

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2005 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Member: Mike Montgomery
Member: Paul Livingston
Member: Joseph McEachern
Member: Valerie Hutchinson

MEMBER ABSENT: Kit Smith (sick).

ALSO PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Damon Jeter, Joyce Dickerson, Tony Mizzell, Doris Corley (arrived at 6:30 p.m.), Larry Smith, Michael Criss, Stephany Snowden, Carrie Neal, Amelia Linder, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Ashley Bloom, Chief Harrell, Joe Cronin, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Marsheika Martin, Jocelyn Jennings

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting started at approximately 6:04 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 22, 2005 – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to approve the minutes as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Central Midlands Council of Governments: Approval of Resolution Adopting the Natural Hazards Risk Assessment and Hazard Mitigation Plan

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to adopt the Resolution. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Hammond School: Approval of Resolution Supporting JEDA Bond Issuance

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

Department of Public Works: Utilities Ordinance Amendment

Mr. T. Cary McSwain, County Administrator, stated this is an action requested to create the Utilities Department as a separate department from Public Works. The Utilities Department would have a department head and would be placed under the same organization as Planning so wherever a sewer goes, planning can be consistent.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to approve.

A discussion took place.

Mr. McEachern made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to forward to a Work Session for further questions and discussions.

Mr. Montgomery noted that Council should be receiving recommendations from all departments (Finance, Legal and Administration) regarding ordinance amendments.

The vote in favor of the substitute motion was unanimous.

Community Development: Fair Housing Resolution

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to approve the Resolution. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Legal Department: Budget Request

Mr. McSwain stated this is relative to a pending legal item and legal expenses that are projected to the end of the calendar year that were over and above what was participated at the beginning of the budget year.

Mr. Livingston recommended forwarding this item without a recommendation; and if there are any questions, to go into Executive Session.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward this item without a recommendation; and hold Executive Session for further discussions if needed, and to review the County's legal services policy to determine if any amendments or updates are needed.

Mr. McEachern added to the motion a request to receive the proper outline of the cost associated with that.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Department of Planning and Department Services: Planning Ordinance Amendment

Mr. McSwain stated this is another item which references departmental division structure. He stated this item could be forwarded to a Work Session as well.

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward along with item 1-c to a Work Session and also to receive an update on the Management Audit at that time. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Report of the Clerk of Council: Personnel Matter (This item originally appeared on the 3-1-05 Regular Session Council Agenda under “Report of the Clerk of Council.” The item was discussed in Executive Session during the 3-1-05 Council Meeting. Council recommended that this item

A discussion took place regarding what this item was.

Mr. McEachern reminded the Committee that staff was not in Executive Session when this item was discussed and was not aware of the amendments requested by Council. He stated Council came out of Executive Session and referred amendments to the ordinance to the A&F Committee for discussion.

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to hold this item in Committee until next month and requested for Mr. Montgomery to get with Administration and convey the amendments. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sheriff’s Department: Holiday Pay

Mr. McSwain gave a brief update on the Holiday Pay for the Sheriff’s Department. He recommended a budget amendment to cover double pay on holidays in the amount of \$168,000 to be taken out of the Fund Balance with the agreement that Mr. Driggers, Budget Director, and Chief Harrell agrees on a number.

Mr. Montgomery requested that before the Administrator brings something to full Council that an analysis of the available sources is received.

A discussion took place.

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to forward without a recommendation with an analysis of the budget item, as well as, the option that Council has with financing. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEM FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION – No items at this time.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:34 p.m.

Submitted by,

Kit Smith, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH)

A. Purpose

County Council is asked to approve a request from the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless in the amount of \$5,000. These funds will be used to contract with the University of South Carolina for the purpose of researching and analyzing data obtained during the 2005 Count of People Experiencing Homelessness.

B. Background / Discussion

The Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless was established in 1994 in an attempt to bridge the gap between the homeless population and the community at-large through education, planning, advocacy, and services. The mission of the MACH is to end homelessness in our society by providing equal access to affordable housing, adequate healthcare, employment opportunities, and education. The MACH also seeks to prevent homelessness, to compassionately serve people in crisis, and to integrate homeless individuals into our community. Membership in MACH is open to anyone who shares the same vision and commitment to service in the following counties: Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun, Chester, Fairfield, Lancaster, Lexington, Orangeburg, Newberry, Richland, and York.

