	4	24	1	13	1	16	7	16
Others	0	2	0	6	0	4	0	43	0	0
Total Animals Quarantined	3	146	9	90	5	75	7	81	11	95
Heads Submitted to DHEC	1	53	5	32	3	26	5	44	2	48

Warnings										
Violation Notices Issued	165	1742	88	1505	123	1553	115	1671	125	1,444
Verbal Warnings	25	282	22	467	27	369	33	473	38	393
Total Warnings	190	2059	110	2054	150	1688	148	2144	163	1,017
Total Restraints	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	-	24
Animal Traps Set										
Dog Traps Set	25	445	35	612	56	480	78	643	33	320
Cat Traps Set	53	624	69	1025	62	707	108	1004	28	409
Total Traps Set	78	1084	104	1637	118	1187	186	2143	61	737
Department of Animal Care										
Monthly Report										
June-05										
	CURRENT		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS		PREVIOUS	
	2004-2005		2003-2004		2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001	
	This Month D	Y-T- D	This Month	Y-T-D	This Month D	Y- T- D	This Month D	Y-T- D	This Month D	Y-T- D
Redemption										
Animals Redeemed by Owners	24	309	22	232	-	-	-	-	-	-
Redemption Fees Collected	\$ 1,329.00	\$ 16,946.00	\$1,109.00	\$13,252.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Court Cases										
Court Cases	22	172	4	96	0	119	13	230	9	87
Citations Issued	11	199	15	122	3	118	15	245	14	127
Convictions	9	110	1	45	0	61	10	139	6	45
Acquittals	9	43	2	16	0	3	2	52	2	30
Setted Out of Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	10
Appeals & Referrals	4	25	1	1	0	1	2	9	16	65
Fees Collected	\$ 3,525.00	\$ 60,454.00								

Pet Licensing										
Dog Licenses Issued	288	2777	369	2689	127	2498	224	2459	206	2186
Cat Licenses Issued	47	581	84	519	22	490	46	440	56	383
Total Number Issued	335	3348	453	3208	149	2730	270	2899	262	2569
Fees Collected	\$ 2,038.00	\$ 20,508.00	\$2,562.00	\$20,104.00	\$1,056.00	\$ 21,243.00	\$1,729.00	\$21,865.00	\$1,287.00	13391

#2



COLUMBIA
"Everybody Counts, Everybody Contributes, Everybody Benefits"

August 15, 2005

Mr. Milton Pope
Assistant County Administrator
2020 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29202

Dear Mr. Pope:

As I discussed with you July 18, 2005 and again on Friday, August 12, 2005 Melissa Gentry, Director of Public Works, Marli Drum, Superintendent of Animal Services and I met with members of City Council on Wednesday, July 13, 2005. We discussed our animal service concerns and the potential for a collaborative approach to animal care with Richland County.

The members of City Council and the City Manager provided us with the following direction:

- There should be no further discussions of joint or consolidated service at this time
- Our negotiations with Richland County should only include the expansion of the Animal Shelter at our Shop Road location

The basis for our discussions on the Animal Shelter should be based on the proposed contract, which was presented to Richland County in August 2004. The significant points of that contract include:

- Payment of the estimated construction cost prior to the commencement of construction.
- New estimate of construction is \$820,000.
- Cost of \$9.50 per day per animal will be charged to Richland County for each animal to be housed for the County.
- Cost of \$15.00 per animal will be charged to Richland County for each animal to be euthanized for the county.

We are prepared to move forward with the construction of the proposed shelter expansion. Please let me know when we can schedule a meeting to finalize the proposed contract.

Sincerely,

S. Allison Baker
Assistant City Manager for
Public Services

Cc: Charles P. Austin, Sr.
City Manager

Office of the Assistant City Manager for Public Services

P.O. Box 147
Columbia, SC 29217

Office: 803-545-3030
Fax: 803-401-8800



PO Box 1777, Columbia, SC 29202
803.407.0991 Phone 803.407.0996 Fax
www.projectpet.com

Mr. Milton Pope
Assistant Administrator
Richland County
Post Office Box 192
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Dear Milton:

This letter is a follow-up to the information that was shared at the Richland County Council Board Retreat about the partnership between Project Pet and Richland County. I hope that the information that was received was informative and addressed any questions that the Council Members may have had about our collaboration. We are hopeful that County Council will be able to fund our \$300,000 request in support of the multi-million dollar capital campaign for an Adoption and Development Center. We also realize through conversations with Ms. Scott and Mr. Livingston that the gift may be funded through the bond process.

With an allocation of \$300,000 and other commitments that have been made by community leaders and businesses, Project Pet plans to begin the construction process of the Development Center and Medical Center in 2005. The balance of the funds needed to complete the Adoption Center will continue to be generated through the capital campaign.

Project Pet believes that a partnership with Richland County is a *win-win* for everyone: our community and our pets. We greatly appreciate the interest and desire expressed by County Council to partner with Project Pet and hope that we will receive favorable support of the \$300,000 request.

