



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Kit Smith	Greg Pearce	Joyce Dickerson, Chair	Kelvin Washington	Valerie Hutchinson
District 5	District 6	District 2	District 10	District 9

**APRIL 27, 2010
6:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: March 23, 2010 [pages 5-6]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Richland County Library: USDA Grant Request-Eastover Branch [pages 8-12]
3. Transportation Enhancement Grant for Woodrow Wilson Home [pages 14-16]

4. Request for Contract Award for Parking Garage Repairs [pages 18-19]
5. Victim's Assistance Fund-Budget Amendment [pages 21-22]
6. Job performance plan for the Clerk of Council position [page 24]
7. Replacement of Damaged RCSD Vehicles [pages 26-28]
8. Business Services Center-Records Retention Schedule [pages 30-32]
9. Approval of the Exercise of an Option to Renew a Contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc. [pages 34-39]
10. Budget Amendment-Risk Management [pages 41-42]
11. Emergency Services Purchase Orders and Contract Approvals for FY 2010-11 [pages 44-45]
12. Pursue properties associated with Caughman Creek using Hospitality Tax funds [pages 47-48]
13. Transfer funds allocated for SC Gospel Fest to Administrator to be distributed as per County Rules [pages 50-56]
14. Eastover Sewer Plant Update (Contractual Matter) [page 58]

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

15. Administrator to provide necessary information to enter into Mutual Aid agreements for Fire and EMS with neighboring Counties and Municipalities where there are no current agreements [page 60]
16. Jail Intervention Program [pages 62-65]
17. County Council to provide funding in the FY 2010-11 budget for the Midlands Housing Alliance [page 67]

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: March 23, 2010 [pages 5-6]

Reviews

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2010 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.

=====

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair: Joyce Dickerson
Member: Valerie Hutchinson
Member: L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.
Member: Kit Smith
Member: Kelvin E. Washington, Sr.

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Damon Jeter, Norman Jackson, Bill Malinowski, Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Jennifer Dowden, Tamara King, Amelia Linder, Anna Almeida, Valeria Jackson, Dale Welch, Dan Johnson, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:06 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 23, 2010 (Regular Session) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Washington, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Budget Amendment-Sheriff: Part-Time Employees – Mr. Washington moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Fair Housing Resolution – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Washington, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Provide assistance to the City of Forest Acres for Building Plan Review and Inspections – Mr. Washington moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval as amended. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Referendum on whether or not Richland County should adopt the Supervisor form of Government – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. A discussion took place.

The vote was in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:25 p.m.

Submitted by,

Joyce Dickerson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Richland County Library: USDA Grant Request-Eastover Branch [pages 8-12]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Richland County Public Library: USDA Grant Request

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve Richland County Public Library's request for the County to apply for a grant in partnership with the Library that will, if funded, expand the Eastover Branch. The Library also requests \$400,000 from the County to complete the project.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Public Library plans to double the size of the Eastover Branch library which will include meeting room space, homework/jobs technology center, space dedicated to materials that highlight the local history of Eastover and explore partnerships to provide interactive youth spaces focusing on developing reading skills. The current facility is 2,600 square feet with limited hours. To better serve the community, the library will also increase the operating hours from 32 hours a week to 62 hours per week. The library will also increase the number of computers from six to twenty-five, some of which will be used in a Lab setting allowing staff to offer patrons classes and to promote workforce development. The renovated Eastover Library will better meet the community's need for services and provide a dynamic, highly visible community gathering place. There will be an increase in programming for all ages that will be provided in the new meeting room space and space for community groups to meet. The library's collection will be increased and a wider variety of materials will be provided. These efforts are intended to increase the use of the library by the community by 30% and promote reading and cultural activities in the Eastover Community.

The Library would like Richland County, owner of the building, to submit an application for a USDA Rural Development grant for community facilities. The Richland County Public Library would complete the application with assistance from the Richland County Grants Manager, manage project implementation as well as cover all reporting related to the project, if successfully funded.

The total cost of the expansion is currently estimated at \$900,000. The library plans to spend \$300.00 per square foot, which includes all building, fixtures and equipment and will ensure the best sustainable building practices to achieve LEED certification. Richland County Public Library plans to add 3,000 square feet to the building. A more detailed budget will be submitted once the Library engages an architectural firm.

If awarded, the USDA Rural Development grant will provide \$500,000 in stimulus funds to the project. The Richland County Public Library is asking the County to provide \$400,000 to complete the project. This amount includes a 25% grant match requirement.

C. Financial Impact

The Richland County Public Library requests \$400,000 from Richland County for the project.

Grant Program	Grant Funds	Request to Richland County	Total Project
USDA Rural Development – Community Facilities Grant	\$500,000	\$400,000	\$900,000

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to accept the USDA Rural Development grant, if awarded, and supply \$400,000 in funds to complete the project.
2. Approve the request to apply for the grant and supply the 25% match requirement of \$125,000.
3. Approve the request to apply for the grant, but recommend the Library raise all additional funds.
4. Do not approve applying for grant funds at this time.

E. Recommendation

This request is at Council's discretion.

Recommended by: Sara Salley, Grants Manager Department: Administration Date: 4-13-10

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation is made on the merits of the request however approval as requested would require the identification of a funding source for the \$400k and a budget amendment.

There are several financial items that are unclear based on the information provided such as;

- What is the actual grant deadline?
- When is a financial commitment from the County required in order for the application to be considered?
- Based on timing, can the County commitment be incorporated into the normal budget process rather than off-cycle? This would allow the evaluation of the impact based on other funding decisions.
- Since this would expand the operation, what will be the incremental change in operating cost and how would that be funded post-expansion?

It would be prudent, if the possible, for the County to analysis the total impact based on the expansion and determine the long-term funding strategy prior to committing resources.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 4/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: April 22, 2010

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This decision is at Council's discretion.