A count of the homeless population in the Midlands, including Richland County, was conducted in January 2005. MACH proposes to enter into a contract with the University of South Carolina, in the amount of \$10,825, for the provision of the following services: data collection, analysis and interpretation, and the production of final reports on homelessness in the Midlands. These reports will provide further information on the incidence of homelessness, the types and availability of services currently being provided, and the current gaps in those services. MACH is requesting \$5,000 from Richland County to be used towards the cost of the contract.

Richland County will receive copies of final reports.

C. Financial Impact

This is an eligible expense for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and could be paid for with the understanding that a public notice is advertised, and a public hearing held, indicating the inclusion of this expense in the current Consolidated Plan.

D. Alternatives

1. Accept the \$5,000 request and fund with Richland County operating funds (*no public hearing required*);
2. Accept the \$5,000 request and fund with CDBG dollars (*must hold public hearing – can be conducted by Community Development staff*); or

3. Do not accept the request to assist with funding of the Homeless Study (which includes Richland County).

E. Recommendation

This Study will provide Richland County with information for planning purposes. Staff recommends that Council fund this \$5,000 expenditure with CDBG funds with the understanding that the Community Development Department will hold a public hearing and satisfy all other federal requirements.

Recommended by: Sherry Wright Moore **Department:** Community Development

Date: March 28,2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: April 6, 2005

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are available as stated in recommendation.

Use of CDBG grant funds does not require a budget amendment.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 405

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Ashley Jacobs Bloom Date: 04/12/05

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that Council fund this \$5,000 expenditure with CDBG funds.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Food Service Management / Aramark Correctional Services, Inc.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the expenditure in the amount of \$1,015,237.65 for food service for the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center.

B. Background / Discussion

This is annual renewal for food service for the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center. Aramark Correctional Service, Inc. has provided the Detention Center with quality food service for the past two years.

C. Financial Impact

The estimated expenditure is \$1,015,237.65 to feed an estimated average daily population of 889 inmates. Additional costs would be incurred if the population exceeds 850 on any given day.

The estimated expenditure is \$1,015,237.65 of the \$2,773,057.00 requested in Account # 2100-5265, Professional Service.

D. Alternatives

1. Renew the Aramark Food Service Management contract in the amount of \$1,015,237.65 for the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center.
2. Do not renew the Aramark Food Service Management contract in the amount of \$1,015,237.65 for the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center. A new service provider must be found.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the negotiations and renew the contract in the amount of \$1,015,237.65 to Aramark Correctional Service, Inc. for food service for the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center.

Recommended by: Ronaldo D. Myers **Department:** Detention Center **Date:** March 2, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 4/12/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Contingent upon adoption of FY 06 budget

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: April 21, 2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood Date: April 14, 2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope Date: April 21, 2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Detention Officer Uniforms Contract Renewal / Wright-Johnson, Inc.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the expenditure in the amount of \$108,000 for officers' uniforms and accessories from Wright-Johnson, Inc.

B. Background / Discussion

Wright-Johnson Inc. of Columbia is the only existing law-enforcement uniform company within the immediate area. The Richland County Detention Center has been purchasing its detention officers' uniforms from Wright-Johnson for well over 20 years. In the past, the Department requisitioned uniforms as needed, based on wear and tear, and issuing of new uniforms to newly hired officers. However, due to the volume of purchases, Procurement recommends that this be placed on an open purchase order, and extended as needed. Funding for the contract has been requested in the FY 05-06 budget. Additionally, several other County Departments use this vendor for uniform purchases.

C. Financial Impact

The estimated expenditure is \$108,000 of the \$154,050 requested in account # 2100-5241, Uniforms and Equipment.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to renew the contract to Wright-Johnson, Inc. in the amount of \$108,000 for FY 05-06 for officers' uniforms and accessories.
2. Do not approve the request to renew the contract to Wright-Johnson, Inc. in the amount of \$108,000 for FY 05-06 for officers' uniforms and accessories. A new service provider must be found.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to renew the contract for Wright-Johnson, Inc. in the amount of \$108,000 for FY 05-06 for officers' uniforms and accessories.