Sincerely,

Denise Wilkinson
Vice President
Project Pet

Cc: Deloris Mungo
Samuel Tenenbuam
Stewart Mungo

Attachment #4

Calculation Sheet

Each of the operation scenarios use the number of 4900 animals that will be housed and euthanized during any given fiscal year.

Option #1

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated County Construction	\$1,500,000.00 (one time cost)
Project Pet Adoption Construction	\$ 300,000.00 (one time cost)
New Operating expenses	\$ 70,000.00 (1 FTE)
Utility expenses	\$ 12,500.00 (estimated)
Capital Equipment	\$ 250,000.00 (one time cost)
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 2,875,000 (attachment #4)

Option #2

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated County Construction	\$ 820,000.00 (one time cost)
Adoption Construction	\$ - 0 -
New Operating cost	\$ 350,000
Animals picked up by persons other than RCAC added above)	\$ 15,000 – 20,000
Utility Expenses	\$ - 0 –
Capital Equipment	\$ - 0 –
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 4,320,000 (attachment #4)

4900 x 9.50 = 46,550 x 5 =	\$ 232,750
4900 x 15.00 =	\$ 73,500
Animals picked up by persons other than animal care	\$ 20,000
Capital Expansion	\$ 820,000

Option #3

Itemized Cost Estimates

Estimated Construction	\$ - 0 -
Adoption Construction	\$ - 0 -
New Operating expenses	\$480,000
Utility expenses	\$ - 0 -
Capital Equipment	\$ - 0 –
Total Cost over 10 years	\$ 4,800,000(attachment #4)

4900 x 12.00 = 58,800 x 5 =	\$ 294,000
4900 x 15.00 =	\$ 73,500
Animals picked up in the County by persons other than animal care	\$ 20,000
Monthly Office Space Lease 1050 x 12 =	\$ 12,600
Monthly Service Fee 7500 x 12 =	\$ 90,000

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Sheriff's Request: Matching Funds for Personnel Grants

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the amount of \$23,206 grant match funds for four grants in the amount of \$242,545. The total of the programs with match comes to \$265,751.

B. Background / Discussion

These applications became available after the grant budget request was submitted and there was no longer an avenue to request additional funds. These grants involve personnel. There is one full-time Hispanic Victim Advocate, one-full time lab technician, and two part-time lab technicians. Details of each program are attached.

These projects were designed to a direct need within our agency and the communities in which we serve.

C. Financial Impact

	Amount
Match funding request	\$23,206
Total	\$23,206

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the match.
2. Do not approve the match and refuse to accept the grants.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve the grant match in the amount of \$23,206.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy

Department: Sheriff's Department

Date: 9/6/2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal

Date: 9/19/2005

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers

Date: 9/21/05

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are available in countywide grant match account. According to the ROA, the grants do contain positions which may create some future liability for the County however the impact could not be determined with the information provided.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 9/22/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives are legally sufficient; this request is at the discretion of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Milton Pope

Date: 9-22-05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: However review budget comments regarding future cost.

August 24, 2005

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

1. Hispanic Outreach Program

The overall goal of this project is to provide the Hispanic community with a specially trained victim advocate who also speaks Spanish as their first language in an effort to improve the level of trust between the community and the Sheriff's Department, increase reporting of crime and consequently prosecution, and provide necessary services to the victims and their families in an immediate and efficient manner.

The project will fund one Victim Advocate Investigator, and may be applied for continuing grant funding for up to five years. Equipment and supplies are included in the grant.

The 25% match amount needed from the Richland County Council: \$14,015. The grantor amount is \$42,044.00 for a total award of \$56,059.

2. DNA Capacity Enhancement Program

With the implementation of this program the following goals will be achieved: 1) decreased DNA testing turnaround time, 2) improved laboratory infrastructure, and 3) continued analyst education and training.

An additional component of this proposal involves an agreement between the Richland County Sheriff's Department and a group of law enforcement agencies from Charleston, South Carolina. These agencies are in the process of starting up a forensic laboratory that will ultimately serve the region as a full service forensic facility. The agreement between RCSD and Charleston area laboratory involves hosting an experienced DNA analyst in the RCSD DNA laboratory for approximately one year.

From its inception, the RCSD forensic services laboratory has intended to obtain American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors accreditation. All aspects of laboratory development have been made with this in mind. Training, increased staffing, and analytical equipment upgrading are the subject of this grant and will help the laboratory and collaborators meet their stated goals. In order for current personnel to have the time to devote to ASCLD certification, one lab technician is needed to aid in case loads. This person will be hired with the understanding that this is a temporarily grant funded position, and continuation funding is not guaranteed.

The amount needed from the Richland County Council: \$9,191.00. This amount is 25% of the salary and fringe costs for one lab technician @ \$36,762. The federal grant amount is \$97,445.00 and the total grant award is \$106,636.

3. **Paul Coverdell Federal Forensic Science Improvement Grant**

This program will improve both the quality and timeliness of forensic services at the level of local government. Funding will allow the agency to: a) purchase and upgrade computer hardware to conduct forensic analyses and facilitate data management; and b) employ one (1) part-time temporary forensic laboratory technician to conduct general laboratory tasks in order to assist the agency in its objective to obtain accreditation by the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors (ASCLD/ISO) in 2006.