Numerous issues are outstanding, many of which are included in the Finance Director's comments. The most pertinent outstanding issue at this time, however, is the funding request. The only funding source currently available at the County is Fund Balance. However, it has come to our attention that the Library has the funds available for the grant match in their own Fund Balance. It is Administration's recommendation that if Council chooses to proceed with the grant application, that the \$400,000 funding request come from the Library's own Fund Balance, and that all outstanding issues, including those raised by the Finance Director, be addressed before submitting a completed grant application.



April 13, 2010

J. Milton Pope
Richland County Administrator
2020 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Pope:

I am writing to request that Richland County support our efforts to expand and enhance the library experience in the Eastover community by applying for a USDA American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funding for Rural Libraries Grant on our behalf. As you know, libraries are more critical than ever in helping people learn, find work and in ensuring that communities can bridge the digital divide. There is not a community that is more deserving and in need of a state of the art library than the town of Eastover.

Our plans include a \$900,000 expansion and renovation of the existing Eastover Library. We anticipate the 3,000 SF expansion to include:

- A computer/homework lab to support expanded classes focusing on workforce development and technology skill building.
- 25 computers for the public.
- An interactive, multi-generational environment for visitors—developed in partnership with EdVenture—that will highlight the rich and proud history of the town of Eastover and engage all ages in 21st Century learning techniques.
- Much needed Community Gathering space.

In addition, the Richland County Public Library is committed to expanding the operating hours of the library—from 32 to 62 hours per week—which will mean more access to valuable resources for library customers.

Our request to the USDA will be in the amount of \$500,000. We request that Richland County provide the remainder of the cost of the project: \$400,000. For our application to be successful, we are required to identify existing sources of funding so it is imperative that we know Richland County's level of commitment prior to submitting our request.

As applicant, Richland County would work with Library staff to ensure timely completion and submission of all required application materials. Upon receipt of the grant, it is our expectation that the Richland County Public Library will manage and be responsible for: the funds received; required reporting and

Page 2
April 13, 2010
J. Milton Pope

evaluation; and the successful implementation and completion of the project—including facilitating the community engagement process and oversight of the design and construction of the library.

I know that you realize what a wonderful yet time-specific opportunity it is to have the USDA committed to libraries in rural communities. Now is the time to move forward with one of our top priorities in RCPL's capital plan – the Eastover Library.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Melanie Huggins". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Melanie Huggins
Executive Director

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Transportation Enhancement Grant for Woodrow Wilson Home [pages 14-16]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Transportation Enhancement Grant for the Woodrow Wilson Family Home

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a grant for the Woodrow Wilson Family Home that will complete the landscape portion of Historic Columbia Foundation’s restoration project for the County owned property.

B. Background / Discussion

Historic Columbia Foundation manages the County owned Woodrow Wilson Family home that is undergoing an extensive renovation including the home and landscape. To assist with the landscape portion, Historic Columbia has asked Richland County to partner with them on a Transportation Enhancement Program grant administered by the Central Midlands Council of Governments.

Applicants must be an official governmental body and may partner with non-governmental organizations. Historic Columbia Foundation is a nonprofit and is not eligible to directly apply for these funds. They request that Richland County partner with them as the local body of government. As a partner, Richland County will submit the application and act as a pass through for Transportation Enhancement Funds that will, if awarded, be used to complete the landscape restoration of the Wilson site.

The renovation of this landscape to an 1870s Victorian-era landscape meets the criteria for “landscaping and scenic beautification” as outlined in the COATS guidelines and impacts the transportation as a “proximity project” related to the improvement in an area surrounding a transportation corridor. Plans for renovation of the 1.25 acre site have been developed and the project is “shovel ready.” Once complete the garden will address three aspects of a Victorian-era landscape including the formal front yard, the functional gardens immediately behind the house and a working rear yard. Once complete the garden will include walking paths with interpretive signage and will be open as a public park space.

The project meets the qualifications of the grant in the following categories: the plan is compatible with historic qualities of the area; the new landscaping will provide community/public gathering space; it will improve the area as a park setting; and it will serve as a beautification project for the southeast entry to the Historic Garden District (at the corner of Hampton and Henderson streets).

Total costs for the renovation of the landscape total \$275,000. Historic Columbia Foundation has raised \$130,000 for the landscape to date, which provides the required 40% match for the \$145,000 of federal funding. The full landscape project would be able to be accomplished with the federal funding support. Historic Columbia Foundation has completed the application and will be responsible for all reporting related to the project if successfully funded.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact on the County.

Grant Program	Grant Funds	Historic Columbia Match	Richland County Match	Total
Transportation Enhancement Grant – Woodrow Wilson Family Home Landscape Project	\$145,000	\$130,000	\$0	\$275,000
				Item# 3

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to partner with Historic Columbia as stated above, and accept the Transportation Enhancement grant, if awarded.
2. Do not approve the partnership.

E. Recommendation

It is left to County Council’s discretion whether or not to approve the request to partner with Historic Columbia as stated above, and accept Transportation Enhancement Funds, if awarded for the Woodrow Wilson Family Home.

Recommended by: Sara Salley, Grants Manager Department: Administration Date: 4-13-10

F. Reviews

(Please ***SIGN*** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 4/13/10
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Recommendation based on no financial impact to the county as stated in section “c”.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 4/13/10
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date:
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope Date: 4-13-10
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval...

April 12, 2010

J. Milton Pope
Richland County Administrator
2020 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Pope,

Please consider this request to submit the Woodrow Wilson Gateway Project for 2010 Transportation Enhancement Funding.

As you know, plans for the renovation of this landscape to an 1870s Victorian-era site have been developed and the project is "shovel ready." The project meets the qualifications of the grant in the following categories: the plan is compatible with historic qualities of the area; the new landscaping will provide community/public gathering space, it will improve the area as a park setting, and it will serve as a beautification project for the southeast entry to the Historic Garden District (at the corner of Hampton and Henderson streets). The site, owned by Richland County, is in proximity to the major transportation corridors of Taylor and Hampton streets.