Recommend by: Ronaldo D. Myers **Department:** Detention Center **Date:** March 2, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 4/12/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Contingent upon FY 06 budget adoption

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: April 21, 2005

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: April 14, 2005

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: April 21, 2005

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Contract Renewal for Detention Center Medical Services / Prison Health Services

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the expenditure for inmate medical services to Prison Health Services in the amount of \$1,632,729.00

B. Background/Discussion

This is an annual renewal of a contract that was initiated in FY 00-01 for 24-hour medical coverage for the Detention Center. This was brought about because of the need for better medical coverage. Over the years, the Detention Center relied on Richland County Emergency Medical Service to transport detainees to Palmetto Richland Memorial Hospital. This was at best a hit and miss situation since non-medical personnel were making decisions that only a medical professional should make. Additionally, the Detention Center tried to recruit nurses to work at the facility, but to no avail. To minimize the risk of detainees not receiving proper medical care and attention, the Detention Center thought it was best to contract with a private health care company. The County's Procurement Department solicited a Request for Proposals and the responsive vendor was Prison Health Service.

C. Financial Impact

The estimated expenditure is \$1,632,729.00 of the \$2,773,057.00 requested in Account #2100-5265, Professional Services.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to renew the contract with Prison Health Services in the amount of \$1,632,729.00 to provide inmate medical services.
2. Do not approve the request to renew the contract with Prison Health Services in the amount of \$1,632,729.00 to provide inmate medical services. A new service provider must be found.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to renew the contract with Prison Health Services in the amount of \$1,632,729.00 for FY 05-06 in order to provide inmate medical services.

Recommend by: Ronaldo D. Myers **Department:** Detention Center **Date:** March 2, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 4/12/05
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Contingent upon FY 06 budget adoption

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder Date: 4/21/2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood Date: April 14, 2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope Date: April 21, 2005
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, however staff also recommends an internal audit of PHS's service delivery. This will be a motion item on the budget list.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of Excavator

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase in the amount of \$224,175.00 for a Volvo EC330BLC excavator. This equipment will be purchased for the Solid Waste and Recycling Division of Public Works for use at the C and D Landfill site.

B. Background / Discussion

This equipment will be replacing Unit 00373 in the Fleet inventory, a 1993 Kobelco SK220C excavator. An excavator is a critical piece of equipment at the C and D Landfill, required as part of the operating permit with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. Among its many functions on site are excavation and cleaning of sediment ponds, loading dirt for facility grounds maintenance and improvements, and digging drainage ditches.

The current unit is aged past its efficient life cycle, with the American Public Works Association guidelines calling for replacement at eight years. The County has spent significant funds to maintain and repair this equipment in the last eighteen months. More importantly, there has been a substantial amount of down time while waiting for replacement parts to effect necessary repairs to the unit. At times, this has also necessitated the additional expense of a rental unit in order to maintain Landfill operations. The replacement equipment will bring a reduction in maintenance and repair costs. More importantly, it will eliminate the costly and inefficient down time which has hampered efficient operations at the Landfill.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County will be the purchase cost of \$224,175.00, available in the current budget of the Solid Waste and Recycling Division of Public Works. The budget account is 3056-5314. The financial breakdown is as follows:

Volvo EC330BLC Excavator	\$229,500.00
Trade-In of Kobelco SK220C (Unit 00373)	\$ 16,000.00
Sales Tax (5%)	\$ 10,675.00
Total Cost, per unit	\$224,175.00

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to purchase the Volvo EC330BLC excavator in the amount of \$224,175.00. This will ensure the continued efficiency and capability of the C and D Landfill to fulfill its operational requirements.
2. Do not approve the request to purchase the Volvo EC330BLC excavator in the amount of \$224,175.00. This will force the County to continue to spend additional funds to repair the older unit, with excessive downtime limiting its availability and decreasing efficiency. In

addition, to meet the operational requirements of the permit, additional rentals may be required.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the request for the purchase of the Volvo EC330BLC excavator in the amount of \$224,175.00 for use by the C and D Landfill.

Recommended by: Bill Peters, Fleet Mgr. **Department:** Central Garage **Date:** April 12, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: April 13, 2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Budget funds are available

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: April 14, 2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 4/21/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives appear to be legally sufficient.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: April 14, 2005

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval. Purchase of this equipment is included in the FY 05 Solid Waste budget; no additional funding will be required.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Resolution to Adopt the National Incident Management System

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval for a resolution adopting the National Incident Management System. Adopting and implementing NIMS is a condition and requirement to receive hazard mitigation funds, emergency management grants, homeland security grants and other future federal grants available to public safety.