This grant may be applied for competitively on a year-to-year basis.

This is a 100% grantor funded project in the amount of \$65,258.

4. **Paul Coverdell Local Forensic Science Improvement Grant**

This program will aid to reduce the number of backlogged forensic cases, decrease casework turnaround time, and provide assistance during accreditation preparation for the forensic laboratory in Richland County.

The project will fund one part time laboratory technician and may be applied for competitively from year to year. Equipment and supplies are included in the grant.

This is a 100% grantor funded project in the amount of \$37,798.

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF MATCH REQUESTED: \$23,206

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF AWARDS: \$242,545

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Sheriff's Request: Matching Funds for COPS Secure Our Schools Grants

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the amount of \$8,675 grant match funds for a COPS Secure Our Schools grant in the amount of \$8,675. The total of the programs with match comes to \$17,350.

B. Background / Discussion

The application became available after the grant budget request was submitted and there was no longer an avenue to request additional funds. This grant does not involve personnel costs. Details of the program are attached.

This project was designed to a direct need within our agency and the communities in which we serve.

C. Financial Impact

	Amount
Match funding request (50%)	\$8,675
Total	\$8,675

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the match.
2. Do not approve the match and refuse to accept the grant.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve the grant match in the amount of \$8675.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy

Department: Sheriff's Department

Date: 9/6/2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Finance Dir.): Carrie Neal

Date: 9/19/2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 9/21/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: No personnel included. Funds are available in countywide grant match account.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 9/22/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives are legally sufficient; this request is at the discretion of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Milton Pope Date: 9-22-05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

August 24, 2005

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. COPS Secure Our Schools (SOS)

The overall goal of this project is to increase school safety. The program will involve updating through software, our current crime mapping system in order to map out areas of concern around schools in Richland County. In turn, educational presentations and plans may be drawn up for school staff, parents, and students for increased safety.

There are no personnel requests in the grant.

The 50% match amount needed from the Richland County Council: \$8,675. The grantor amount is \$8,675 for a total award of \$17,350.

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF MATCH REQUESTED: \$8,675

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF AWARDS: \$8,675

PENDING ANALYSIS

Subject: Richland County Business Service Center

Background / Discussion

Background: A presentation was made to the County Council at its retreat in January of this year regarding the Business Service Center.

The concept of a business service center was a product of a business license benchmarking effort initiated by Richland County in October 2003. Participating in this effort was:

- Dorchester County
- Horry County
- Jasper County
- Marion County
- Richland County
- Sumter County
- City of Aiken
- City of Anderson
- City of Charleston
- City of Sumter

Charleston County was the only county in South Carolina with a business license that did not participate, and they expressed great interest in being kept informed as to the progress and findings of this benchmarking project. The City of Columbia declined to participate in this benchmarking effort. Other outside organizations interested in this benchmarking effort included the Department of Revenue and the University of South Carolina's Institute for Public Service & Policy Research.

The IT Department initiated the Business Service Center idea in order to address some fundamental concerns by County staff regarding the provision of services to businesses. Currently, businesses must visit many different locations to obtain many different licenses and permits, and pay different taxes and fees, in order to operate lawfully within Richland County.

Discussion: The BSC proposes to consolidate the issuance of several different licenses and permits as well as the collection of certain taxes and fees that businesses need to have and pay. There are three planned "phases" of the Business Service Center. Each phase is described briefly below.

- Phase I
- proposed go-live date: January 1, 2006
 - would issue business licenses, peddler's licenses, and fireworks licenses.
 - would collect the fees associated with these licenses and the Hospitality Tax
 - would also serve as the starting point for the Hazardous Materials and Precious Metals permit processes.
 - It is intended that any business renewing or applying for a business license would be required to meet all other requirements, such as being current in its Hospitality Tax payments, before being issued a business license.
 - A website would serve as the dominant information source for businesses and allow online business license renewals and Hospitality Tax payments, greatly increasing the convenience to businesses as well as reducing the burden on staff by walk-in applications.

- Staffing requirements: one director and two clerks. These positions will be requested to be approved and funded in the current fiscal year.

- Phase II
- proposed go-live date: July 1, 2006
 - would include greater integration with other County databases for greater coordination of the various licensing and permitting requirements for businesses
 - may also include coordination with and a presence on the State's Business One Stop (SC BOS) website, enhancing the information-sharing occurring between Richland County and State agencies, such as DOR, LLR, Sec. of State, and others.
 - Staffing requirements: in addition to the staff mentioned in the previous phase, one inspector and one auditor, will be requested to be approved this fiscal year, but with the actual funding request to be made through the regular budget process for the upcoming fiscal year.

- Phase III
- proposed go-live date: January 1, 2007
 - would include a sophisticated GIS-based software system linked to many other County databases for further coordination and automation
 - Staffing requirements: in addition to the staff mentioned in the previous phases, one additional inspector and one additional auditor, will be requested to be approved this fiscal year, but with the funding request to be made through the regular budget process for the upcoming fiscal year.