Total costs for the renovation of the landscape total \$275,000. HCF has raised \$130,000 for the landscape to date, which provides more than the required 40% match for the \$145,000 federal funding. The total project would be able to be accomplished with the federal funding support.

HCF would complete the application as well as cover all reporting related to the project if successfully funded.

Thank you for considering this request. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,



Robin Waites
Executive Director

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Request for Contract Award for Parking Garage Repairs [pages 18-19]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Request for Contract Award for Parking Garage Repairs

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request is to seek County Council's approval to enter into a construction contract with the lowest, most responsive bidder for the second phase of a three phase sealing project of the Administration Complex parking garage. Cleaning and resurfacing the structural components of the crosswalks are also part of the scope of work in this repair. The purpose of the project is to prevent water that is currently entering the structure from continuing to enter and create negative impacts on the structure.

B. Background / Discussion

After having a complete evaluation of the structure and defining the need and detail for preventing water intrusion into the garage structure, a priority list of tasks was determined to meet the funding levels for this fund source. Facilities has been funding the multiple phases of the parking garage sealant repairs by utilizing only the funding available in parking garage fund balance after normal maintenance and operations have been satisfied. The first phase of sealing and coating the surface to prevent water intrusion into the EMS HQ was completed late summer 2008. This greatly improved the conditions for all employees working from this facility. Sufficient funding for the second phase was realized and approved in the current fiscal year 10 budget for design and construction of major water intrusion prevention processes. The design for phase two has been completed during this fiscal year and all bid responses were received on March 10, 2010. After evaluation of the responses, staff requests that Aquatech of Greenville SC. be awarded the bid as the most responsive and advantageous responder for Richland County on this project. This phase of work will make major repairs by sealing all water intrusion areas through the entire facility and installing several floor drains to prevent ponding water within the garage.

C. Financial Impact

There are no additional funds requested for this phase of the project. All funds necessary to complete phase two were approved in the FY 10 budget process totaling \$198,435. Of this amount \$30,000 is allocated for design, bid documents and construction oversight to ensure quality of performed work to the design. The Aquatech bid is \$110,457 for the base bid and \$9,120 for alternate two. The purpose of alternate two is to repair abraded concrete at the turn areas of the vehicle lanes. After including a 10% contingency of \$11,957 the total contract will be \$131,534. This will allow the remaining funded \$36,901 to be utilized for the third phase to coat the concrete as was completed over the EMS section and address façade items. Once this is complete normal maintenance will be utilized to protect the asset and help prevent future major repairs.

D. Alternatives

1. Council is requested to allow the Procurement Director and Support Services Department to move forward with negotiation and award of the contract to complete the designed and bid scope of work to stop the water intrusion into the parking garage structure.
2. Do not approve the request to move forward with entering into a contract to make the repairs and the continued water intrusion will create safety concerns in future years by continuing to degrade and damage the structural components of the structure.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended for Council to approve alternate 1

Recommended by: John Hixon Department: Support Services Date: 4/12/10

F. Reviews

(Please ***SIGN*** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 4/13/10
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are appropriated in the FY10 budget

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 4/15/10
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date:
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 4/15/10
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Victim's Assistance Fund-Budget Amendment [pages 21-22]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Victim's Assistance Fund Budget Amendment

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment for Victim's Assistance fund in the amount of \$50,000.

B. Background / Discussion

The Victim's Assistance fund was originally budgeted to receive revenue of \$775,000 for FY10. In addition, the approved budget included a transfer of \$241,374 from the General Fund. Upon analysis of the revenue and expenditure activity to date, it is projected that the Victim's Assistance fund would finish the fiscal year with a deficit of \$50,000 due to lower revenue collection.

C. Financial Impact

Increasing the Victim's Assistance fund budget will require an increase in the subsidy from the General Fund or identification of another funding source.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the budget amendment to increase the transfer from the General Fund to Victim's Assistance.
2. Approve the budget amendment to increase the Victim's Assistance budget by identifying another funding source.
3. Do not approve the budget amendment which will necessitate immediate spending reductions to possibly include personnel reductions.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to increase the Victim's Assistance fund by \$50,000 through an operating transfer from the General Fund.

Recommended by: _____ Department: Administration Date: 04/08/2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/9/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment. The current budget includes the following uses of fund balance.

FY10 budget	3.5m	
FY09 capital rollover	2.2	
FY10 approved amendments	.2	
FY10 pending amendments	<u>1.2</u>	sheriff/risk mgt
Total	7.1m	

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 4/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funding to come from the General Fund fund balance.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Job performance plan for the Clerk of Council position [page 24]

Reviews

Motion: Council will create a job performance plan for the Clerk of Council position to make that employee aware of the job requirements. This plan will be updated periodically but no later than every two years. The Clerk of Council will receive an annual appraisal to be completed by (set date) and all appraisals will be signed by the appraising council member. [Malinowski]

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Replacement of Damaged RCSD Vehicles [pages 26-28]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Replacement of Damaged RCSD Vehicles

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Sheriff's Department budget in the amount of \$92,102.00 for the purpose of replacing five RCSD vehicles that have sufficient accident damage requiring replacement of the vehicles.

B. Background / Discussion

Unit DE141 is a 2008 Ford F150 pickup truck that was damaged on May 8. USAA Casualty had declared it a total loss and issued a check in the amount of \$18,467.00 in settlement of the claim. The check has been deposited and the funds are in the "Insurance Adjustment" budget account (IFAS account line 1100100000452001).

Unit DD012 was damaged on June 15. The initial estimated repair cost is \$13,332.75, while the Blue Book value, in "Fair" condition is \$9,050.00. The actual value is less, as it is severely damaged, but Blue Book does not offer values on damaged or "Poor" equipment.