B. Background / Discussion

On February 28, 2003, President Bush signed Homeland Security Presidential Directive – 5, HSPD-5, establishing the National Incident Management System (NIMS) as the national standard for emergency management planning, mitigation, response and recovery to emergencies, disasters and terrorist events. NIMS provides a consistent nationwide template to enable government, private sector, and nongovernmental organizations to work together during domestic incidents. NIMS is applicable across a full spectrum of potential incidents and hazard scenarios regardless of the type, size and length of the emergency. NIMS improves coordination and cooperation between agencies before, during and after an incident. There are numerous components of NIMS including: Preparedness, Command and Management, Communications and Information Management, Resource Management, Support Functions and Technology, and Continuous Management and Maintenance. The Incident Management System (ICS) is also a component of NIMS.

Adopting and implementing NIMS is a condition and requirement to receive hazard mitigation funds, emergency management grants, homeland security grants and other future federal grants available to public safety. Richland County participates in current grants and will participate in future federal grants, which will include the requirement to formally adopt NIMS as the Richland County standard for emergency planning, mitigation, response and recovery.

Each jurisdiction must adopt NIMS by October 2005 with full implementation by the end of 2006. The National Incident Management System Integration Center (NIMS-IC) outlines the conditions, interpretation and management of NIMS. NIMS requires all applicable personnel involved in planning and response to receive training in NIMS.

C. Financial Impact

There is no immediate and direct financial impact for adopting NIMS. The potential financial impact to Richland County will be the loss of grant funding.

D. Alternatives

1. Adopt NIMS as the standard for Richland County.
2. Do not adopt NIMS, and forfeit the opportunity to receive hazard mitigation funds, emergency management grants, homeland security grants and other future federal grants available to public safety.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council adopt NIMS as the standard for Richland County by approving the attached resolution.

Recommended by: Michael Byrd **Department:** Emergency Services **Date:** March 1, 2005

Recommended by: Sheriff Leon Lott **Department:** Sheriff's Department **Date:** 3/1/05

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/13/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Dawn Darby

Date: 4/14/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 4/19/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 4-20-05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
 COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS) IN RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

Whereas, Richland County recognizes the need to have an organized plan and response to natural and man-made emergencies and disasters which crosses the full spectrum of potential incidents and hazards, improving coordination between public and private entities before, during and after disasters, emergencies and terrorists events; and

Whereas, undertaking emergency response planning, prevention, mitigation, response and recovery from disasters is essential in combating the threat of emergencies, disasters and terrorists events which has the potential to harm people and property in Richland County; and

Whereas, the President of the United States issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive –5 (HSPD-5) which requires all government, private-sector, and non-governmental organizations to develop and administer the National Incident Management System which promotes working together during incidents; and

Whereas, adopting NIMS is a condition and requirement to receive hazard mitigations funds, emergency management grants, homeland security grants and other future federal grants available to public safety; and

Whereas, Richland County participates in current grants and will participate in future federal grants which includes the requirement to formally adopt NIMS as the Richland County standard for emergency planning, mitigation, response and recovery; and

Whereas, Richland County will provide NIMS training to all applicable Richland County employees active in planning or active during an emergency, disaster or terrorist event to the required level as outlined by the National Incident Management System Integration Center (NIMS-IC);

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Richland County Council hereby adopts the National Incident Management System (NIMS) as the method to plan, prevent, respond, mitigate and recover from emergencies, disasters and terrorist events in Richland County.

ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2005.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
 Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

(Seal)

ATTEST:

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: TIF Audit

A. Purpose

At the request of Councilwoman Kit Smith, it is recommended that an audit regarding the TIF be completed prior to the setting of the millage.

B. Background / Discussion

Because of the Local Option Rollback, the County is responsible for funding any loss of funds due to the rollback from general revenues.

An audit will provide information about where the county stands on the payment of debt. It will also consider how much will be owed this year, and what portion will be needed from the County.

Questions remain to be answered: Who can perform the audit? Who will perform the audit?

C. Financial Impact

Several financial questions remain to be answered: How much will the audit cost? Will TIF funds pay for the audit under our agreement with the City?

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request for a TIF audit prior to the third reading and adoption of the County Budget (or setting of millage).
2. Do not approve the request for a TIF audit.

E. Recommendation

Recommended by: Kit Smith

Date: April 12, 2005

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Recreation Commission Steering Committee Report

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request is to consider a contract with Wood + Partners for recreation consulting services. An award was made to Wood + Partners in response to Richland County’s RFQ.