- Staffing
- The BSC, when fully staffed, would have seven employees in four different positions: one director, two auditors, two inspectors, and two clerks.
 - All seven positions will be requested to be approved this fiscal year, but only the three positions associated with Phase I will be requested to receive funding during this budget year.
 - The remaining five positions will be requested to be approved as part of the BSC but be unfunded until requested through the annual budget request process.

- Locations
- Several possible locations have been identified for the temporary housing of the BSC. These include, in order of preference:
 1. A temporary office unit, similar to a construction job site trailer;
 2. A temporary office like a patio room or "Florida room";
 3. A semi-permanent office constructed within the atrium area of the first floor of the County Administration building;
 4. A semi-permanent office constructed within part of the Finance Department's computer room;
 5. A semi-permanent office constructed within part of the atrium area and part of the Central Services Department; or

6. The use of an existing cubicle in the IT Help Desk area and using current employees at their existing desks.

Financial Impact

The financial impact to undertaking a Business Service Center depends upon the scope and level of the services provided. Every effort has been made to make as studied a projection as possible on both the start-up costs and annual costs. The cost for operating the BSC at its beginning, with three employees and the associated start-up costs, is estimated to be \$209,148 for the eight months beginning November 2005 and ending June 2006. This figure includes \$25,000 for the cost associated with preparing a physical work space for employees to occupy it or renting a temporary office unit.

The annual costs of operating the BSC are naturally expected to increase as the BSC becomes fully staffed and developed during the next fiscal year. Part of this cost will include acquiring or developing the Phase III GIS-based software envisioned for a Business Service Center fully integrated with the appropriate County departments.

In prior years, Richland County has had an Agreement with the City of Columbia to collect the County’s business licenses. The County has paid the City many hundreds of thousands of dollars for this service. The table below shows prior actual amounts for this agreement and the requested and approved budgeted amount for this fiscal year.

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Approved	Requested	Approved	Requested for BSC
Account Description	2000 - 2001	2001 - 2002	2002 - 2003	2003 - 2004	2004 - 2005	2005 - 2006	2005 - 2006	eight months of 2005 - 2006
Special Contracts- City Business License	249,302	256,510	294,171	292,297	318,415	370,292	318,415	209,148

However, Richland County sent official written notification to the City terminating the Agreement effective July 1, 2005.

Funding for the BSC is planned, for Council approval in the near future, by redirecting a portion of the appropriated funds for business licensing operations to the BSC rather than to the expired Agreement with the City.

Financial Benefits:

- Improved operations:
 - County business licenses at current operational levels yield roughly \$5.5 million.
 - We know the \$5.5 million dollar figure without the benefit of having the needed information to audit this amount.

- By administering its own operations, the County will have more information to better understand and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of those operations.
- Better compliance:
 - In 2004, only seven (7) Precious Metal permits were issued, generating \$350 at \$50 each.
 - Precious Metal permits are required by any business which, in short, sells gold, silver, platinum, or precious or semiprecious stones, such as jewelry stores as well as pawn shops selling jewelry.
 - Using the phone book and the online GIS system, roughly 32 businesses are in the unincorporated areas of the county that would need this permit.
 - This represents a 457% increase from 2004, and would generate \$1250 more dollars, an increase of 357%.
- Better enforcement:
 - The Hazardous Materials (HazMat) manager estimates that the 488 current Hazardous Materials permits issued in 2005 represent roughly only 20% of the businesses that should have HazMat permits.
 - Using this estimate, roughly 878 businesses should have HazMat permits.
 - This may have significant revenue implications. Current collections are \$52,800. But it may have even more substantial and important implications for public safety in Richland County.
- Better coordination:
 - By the BSC tapping into the various County databases, this will help staff ensure greater compliance by businesses in obtaining required fees and permits.
 - For example, a business requesting to renew a business license will also be required to obtain all other required permits and licenses before being issued a business license.
- Better cooperation:
 - The BSC is intended to help Richland County and various State agencies cooperate and share business-related information for improved compliance.
 - For example, in September 2003, an informal survey of Decker Blvd. found that, of the 216 businesses that were found to have a physical presence on the street, roughly only 74, or 34% of businesses, were found to be in both the City and the Department of Revenue business databases.

Alternatives

Two alternatives have been developed regarding the Business Service Center. These are to:

1. Approve the Business Service Center as a County department reporting directly to the County Administrator and approve the ordinances which would establish and fund it as its own department. It is planned for these ordinances to be drafted and presented to Council at the Committee meeting in October.
2. The County may also attempt to renegotiate a new contract with the City of Columbia for the City to continue administering the County's business license operations. According to the County Administrator, attempts to meet with the City to discuss possible alternatives are ongoing.

PENDING ANALYSIS

Subject: Proposed Regional Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Closing the Gap Creating an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in the Midlands

Background

The Food, Shelter, Safety and Transportation Council of the United Way of the Midlands met with Mayor Coble, City of Columbia in the fall of 2004 to discuss strategies for increasing affordable housing in the metro area. The Mayor was receptive to several proposals and requested that the United Way of the Midlands organize a committee to investigate development of local housing trust fund. The Blueprint Process to Address Homelessness had already been initiated and because of the close connection between homelessness and the need for affordable housing—the housing committee worked in tandem with the Blueprint process.