Unit DD006 is a 2007 Ford Crown Victoria that was damaged on September 27. The County has received a settlement check in the amount of \$12,435.00 from State Farm insurance, which has been submitted to Finance for deposit into the "Insurance Adjustment" account.

Unit DF028 is a 2009 Ford Crown Victoria that was damaged on October 15. The initial damage estimate to repair is \$14,770.00, while the Blue Book "Fair" value is \$15,025.00. (No value is offered on damaged or "Poor" equipment)

Unit DB039 is a 2005 Ford Crown Victoria that was damaged on November 8. The initial repair estimate is \$21,025.00, and the Blue Book "Fair" value is \$4,775.00. (No value is offered on damaged or "Poor" equipment)

C. Financial Impact

DE141 - The cost of a replacement Ford F150 pickup, purchased from state contract:

2010 Ford F150	\$23,180.00
Decals	\$ 400.00
SC Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost	\$23,880.00
Insurance Adjustment	(\$18,467.00)
Final Cost	\$ 5,413.00

DD012 - The cost of a replacement Ford 500 (now Ford Taurus), purchased from state contract:

2010 Ford Taurus	\$22,437.00
Decals	\$ 400.00
SC Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost	\$23,137.00

DD006 - The cost of a replacement Ford Crown Victoria (pursuit package), purchased from the state contract:

2010 Ford Crown Victoria	\$24,029.00
Decals	\$ 400.00
Video System Components	\$ 1800.00
SC Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost	\$26,529.00
Insurance Adjustment	(\$12,435.00)
Total Final Cost	\$14,094.00

DF028 - The cost of a replacement Ford Crown Victoria (Pursuit Package), purchased from the state contract:

2010 Ford Crown Victoria	\$24,029.00
Decals	\$ 400.00
SC Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost	\$24,729.00

DB039 – The cost of a replacement Ford Crown Victoria (Pursuit Package), purchased from the state contract:

2010 Ford Crown Victoria	\$24,029.00
Decals	\$ 400.00
SC Sales Tax	\$ 300.00
Total Cost	\$24,729.00

The total cost of the budget amendment request for the replacement of the five RCSD vehicles is \$92,102.00.

D. Alternatives

There are three alternatives available:

1. Approve the request for the budget amendment, allowing the RCSD to replace equipment damaged beyond repair. The cost of the budget amendment is \$92,102.00.
2. Replace the damaged units with suitable equipment previously taken out of service until the arrival of new vehicles purchased for the RCSD. There will be nominal expenses, primarily impacting non-contract maintenance costs, as the replaced units are returned to service.
3. Do not approve the request for a budget amendment, preventing the RCSD from replacing equipment damaged beyond repair.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to amend the Richland County Sheriff's department budget for the cost of replacing the damaged vehicles.

Recommended by: Bill Peters, County Fleet Manager
Date: November 12, 2009

Department: Support Services

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers:

Date: 4/14/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: We would recommend alternative 2. The County has a funding program in place to replace about 80 sheriff vehicles per year additionally there are currently 25-30 vehicles available that have been replaced but not sold. Approval of alternative 1 would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 4/14/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Alternative # 2

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 4/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Alternative #2.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Business Services Center-Records Retention Schedule [pages 30-32]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Business Service Center – Record Retention Schedules

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve two more record retention schedules developed by and in cooperation with the SC Department of Archives & History, for (1) Business License Audit Records and (2) Freedom of Information Act Request Files.

B. Background / Discussion

As part of creating and operating the Business Service Center, the staff inventoried each document type that the office generates, collects, uses, or keeps. Staff then reviewed the State Department of Archives & History's record retention schedules for counties to determine what the retention schedules were for each type of record. This comparison resulted in a finding that some document types in the office did not have applicable retention schedules.

While the State long ago established record retention schedules for many municipal operations, the same schedules were not always developed for counties, since most counties, when the schedules were developed, did not include many of the municipal operations. These include business licenses, Hospitality Taxes, Tourism Development Fees, and others. Since counties are unable to use schedules developed for municipalities, retention schedules for some county operations had to be developed.

The Business Service Center coordinated with the State Department of Archives & History to develop the proposed record retention schedules. With the drafts complete, the State now requires the county's governing body to approve them.

These latest two retention schedules are for (1) Business License Audit Records and (2) Freedom of Information Act Request Files. These new retention schedules are attached for your review.

No other retention schedules for the Business Service Center are foreseen at this time to be needed.

C. Financial Impact

Approving these record retention schedules will have no negative financial impact on the County. Additionally, implementing approved retention schedules will have the positive financial impact of reducing the County's costs associated with storing records.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the record retention schedules as described.
2. Disapprove the record retention schedules as described. Concerns should be clearly stated so they may be considered by the SC Dept. of Archives & History for possible revision to the schedules.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that the record retention schedules developed by the SC Dept. of Archives & History be approved.

Recommended by: Pam Davis, Director Department: BSC. Date: 03/12/10

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 3-17-10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval



RICHLAND COUNTY

RECORD GROUP NUMBER: 0040

BUSINESS SERVICE CENTER

15454 BUSINESS LICENSE AUDIT RECORDS

Description:

This series is used for the purpose of determining if businesses accurately report revenue to ensure that the proper amount of fees and taxes were paid based on gross revenue. Information includes business license renewal information (including a list of deductions); correspondence sent to and received from businesses being audited; business financial records (sales tax, income tax, and other related information); copies of billing sheets and completed audit report; and any other related documentation.

Retention:

3 years, then destroy.

15455 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST FILES

Records used to respond to citizens requests for public information. Information includes initial request, name of requestor, name of person responding to request, any related correspondence and supporting documentation.

Retention:

2 years after final action, then destroy.