B. Background/Discussion

The Hospitality Tax Ordinance authorizes the development of a ‘recreation facility in northern Richland County’ that should attract regional visitors. The Capital Projects Committee of Council (Smith, Pearce, Tillis) recommended that the County engage a consultant to oversee this project because of the County’s need for expert guidance and lack of internal resources.

In November 2004, the Committee recommended and Council adopted a motion “to engage a recreational planning firm or consultant to:

- assess the recreational needs of Richland County and recommend a project that would draw regional visitors
- determine the financial viability of such a project
- assist the County in selecting a site
- develop a land use plan for the center with estimated operating and construction costs.

Four companies submitted their qualifications, and the evaluations were put on hold due to more pressing projects at that time. The evaluations were completed in November of 2004, and an award was made to Wood + Partners.

The RFQ contains information regarding conceptual planning services, and design development through construction phase services. More specifically, the Tasks proposed, along with corresponding costs, are as follows:

Task 1 – Public Opinion & Customer Organizations Surveys.....	\$38,500.00
Task 2 – Program Definition, Market Assessment, & Financial Plan.....	\$29,500.00
Task 3 – Site Selection Services.....	(see note below)
Task 4 – Park Conceptual Master Planning.....	\$54,000.00
Total Conceptual Planning Services.....	\$122,000.00

Note: Fees for Conceptual Planning Services do not include Site Selection Services. These fees will be negotiated following the County’s selection of sites to assess.

Staff review of similar projects in other jurisdictions indicates that these charges are in line with market and reasonable.

C. Financial Impact

Wood + Partners has quoted an estimate of \$122,000 - \$137,500 in its RFQ for the aforementioned services (Tasks 1, 2, and 4). The Hospitality Tax account has adequate funds to cover these expenses.

D. Alternatives

1. Negotiate with Woods + Partners to contract for Phase I of the project to recommend types of facilities that could be built that would attract regional visitors, develop financial feasibility assessments for each, and the amount of land that would be needed. Once Council has determined *what* type of facility will be built (soccer, baseball, swim, equestrian, etc.), and the *required acreage*, negotiations for site selection and design concepts can ensue. Approve \$122,000 - \$137,500 in Hospitality Tax funds for the recreation consultant, Wood + Partners, to proceed with plans for the recreation facility in the northern portion of Richland County
2. Do not approve \$122,000 - \$137,500 in Hospitality Tax funds for the recreation consultant, Wood + Partners, to proceed with plans for the recreation facility in the northern portion of Richland County. Another RFP must be issued.

E. Recommendation

Administration recommends alternative 1.

Recommended By: Staff Department: Administration Date: April 15, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 4/19/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Currently there is \$1,834,181 in undesignated hospitality tax funds available.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 4/19/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives appear to be legally sufficient.

Administration

Reviewed by: Ashley Jacobs Bloom Date: 04/20/05
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Selection of a recreation consultant is consistent with Council’s direction regarding the establishment of a recreation complex to be funded by Hospitality Tax proceeds. It is recommended, therefore, that the Council approve option 1 above and authorize the staff to begin negotiations with Wood + Partners.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: 2005 Black Expo

A. Purpose

At the request of Councilman Paul Livingston, Council is requested to review the information provided to funding applicants regarding fiscal years and the funding process.

B. Background / Discussion

Due to a lack of understanding of the fiscal years and the funding process, Black Expo has not received funding for FY 05. The 2005 Black Expo is scheduled to take place May 21, 2005. Funding for this event should have been requested during FY 04-05 (applications for FY 04-05 were due February 2004).

Hospitality Tax and Accommodations Tax applications for the Black Expo were submitted in February 2005 for the May 21, 2005 event. However, if awarded funding based on this 2005 application, the funds would be allocated for the 2006 Black Expo, not for the 2005 Black Expo, for which money is needed.

Black Expo was granted 501 (c) 3 status on February 24, 2005.

To clarify the fiscal year and funding process in funding applications, verbiage could simply be added to these documents stating, "This application for funding pertains to events being held from July 1, 200X – June 30, 200X. Organizations receiving funding must request these funds on a quarterly basis. These funds will be available beginning July 1, 200X."

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with clarifying the fiscal year and funding process in funding applications.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to review the information provided to funding applicants regarding fiscal years and the funding process.
2. Do not approve the request to review the information provided to funding applicants regarding fiscal years and the funding process.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that the suggested verbiage be added to funding applications regarding the fiscal years and funding process.

Recommended By: Administration Staff, per Paul Livingston

Date: April 15, 2005