The Steering Committee worked through the spring and summer of 2005 investigating programs in other communities and drafting recommendations for the Midlands of South Carolina. The following is an overview of the need, proposed operations, and recommendations of funding sources.

Local Housing Need

Recent local news coverage of the housing market suggests that the Columbia-metro area is blessed with housing that is more affordable than many other communities. As of March 2005, the median price of a home in the Midlands was \$120,000. The local market continues to avoid the rapid short term price growth (nationally 20%) that threatens other communities with “housing bubbles.” This is good news for attracting and supporting economic development in the region.

While the local housing market is healthy, gaps and shortages for some members in our community persist. Among those who struggle most to secure housing within their means are low income workers and people with special needs such as people who are homeless, disabled, and elderly.¹ In a recent examination of housing affordability in 200 communities, the National Housing Conference reviewed wages of people in 63 occupations. The occupations were selected as those that serve the community and ranged from public servants like teachers, policemen, firemen and prison guards to people providing frequently consumed services such as dental assistants, librarians, nurses, wait-staff and others who support daily commerce like truck drivers, bank tellers, construction laborers and farm-workers. In spite of the affordability of housing in the region, the study calculated that people earning average wages in 45 of the 63 occupations could not afford to buy a median priced home. More discouraging is the news that people in 19 of the occupations (e.g. bank teller, home health aide, receptionist, and school bus driver) could not afford a two-bedroom unit at the local fair market rent of \$625/month.

People whose incomes are more limited by circumstance struggle even more. An individual who is disabled and has an SSI **monthly income of \$579 can afford monthly rent of no more than \$174**. In fact, the fair market rent (\$561) for a one-bedroom unit represents the entire income of someone

¹ Housing is considered to be affordable if rent/mortgage and utility expenses represent 30% or less of household income.

on disability. **The average income of current Columbia Housing Authority public housing residents is \$9,162.** The shortage of units for people with extremely low income units is illustrated in the current Columbia Housing Authority waiting list that exceeds 5000 people. In Richland and Lexington counties, an estimated 32,000 households had incomes of less than \$15,000, considered to be extremely low income by HUD standards. Twenty six percent of the household population in the region has income of less than \$25,000. And while the percentage of households in the Midlands earning less than \$25,000 is expected to decrease by 2009, the total number of households is projected to increase to 60,005. Even for those at the high end of that income range to afford to live in the area in 2009, the fair market rent will have to stay at the exactly the same place.

Affordable Housing Trust Funds

Housing Trust Funds are distinct accounts with dedicated revenue sources created to support decent housing for those most in need.² Housing Trust funds provide **local, flexible funding** to increase the availability of affordable housing for low income and special needs populations. As of 2002, there were 42 city housing trust funds, 17 county trust funds (plus an additional 40 in Pennsylvania) and three regional trust funds. Legislation creating trust funds typically includes language about purpose that specifies targeted populations (e.g. by income) and/or activities. The vast majority of trust funds target the funding to serve people in a particular range of area median income (a.m.i.) with most of them targeting people at 80% or below a.m.i. Targeting should be specific enough to meet an identified gap in the housing market (e.g. rental housing for low income people) but broad enough to allow the trust fund to address changing needs over time. Some trust funds target different incomes by formula. For example, a regional trust fund in Washington has set long term goals of using 56% of the funds for families; 19% for the elderly, 13% for the homeless and 12% for other special needs groups. Some target funding to specific programs. Trust fund programs that support rental housing target lower a.m.i. (30-50%).

Benefits of Trust Funds

Trust funds are valuable as **flexible sources of funding** to fill gaps that federal programs do not meet. In addition to funding activities like acquisition, construction and rehabilitation, trust funds can support hard-to-fund activities like capacity building (predevelopment costs), land trusts and land banking, emergency shelters, innovative housing projects, rental support and other activities. The funding can be awarded as loans or grants depending on the balance between needing deep subsidies and the need to generate program income or recycle the funding. To the extent that a trust fund targets extremely low income households (including people who have been chronically homeless, people with disabilities and some elderly), rental assistance or operating subsidy activities should be considered.

Administration

Most funds are administered by governmental agencies such as the community development department of a city or county. A few housing trust funds are administered by independent commissions (including multi-jurisdictional funds). Funds also are administered by nonprofit entities. Charleston has created a nonprofit trust fund that operates with support from the City of Charleston (e.g. providing housing expertise and funding for staff) and the local Community Foundation (assisting with the competitive award process).

² The single resource for the attached information is the Center for Community Change which provides technical assistance and research on Housing Trust Funds in the U.S. <http://www.communitychange.org/issues/housing/trustfundproject/>.

Typically, housing trust fund operations are governed by an **oversight board**. The board's authority ranges from selecting projects for funding to serving as program advisory boards. The State of South Carolina's Trust Fund is administered by the SC State Housing Finance and Development Authority and the SCSHFDA board has authority to distribute the funds with program input offered by a legislatively mandated advisory committee.