1 of 1

The approval and implementation of this records retention schedule should comply with the Department of Archives and History's *Guidelines for Understanding and Implementing Records Retention Schedules*.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Approval of the Exercise of an Option to Renew a Contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc. [pages 34-39]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Approval of the Exercise of an Option to Renew a Contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc.

A. Purpose

The Treasurer/Tax Collector requests County Council to exercise the option to renew our contract with Palmetto Posting through the 2010 tax sale this year, per Item 9 of last year's contract. There are no changes to the existing contract from 2009. The purpose of the contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc. is for the posting of property, per state law, in Richland County on which delinquent ad valorem property taxes are due. County Council is requested to approve an expenditure of \$20.00 per property posting. Total charges for postings of Richland County Properties are estimated to result in an expenditure of funds over \$100,000.

B. Background / Discussion

Palmetto Posting, Inc. provided property posting services in a timely, efficient and cost effective manner for the prior tax year. Palmetto Posting, Inc. possesses the unique and singularly available capacity to meet the County's requirements for posting of delinquent properties for this tax year according to statute.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact to the County's General Fund. All monies expended for the posting of properties come from the Tax Sale Account, 1735, a revenue fund that can only be used for services and notices related to delinquent property taxes.

It is anticipated that the financial impact of this request will be no more than \$130,000.00 to account 1735. This amount has been requested as part of the County Treasurer's authorized budget for Fiscal Year 10-11.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request of the Treasurer/Tax Collector to exercise the option to renew our contract with Palmetto Posting through the 2010 tax sale this year, per Item 9 of last year's contract, at rate and cost estimates provided, for the purpose of posting of property in Richland County on which delinquent ad valorem property taxes are due. This request will increase the speed and accuracy of the process for the county and our taxpayers, and will not impact the General Fund.

2. Do not approve.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council exercise the option to renew our contract with Palmetto Posting through the 2010 tax sale this year, per Item 9 of last year's contract, as requested by the Treasurer/Tax Collector.

Recommended by: David A. Adams **Department:** Richland County Treasurer **Date:** April 8, 2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers: Date: 4/12/10
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Budget funds are available as stated

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 4-12-10
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date:
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 4/13/10
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:



JUSTIFICATION FOR SOLE SOURCE PROCUREMENT

Definitions that should be used when determining a True Sole Source Purchases

Sole Source Procurement is when only **ONE VENDOR/CONTRACTOR** possesses unique and singularly available capacity to meet the requirements such as technical specifications and qualifications, ability to deliver at and in a particular time. When the required equipment, supplies, construction, or services are available from only one source and no other type of property or services will satisfy the need. A **"True Sole Source"** product is available from only one source, often determined by patent or copyright protection, proprietary rights and capacity of one supplier to provide superior capabilities unobtainable from any other supplier for similar products.

Sole Source must be justified with information of efforts undertaken to locate possible alternative supplier. Whenever using Sole Source rather than full and open competition, provide an explanation of the reason why specifications suitable for full and open competition could not be developed or meet your needs and **why** it is necessary and in the county best interest. The use of Sole Source addresses the source of a product or services not the item itself.

The following examples describing circumstances which could necessitate "Sole Source" procurement:

- (a) Where the compatibility of equipment, accessories, or replacement parts is the paramount consideration;
- (b) Where a sole supplier's item is needed for trial use or testing;
- (c) Where a sole source supplier's item is to be procured for resale;
- (d) Where public utility services are to be procured;
- (e) Where the item is one of a kind; and
- (f) Printed forms, pamphlets, brochures, exclusive of printing equipment.

1. **REQUIRING DEPARTMENT:** Treasurer's Office

NAME OF REQUESTOR: David A. Adams

TELEPHONE:803-576-2275

2. DESCRIPTION OF ACTION.

- a. State if procurement is: Non-Urgent Sole Source Urgent Sole Source
- b. For sole source requests, provide the contractor name, point of contact, address and phone/fax numbers and e-mail address. If a sole source manufacturer distributes via Vendors, provide Vendors information here.

Company: Palmetto Posting

Point of Contact: Terry O'Brien

Telephone #: 864-585-8080

Fax #:

Address: 150 E. Henry Street, Suite 201 Spartanburg, SC 29306

3. **DESCRIPTION OF SUPPLIES/SERVICES, ESTIMATED DOLLAR VALUE AND DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS.** Give a short description of the item or service required, the estimated cost, and required delivery date.

Item:

4. **EXPLANATION OF SOLE SOURCE CIRCUMSTANCES.**

For Sole Source Requirements:

- (1) Explain why the item is needed and what will happen if it's not received by the Required Delivery Date (RDD). Describe impact on overhaul/availability schedules, impact to support, personnel safety issues, potential environmental damages, etc., and include the dollar value associated with late delivery.
- (2) Explain the unique features/function of the item and why only one manufacturer can provide it. Discuss why a similar product from another manufacturer will not work.
- (3) If the item can only be obtained from the OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer), discuss the proprietary (i.e. owned by the company, not for public release) design/drawing/specification requirements.
- (4) If there is a higher order requirement mandating a particular manufacturer (Public Safety equipment, goods and services), cite the requirement and who approved or required its usage. For component repair or replacement parts, explain any compatibility requirements, including a description of the existing equipment and the interface requirements.
- (5) Provide Sole Source information requested above.

5. PROPRIETARY INFORMATION:

- a. If sole source is based on proprietary data, a statement to that effect is all that is required in response to this block.

The equipment and software are proprietary to:

6. **DOCUMENTATION OF REVIEW OF SPECIFICATIONS FOR SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS.** If the procurement is for spare or repair parts, include a statement that the specifications have been reviewed and meet the minimum functional requirements of the government.

CERTIFICATIONS

I CERTIFY THAT THE FACTS AND REPRESENTATIONS UNDER MY COGNIZANCE WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN THIS JUSTIFICATION ARE COMPLETE AND ACCURATE AND IS BEING PROCURED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES.