Funding Trust Funds

A dedicated source of funding is critical to the success of a trust fund. Suitability of any single source will depend on the adequacy of the resource, and the legal and political feasibility of securing it for a trust fund. The typical source of revenue is **an increase in a tax or fee** with the increase going to the trust fund. New fees also are common such as developer fees and inclusionary zoning in-lieu fees. Another source is to commit revenues from an existing source like a hotel/motel tax, document recording fees, or developer fees. New taxes to fund a trust fund are rare. It is common to identify a source where the relationship to affordable housing is clear. For example, if the trust fund is to target low wage workers like service workers, a hospitality tax that would support housing them might be considered. Similarly, communities have used taxes or fees related to building, development or real estate. To identify one or more feasible sources will require establishing criteria for the source (amount of funding needed, tie-in to housing, ease of securing the funding, etc.) brainstorming; research on the level of funding the sources provide; agreement among the participating jurisdictions and an assessment of the likelihood of securing the funding. The trust fund could be developed with more than one dedicated funding source.

Examples of city housing trust fund sources:

- Transit occupancy tax (hotel/motel tax)
- Business license tax
- Property tax
- Sales tax
- Real estate transfer tax
- Use tax
- Housing excise tax
- Redevelopment tax increment
- Sale of city land
- Parking revenues
- Impact fees

Recommendations

In deliberations on creation of an affordable housing trust fund, the committee was guided by the following vision for the community.

The Midlands region offers quality, affordable housing that supports a high quality of life for its residents and sustains the development of an economically vital community.

The committee also envisioned the following role for a local trust fund.

The Midlands Housing Trust Fund is a public- private partnership that promotes and funds the development of affordable housing in the region. The MHTF targets people who struggle to secure housing including people who work at low wage jobs, people with disabilities and other special

needs. The mission of MHTF is to offer flexible programs and funding that fill gaps in the affordable housing market, leverage funding and enhance existing strategies.

1. ***Create a regional affordable housing trust fund to serve the Columbia metro area of Richland and Lexington counties.***

Regional issues require regional solutions. Because the need for affordable housing affects both counties and the City of Columbia, the committee strongly recommends that the trust fund be designed to maximize participation of both counties and all local municipalities. Broad governmental participation increases potential resources for housing and supports the integration of affordable housing across the region rather than its concentration in a few communities. Rather than delay the creation of the trust fund until all potential participants are committed, however, the committee recommends that the trust fund be created with those entities most ready to participate and that the structure of the fund allow expansion as other municipalities or counties request entry.

2. ***The trust fund should target people at 50% median income or less with a primary focus on people with incomes of 30% or less than area median income. The committee further recommends that the trust fund target special needs populations including people who are disabled, elderly, or homeless.***

The Midlands continues to benefit from a long history of publicly supported community development, including successful housing programs. In the last few years, both counties also have become entitlement communities for US Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grants and/or the HOME program funds which offer opportunities to expand their development activities. Richland County also has initiated an ambitious neighborhood planning and development initiative. Richland County currently targets homeownership, rental rehabilitation, neighborhood redevelopment, emergency repair and public sewer with CDBG and HOME funds. Lexington County targets a wide range of activities with its \$1M CDBG fund including the development of public facilities, infrastructure, planning, community and social services affordable housing and homelessness. The City of Columbia has successful homeownership programs and housing development programs, particularly focused on people at 50% area median income and above. These programs including several low interest loan programs for first time homebuyers and special programs for police officers and qualified city employees. City sponsored development corporations also support construction of owner-occupied units and multifamily units. Lexington County has recently become an entitlement for CDBG funds. The county's approach to affordable housing is to concentrate on expansion and improvement of infrastructure. This will open up areas of the County that are now reliant upon large tracts of land to support the required septic and well systems for residential, commercial, and industrial units.

The cumulative result of these activities, which have been enhanced by local private nonprofit development, is the production of new housing and particularly new homeowners. But in spite of these successful programs and an overall reduction in the percentage of people earning less than \$25,000/year, the total number of households with incomes of less than \$25,000 is expected to increase to 60,005 by 2009. Data taken from local Consolidated Plans suggests that a very high percentage of households with incomes of 50% and below median income pay more than 30%, some more than 50% of their income for housing. The committee also acknowledges that the Draft

Blueprint Strategies for Reducing Homelessness in the Midlands calls for the development of over 500 housing units over ten years targeting individuals and families who are homeless. It is more expensive to develop and operate housing for people at these low income levels, but because of the high number of people who are cost burdened at this income level, the committee recommends that this new housing resource target this population.

3. *The trust fund should be funded with private funds and one or more source of dedicated public funding. The committee recommends an Initial goal for the trust fund of \$1 million with ongoing support that sustains a trust fund of \$2M.*

The trust fund will require funding to capitalize it and a small amount of funding to operate it. More importantly, **the success of the Midlands housing trust fund will depend on a reliable source of continuing funding.** In reviewing the potential sources of funding for a local trust fund, the committee took several factors into consideration.

- Communities have many demands on scarce resources.
- Different jurisdictions have different resources and considerations in allocating them. To accommodate differences, reliable funding for a regional housing trust fund likely will come from several different sources.
- Two million dollars in housing funds leveraged at a ratio of 1:4 could support the development of 125 units a year.³
- Local investments in affordable housing benefit those who receive the housing but also the community. For example, a \$1M new construction project generates 59 construction jobs and \$80,000 in state and local tax revenues. The full benefit of \$10M in new production would generate 590 construction jobs and \$800,000 in state and local taxes. This does not include the additional revenue generated from housing related retail and services like the purchase of furniture, yard maintenance, realtor, insurance and other services.⁴
- The rising cost of housing production, recent and proposed federal reductions in housing funding and persistent need contribute to a sense of urgency in creating new local funding sources.

The committee recommends the following options be explored for initial capitalization of the trust fund:

- Local private funding.
- A portion of the proceeds from the sale of Canalside.
- Local CDBG funding.
- Other federal funding.

The committee recommends the following options be explored for as sources of dedicated funding for the trust fund:

- Documentary stamp taxes
- Building permit fees

³ Estimate based on a per unit development cost of \$80,000/unit.

⁴ Calculations are based on formulas used by the Bureau of Economic Advisors. To estimate the number of construction jobs created directly and indirectly through new construction or rehabilitation they offer the following formula: [Value of new construction (including land) + Value of Rehab] / \$27,172 - 2004 (estimate) State Per Capita Personal Income (BEA)= Jobs Directly created. [[Value of new construction (including land) + Value of Rehab] x 60%] / \$27,172 - 2004 (estimate) State Per Capita Personal Income (BEA)=Jobs indirectly created. Construction Jobs calculations assumes workers were not employed, but hired as a result of construction.

- Hospitality or accommodations taxes.

4. ***The trust fund should be a flexible source of housing development funding that can support a wide range of eligible activities.***

The committee recommends that the trust fund support acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction activities. The committee also recommends that the trust fund develop and fund rent support programs to target shortages in current programs (e.g. HUD Section 8 vouchers) including project and sponsor based rent support programs. The committee also recommends that trust fund activities include pre-development. The committee recognizes that targeting the low and extremely low income populations will require deep subsidies, in the form of grants. In order to sustain the activities of the trust fund, the committee recommends that a portion of the funding be distributed in the form of zero and low interest loans.

5. ***The trust fund is envisioned as a public/private partnership that will operate as a distinct entity with participation and support from participating jurisdictions and local communities.***

Several factors were considered in evaluating potential organizational structures or hosts for the trust fund:

- The trust fund should have the capacity and authority to accept public and private funds.
- The administrative structure should be lean and efficient. A trust fund requires a range of activities and expertise (housing development, fund management, grant management, grant writing, etc.). Where possible, existing public and private organizations should contribute expertise to management of the fund.
- The governing structure of the fund should include representation from participating jurisdictions. Additionally, the community should have a formal role advising the governing board on programs and planning for the trust fund.
- Once established, the trust fund should have a broader role than accepting and distributing funds. In promoting affordable housing; the trust fund could serve as a developer, convener, partnership broker, capacity builder, etc.

With these factors in mind the committee explored several ways of structuring the fund including locating it within existing organizations (United Way of the Midlands, Central Carolina Community Foundation, Central Midlands Council of Governments, Columbia Housing Authority's nonprofit development corporation) or organizing it through intergovernmental agreements. After evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of these options, the committee recommends that the trust fund be **created as a new nonprofit organization.**

This is a common structure for multi-jurisdictional trust funds including the Charleston Trust. Advantages to this option include the ability to design the fund to meet all criteria from the start; the spectrum of activities that a nonprofit can assume and the visibility of a stand-alone organization. Initially, the trust fund will need at least one full time staff person. Additional staff requirements will depend on the level of support provided from other organizations (for activities such as application review including underwriting; assistance with grant competition and program monitoring, marketing and others). The governing structure for the nonprofit board would include

representation from participating jurisdictions and a citizen's advisory committee to assist with program development and prioritization of funded activities.

One Year Action Plan

1. Brief local jurisdictions on recommendations.
2. Continue to brief other local stakeholders in the housing community (banks, realtors, chambers of commerce, developers, nonprofit organizations).
3. Secure initial private funding.
4. Evaluate funding strategies.
5. Develop local and state legislative agendas for funding.
6. Secure local government commitments to participate.
7. Initiate creation of nonprofit.
8. Secure technical assistance as needed.