REQUESTOR

Name, Title and Signature:
David A. Adams, Treasurer

Account Code
1735-5265

Telephone
803-576-2275

Date
4/8/10

I CERTIFY THAT THE FACTS AND REPRESENTATIONS UNDER MY COGNIZANCE WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN THIS JUSTIFICATION ARE COMPLETE AND ACCURATE AND IS BEING PROCURED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES.

PROCUREMENT DIRECTOR

Name and Signature

Date:

I CERTIFY THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS UNDER MY COGNIZANCE ARE BEING PROCURED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES.

ADMINISTRATOR

Name and Signature

Date:

Attachment for Sole Source Form

3. Description

The Treasurer/Tax Collector requests County Council to exercise the option to renew our contract with Palmetto Posting through the 2010 tax sale this year, per Item 9 of last year's contract. There are no changes to the existing contract from 2009. The purpose of the contract with Palmetto Posting, Inc. is for the purpose of posting of property, per state law, in Richland County on which delinquent ad valorem property taxes are due. County Council is requested to approve an expenditure of \$20.00 per property posting. Total charges for postings of Richland County Properties are estimated to result in an expenditure of funds over \$100,000.

4. Explanation

To perform the duties required by State Law 12-51. If this is not approved, we will not have the capacity to perform these duties.
There is no other service of this kind available currently.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Budget Amendment-Risk Management [pages 41-42]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Budget Amendment for Risk Management

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Risk Management Department in the amount of \$500,000 to pay liability and workers compensation claims. \$300,000 is for liability claims, and \$200,000 is for workers' compensation claims.

B. Background / Discussion

The budget for fiscal year 09-10 for liability claims is \$1,035,977. The budget for fiscal year 09-10 for workers' compensation is \$3,787,260. Claims are expected to exceed the budget by the amounts requested.

C. Financial Impact

The general fund will be reduced by \$500,000 to pay liability and workers' compensation claims.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the budget amendment request to cover claims and expenses for this fiscal year.
2. Do not approve the budget amendment request.

E. Recommendation

Approving the budget amendment request is recommended.

Recommended by: David Chambers Risk Management March 9, 2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/9/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval would require the identification of a funding source and a budget amendment. The current budget includes the following uses of fund balance.

FY10 budget	3.5m
FY09 capital rollover	2.2
FY10 approved amendments	.2
FY10 pending amendments	<u>.3</u>
Total	6.2m

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 4/22/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funding to come from the General Fund fund balance. Any portion of this budget amendment that does not get spent during the remainder of the current fiscal year will revert back to the fund balance on July 1, 2010.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Emergency Services Purchase Orders and Contract Approvals for FY 2010-11 [pages 44-45]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: ESD01041210

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to award Purchase Orders for services in the 2010-2011 budget year. These services are required for the operations of the Emergency Services Department. These Purchase Orders and Contract approvals are subject to Council's adoption of the 2010-2011 budgets.

B. Background / Discussion

The Emergency Services Department uses vendors to provide service for operations. It is necessary to have agreements in place July 1, 2010, so that service will not be interrupted at the start of the new budget year.

VENDOR	SERVICE	ESTIMATED AMOUNT
City of Columbia	EMS/ESD Diesel & Gasoline	\$240,000
Phillips Medical	Annual Service, EKG Monitors	\$ 70,000
Motorola	EMS/Radio Service	\$ 75,000
Motorola	ETS/911 Equip. Service Agreement	\$197,000
Motorola	FIRE Radio Service	\$132,000

C. Financial Impact

Funding is included in the 2010-2011 budget request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the purchase orders and contracts.
2. Do not approve the purchase orders and contracts.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the purchase orders and contracts for the services, contingent on the 2010-2011 budget, so there will not be an interruption of these mission essential services at the beginning of the new budget year.

Recommended by: Michael A. Byrd, Director of Emergency Services April 12, 2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 4/13/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval contingent upon the adoption of the FY11 budget.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 4/13/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 4/21/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Pursue properties associated with Caughman Creek using Hospitality Tax funds [pages 47-48]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Pursue Properties Associated with Caughman Creek Using Hospitality Tax Funds

A. Purpose

Council is requested to consider the motion made at the March 16, 2010 Council Meeting, and direct staff as appropriate.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made at the March 16, 2010 Council Meeting by Councilman Jackson:

Richland County, the Conservation Commission, and the Recreation Commission pursue purchasing all properties associated with Caughman Creek using Hospitality Tax Funds for recreational, historical, and conservation purposes; also explore a public/private partnership.

It is at this time that staff is requesting direction from Council with regards to this motion.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request at this time, as further information and direction from Council will need to be obtained before a financial impact can be determined.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion and direct staff as appropriate.
2. Do not approve the motion.

E. Recommendation

Council discretion.

F. Reviews

(Please replace the appropriate box with a ✓ and then support your recommendation in the Comments section before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date:

Recommend Approval

Recommend Denial

No Recommendation

Comments:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Approval

Recommend Denial

No Recommendation

Comments: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 4-19-10

Recommend Approval

Recommend Denial

No Recommendation

Comments: The Committee and Council must first give direction to staff however all existing obligations of the H-Tax fund should be acknowledged before any “new” obligations are made.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Transfer funds allocated for SC Gospel Fest to Administrator to be distributed as per County Rules [pages 50-56]

Reviews

Transfer funds in the amount of \$28,500 allocated for SC Gospel Fest to Administrator to be distributed as by County Rules; and withhold an additional \$11,500 for funding pending investigation of 2009 funding (SERCO) [Jackson]

sum of Two Hundred Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred (\$237,500.00) Dollars to the Recipient for fiscal year 2009/2010, from the Local Hospitality Tax Revenue Fund.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual benefits, covenants and agreements described herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