PENDING ANALYSIS

Subject: NACo Prescription Discount Card

NACo Prescription Drug Discount Card Program

Summary

- Caremark was chosen as the program provider after a two-year process that involved the NACo Membership Committee, a consulting firm and a special evaluation committee appointed by the NACo President (Karen Miller was President at the time).
- The Caremark program was chosen not only for its price savings, but also for its ease of use and understanding.
- The program provides great flexibility for participating counties. The discount cards can be used by anyone—senior citizens, the elderly, or the uninsured. Some counties may use the cards for their jail populations or their employees if they do not have a prescription drug insurance program.
- There is no cost to NACo, no cost to the counties participating in the program and no cost to the citizens using the discount card.
- Citizens do not have to fill out any forms to participate and, therefore, the counties do not have to maintain any database of who has the cards. The card will be given to citizens with a brochure and can be used immediately by anyone who needs it.
- The discount cards are accepted at more than 57,000 pharmacies nationwide. The overall average savings is about 20 percent. The savings range from 13 percent to 35 percent on purchases of drugs at a local pharmacy and up to 50 percent on mail order purchases. Savings differences are based on brand-named prescriptions vs. generic.
- Only NACo member counties can participate.

PENDING ANALYSIS

Richland County Council Request of Action
--

Subject: Sheriff's Department: SRO Budget Amendment

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a Budget Amendment to allow the Sheriff's Department to transfer into its budget the amount of \$ 219,736 from funds received from School Districts 1, 2, Richland/ Lexington 5 and Heathwood Hall, to reimburse the incidental costs of providing School Resource Officers.

B. Background / Discussion

The Sheriff's Department has contracted with each of the above school districts and expects to collect \$573,704 collectively, from the School Districts, which are intended to share the costs of providing School Resource Officers. The Sheriff is requesting that the following line items be reimbursed from these funds to offset the costs incurred by this program;

- Line Item 2010.5221.1 (Radio Service) \$49,248
Provides for 800mhz radio usage by SRO's.

- Line Item 2010.5262 (Beepers and Cell Phones) \$57,888
Provides for Nextel usage on campus and communications between schools without tying up radio circuits.

- Line Item 2010.5244 (Uniforms and Equipment) \$42,600
Each Deputy is provided a replacement uniform each year
As well as replacement of depleted equipment.

- Line Item 2010.5264 (Employee Training) \$70,000
Provides for SRO re-certification, DARE re-certification
And D.A.R.E training.

Inclusion of these funds into the budget will allow the Sheriff to continue normal law enforcement operations without a drain on his resources, and continue to provide critical security for our schools.

C. Financial Impact

Line Item 2010.5221.1	\$ 49,248
Line Item 2010.5262	\$57,888
Line Item 2010.5244	\$42,600
Line Item 2010.5264	\$70,000
Total	\$219,736

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request and allow the Sheriff to continue normal operations without a drain on his allocated resources.
2. Do not approve the request and cause the Sheriff to defer other duties and obligations to continue the program

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve this request.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy **Department:** Sheriff's Department
Date: 9/14/2005

F. Reviews

Additional information regarding this item has been requested by the Chair of the A&F Committee. This item is currently pending further analysis.

PENDING ANALYSIS

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Sheriff's Department: Expenditure Request

A. Purpose

Pursuant to Ordinance Number 069-04HR, sec 22a, the Sheriff submits a one-time Material Project equipment expenditure using funds from Special Duty Administrative Fees collected in FY2004/2005.

B. Background / Discussion

The Sheriff's Department would like to purchase 10 Portable Radios and 100 Tasers from the Sheriff's Special Duty Administrative fees. The portable radios are necessary to outfit reserve deputies when they are on duty. The tasers will be issued to line deputies and provide them with a non-lethal alternative in combative situations. It is also requested that \$ 20,000 be transferred to 2010.5113 to cover the cost of the Part time Administrative Clerk who maintains special duty records. There is no adverse impact on the general fund.

C. Financial Impact

Potable Radios (10 @ \$4000 ea)	\$ 40,000
Tasers (100 @ \$1,000 ea)	\$100,000
Part time Admin Clerk	\$20,000
Total	\$160,000

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request as set forth in the Ordinance.
2. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve this request.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy

Department: Sheriff's Department

Date: 9/14/2005

F. Reviews

Additional information regarding this item has been requested by the Chair of the A&F Committee. This item is currently pending further analysis.

PENDING ANALYSIS

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Sheriff's Department: Budget Amendment for Fuel Costs

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Sheriff's Department budget in the amount of \$242,000.00 for the purpose of providing for a budget shortfall in Petrol, Oil and Lubricants.

B. Background / Discussion

The Sheriff's Department will experience a serious shortfall in line item 2010.5216, "Petrol Oil and Lubricants", due to an unprecedented increase in fuel costs. The Sheriff has already added \$200,000 to this line item from his Administrative Account, established to compensate the budget for fuel costs incurred by Special Duty assignments. But the escalating cost of fuel has exceeded projections. The Sheriff's original budget request was submitted on a projected cost of \$14,000 per week one year ago. The price of oil has increased significantly since that time, requiring \$21,000 - \$22,800 per week to support normal operations.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County's fund balance will be \$242,000.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to allow for unforeseen budget shortfall and continue normal operations.
2. Disapprove the request and allow the Sheriff's Department budget to suffer a shortfall in fuel and petrol.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve this request.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy

Department: Sheriff's Department

Date: 9/14/2005

F. Reviews

Additional information regarding this item has been requested by the Chair of the A&F Committee. This item is currently pending further analysis.