- 1) The Recipient will continue to work towards developing the Lower Richland Heritage Corridor by holding annual events at the Harriet Barber House, the Kensington Mansion and the Congaree National Park, and other Lower Richland Heritage Corridor sites.
- 2) Richland County agrees to award the Recipient the sum of Two Hundred Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred (\$237,500.00) Dollars for fiscal year 2009/2010. Such funds are to be used as program operating funds and **shall only be applied towards tourism related activities.**
- 3) The Recipient shall request disbursement of approved funding by writing to the Richland County Budget Department on a quarterly basis, with the quarters being July-September, October-December, January-March and April-June. Such requests shall include a balance sheet and expenditure summary as of the end of the preceding quarter. The requests for disbursements should be mailed to: Richland County Budget Department, Hospitality Tax Disbursements, P.O. Box 192, Columbia, SC 29202;
- 4) The parties hereto understand that the funding for this award is for fiscal year 2009/2010 only, and that the appropriations herein agreed to shall be subject to the availability of funds for Richland County during the fiscal year.
- 5) The parties understand that the Recipient shall submit a budget plan for the

complete Two Hundred Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred (\$237,500.00) Dollar award. This budget shall include any special appropriation made by council for inclusion in the recipient's budget (see paragraph 14).

- 6) The parties understand the Recipient shall submit, on a form provided by Richland County, a report of expenditures and the impact on tourism for the preceding calendar year. This report shall be submitted to the Richland County Administrator on or before May 1, 2010.
- 7) This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for fiscal year 2009/2010, subject to paragraph 4 above, provided the Recipient continues to carry out its above-stated mission and uses the award for tourism related activities. If at any time Richland County Council finds that the awarded funds are not being used in accordance with Local Hospitality Tax requirements, as provided in applicable State law and the Richland County Code, Chapter 23, Article 6 or the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding, Richland County shall have the right to immediately terminate this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 8) The parties hereto expressly agree that the tendering of this award by Richland County and the acceptance thereof by the Recipient in no way creates any agency relationship between the parties or any relationship which would subject Richland County to any liability for any acts or omissions of the recipient entity or entities. The Recipient shall indemnify and hold harmless Richland County, its parent, subsidiaries and affiliates and all their respective directors, council members, officers, agents and employees (hereafter collectively referred to as the "Indemnitee") from liability, damages, losses, costs, expenses, demands, claims,

suits, actions and causes of action on account of illness, personal injury or death to employees or any other persons, damage to property of Richland County or others or other loss or liability arising from or in connection with the Recipient's performance of any services funded by this award. Further, the Recipient, at its own expense, shall defend any demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action brought against the Indemnitee where such demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action arises from any cause for which the Indemnitee may be entitled to be indemnified and held harmless pursuant to this agreement, arising from or in connection with such demand, claim, suit, action or cause of action; provided, however, that the Indemnitee shall be entitled to participate in such defense.

- 9) Any such employees, volunteers or persons authorized to conduct or carry out the mission of the Recipient shall be the sole responsibility of the Recipient, which shall ensure that such persons comply with all applicable laws, rules, regulations or decisions of any federal, state, county or municipal governmental authority (including all requirements of state, federal or other grant authorities to ensure a drug-free workplace).
- 10) Recipient must at all times during the term of this Memorandum of Understanding be a non-profit corporation in good standing with the South Carolina Secretary of State, and must fully comply with all applicable State, Federal, and local laws, rules and regulations as they apply to non-profit corporations. If, in the sole opinion of Richland County, Recipient violates this provision, it shall be considered a breach of this Memorandum of Understanding and Richland County shall have the right to immediately terminate this Memorandum of

Understanding.

- 11) Recipient must use all awarded Hospitality Tax Funds as provided in its budget approved by Richland County Council. Any changes in funds expenditures must be pre-approved by the Richland County Council before funds disbursement. Expenditure of funds not in accordance with the pre-approved budget or approved by Richland County Council is a breach of this Memorandum of Understanding and Richland County shall have the right to immediately terminate this Memorandum of Understanding.
- 12) Any awarded Hospitality Tax Funds not expended during the fiscal year for which they are awarded shall be promptly returned to Richland County.
- 13) No contract may be awarded to, nor may any awarded Hospitality Tax Funds be used to compensate any relative of any Board Member of Recipient within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity, except with the prior approval of the Richland County Council.
- 14) By accepting the awarded Hospitality Tax funds, Recipient hereby agrees to use the funds only on the following specifically delineated projects. Expenditure of funds not in accordance with the below list or with specific pre-approval of Richland County Council is a breach of this Memorandum of Understanding and Richland County shall have the right to immediately terminate this Memorandum of Understanding. The following projects, totaling Fifty-Seven Thousand ^{47,500} (~~57,000~~) Dollars have been approved by council for specific appropriations under the recipient's total allocation:
 - a) Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival (\$19,000) ✓
 - b) Odyssey Golf Foundation (\$9,500)

c) SC Gospel Quarter (~~\$18,500~~) ^{19,000} ~~\$18,500~~

~~190,500.00~~

The remaining One Hundred Eighty Thousand Five Hundred (\$180,500.00) ^{190,000}

Dollars may be used only on the following specifically delineated projects:

- a) Kingsville Reunion
- b) Congaree Swamp Fest
- c) Lower Richland Veterans Day Parade & Celebration
- d) Holiday Taste and Tour - Dec. 12
- e) Victorian Christmas at Kensington Mansion Dec. 5
- f) Strong Threads III Feb.
- g) Eastover Festival and Parade - June ?
- h) Memorial Day Celebration _
- i) Juneteenth -
- j) Gadsden Community Festival - 2010
- k) Heritage Corridor Promotions _

The recipient shall be responsible for providing expenditure reports to the county, as provided in paragraph 6, for all projects that are funded from the lists above.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE THE UNDERSIGNED have this 15th day of July, 2009, set our hand and seal hereon.

SOUTH EAST RURAL COMMUNITY
OUTREACH ~~MINISTRY~~
Reborah Scott Brooks
Executive Director

WITNESSES:
Marie B. Adams

RICHLAND COUNTY
Paul Livingston
Paul Livingston
Chairman, Richland County Council

WITNESSES:
Monique Walters
Michelle Oglez

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Eastover Sewer Plant Update (Contractual Matter) [page 58]

Reviews

Staff will provide information at the committee meeting.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Administrator to provide necessary information to enter into Mutual Aid agreements for Fire and EMS with neighboring Counties and Municipalities where there are no current agreements [page 60]

Reviews

Motion: To have the Administrator provide the necessary information to enter into Mutual Aid agreements for fire and EMS with all neighboring counties and municipalities we currently do not have one with, or why we should not do this [MALINOWSKI]

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Jail Intervention Program [pages 62-65]

Reviews

Richland County Government

County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202



Phone (803) 576-2050
Fax (803) 576-2137
TDD (803) 748-4999

Office of the County Administrator

MEMORANDUM

TO: Councilman Norman Jackson
FROM: Sparty Hammett, Assistant County Administrator
SUBJECT: Military Diversion Program
DATE: November 24, 2009

Overview of Military Diversion Program

The program criterion as outlined by the Solicitor's Office is similar to the criteria in place for the existing Pretrial Intervention (PTI) program. In a follow-up discussion with the Assistant Solicitor, she confirmed that the program would serve as an extension of the PTI program. The Solicitor's Office would operate the program with existing Pretrial Intervention staff, and would potentially consider a slightly higher level offender for the program than they would normally approve for regular Pretrial Intervention. There would be no additional cost to implement the program either for the Solicitor's Office or the Detention Center.

Potential alternative candidates would apply for the program and their charge would be dismissed at the discretion of the Solicitor based upon acceptance into the military for a specified period of service. There are several thousand offenders admitted into the Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center (ASGDC) annually that meet the age criteria of 17 to 35; however, it is the other criteria (no prior record – either through expungement or otherwise, for example) that would make the majority of the offenders who are detained after appearing before bond court ineligible.

Impact on the Detention Center

Based upon the initial Military Diversion Program meeting, and the general comments that were made by both the representatives from Fort Jackson and the Solicitor, it appears that only a small number of offenders admitted and detained at the ASGDC would qualify. The average length of stay at the ASGDC is 16.4 days and the cost per day is \$60, resulting in a potential cost savings of \$984 per young offender who is diverted into the program. In a preliminary discussion with

the Detention Center Director, we estimated that 10 to 20 ASGDC incarcerated offenders may qualify annually and choose the intervention program versus prosecution. This would yield an annual cost savings of \$9,840 to \$19,680.

I contacted the Solicitor's Office in mid-September to discuss the program, the proposed criteria, and how they envisioned the Military Diversion Program being administered. I told the Assistant Solicitor that my preliminary estimate would be 10 to 20 offenders diverted from the jail population annually. She indicated that number could be potentially high. I met with Detention Center staff to go over the preliminary criteria for the program proposed by the Solicitor's Office. After this meeting, I had staff go through the records of all of the offenders who were detained on September 14, 2009. The result of that review was that there were no offenders who would meet the program criteria detained on that date.

In order to ensure that this result was a good reflection of the potential impact of the program on the jail population, I waited a month and had the Detention Center do the same analysis of records on October 15, 2009. The result for this date was that there were three offenders that could potentially qualify. Please note that these offenders could potentially qualify, they would still have to be assessed by the Solicitor's Office and agree to join the military in lieu of sentencing.

Conclusion

As a consultant, I have been involved in conducting Detention Center studies in over 50 counties. Jail population management is one of the things that Richland County does as well as any county that I am aware of. As a result, the County has an extremely low number of non-violent offenders without prior criminal records detained in the ASGDC. Most of these offenders either receive low-level bonds and bond out, or they receive personal recognizance (PR) bonds. In addition, all offenders who receive a sentence of over 90 days serve their time in the South Carolina Department of Corrections and not the ASGDC.

South Carolina is very unique with the 90-day sentence limitation. In most states, inmates sentenced to either one or two years serve their time in a local detention center, and in many cases there is a backlog into the state system, even for the inmates who the state is responsible for. Now, in South Carolina there is no backlog into the state system.

The Solicitor's Office indicated they could run the program with the existing PTI staff, so there would be no additional cost to implement the Military Diversion Program. In addition, the existing Pretrial Services staff at the ASGDC could be used to help identify potential diversion candidates, so there would be no additional cost to the Detention Center to implement the program. Anyone who is diverted from the criminal justice system is a very positive achievement, whether it is from the ASGDC or the State Department of Corrections.

CRITERION FOR “MILITARY” (ARMY?) DIVERSION PROGRAM

- Alternative to jail sentence; (not for those qualified for probation?)
- Defendant is age 17 to 35
- Military must be willing to accept the defendant (can have a prior non-violent record)
- Victim’s consent
- Law enforcement officer’s consent
- Specified amount of time in military service
- Current charge cannot involve a weapon
- Current charge must be non-violent
- Decision made by Solicitor on case-by-case basis
- Educational requirements set by military
- Defendant may be in jail OR on bond on current charge
- No prior record—either through expungement or otherwise
- Charge will be dismissed based upon acceptance into military
- Eligible defendants will be identified by their attorney and sent to Solicitor’s Office (PTI?) for screening

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

County Council to provide funding in the FY 2010-11 budget for the Midlands Housing Alliance [page 67]

Reviews

Motion: That Richland County Council provide funding in the FY 10 – 11 budget for the Midlands Housing Alliance, the amount to be determined based on a percentage of whatever the City of Columbia appropriates to support the program. Justification for this request will be forwarded to the A&F Committee prior to their meeting. [Pearce]