

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Kit Smith, Chair
District 5

Mike Montgomery
District 8

Paul Livingston
District 4

Joseph McEachern
District 7

Valerie Hutchinson
District 9

*February 28, 2006
6:00 PM*

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

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes – January 24, 2006: Regular Session Meeting [Pages 3 – 5]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

A. Funding Request: Wood + Partners, Task 2, Entertainment/Recreation Complex
[Pages 6 – 8]

B. Adoption of Internal Audit Project List and Consideration of Project Funding for FY 06
[Pages 9 – 10]

C. Public Works Purchase Request: Purchase of One (1) Tractor/Mower
[Pages 11 – 13]

D. Sheriff Grants

1. Approval of Four Grants – No personnel costs or financial match required
[Pages 14 – 16]

2. Approval of Two Grants - No personnel costs, \$7,488 matching funds required
[Pages 17 – 18]

- 3. Approval of Grant for One AFIS Work Station and Two Live Scan Devices and Printers - \$47,000 match required**
[Pages 19 – 21]

- E. Approval of Qualified GIS Contractor List**
[Pages 22 – 24]

- F. Acquisition of Land to the North of the Richland County C&D Landfill**
[Pages 25 – 26]

- G. Exemptions to Road Maintenance Fee**
[Pages 27 – 31]

- H. Local Option Sales tax**
[Pages 32 – 35]

- I. Allocation of \$10,000 in Unallocated HTAX Funds to City-Center Partnership for International Downtown Association Spring Conference Sponsorship**
[Pages 36 – 40]

II. Items for Discussion / Information

- A. Demographic Pay Information**

III. Items Pending Analysis

- A. Business Service Center Ordinance**

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2005
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING D&S**

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: Kit Smith
- Member: Paul Livingston
- Member: Joseph McEachern
- Member: Valerie Hutchinson
- Member: Mike Montgomery

ALSO PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Greg Pearce, Joyce Dickerson, Damon Jeter, Anthony Mizzell, Milton Pope, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Ashley Jacobs, Tony McDonald, Joe Cronin, Roxanne Matthews, Larry Smith, Amelia Linder, Chief Harrell, Michael Byrd, Jocelyn Jennings, Monique Walters, Kendall Johnson, Jennifer Dowden, Rodolfo Callwood, John Hixson, Donny Phipps, Brad Farrar, Pam Davis, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:04 p.m.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson to nominate Kit Smith as Chair of the Administration and Finance Committee. The vote in favor was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 20, 2005 (Regular Session) – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Smith stated that the Business Service Center Ordinance needed to be moved to Items Pending Analysis and that the 1612 Marion Street Property and Township Auditorium Land Purchase could be taken up in Executive Session.

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Approval of Changes Made to the Operation Manual for Columbia Owens Downtown Airport – Mr. McDonald gave a brief overview of the changes proposed.

Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval contingent upon acceptance of the Airport Commission. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Community Development Office Request to Change CDBG Budget – Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Construction Contract for Arthurtown Community Redevelopment Project – Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Establishment of a Bond Review Committee – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. McEachern, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval with an amendment on Second Reading.

A discussion took place. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Intergovernmental Agreement—State of SC CDBG Program for Regional Water and Sewer Infrastructure Mapping Application – Ms. Robin Cooley from Council of Governments gave a brief presentation regarding this item.

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

Request for Information Regarding Project Fish Fry – A discussion took place. This item was held in committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to go into Executive Session.

=====
Council went into Executive Session at approximately 6:45 p.m. and came out at approximately 7:00 p.m.
=====

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

A. **Consideration of Offers for the Sale of a County Building at 1612 Marion Street** – Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

B. **Township Auditorium**

a. **Consideration of Land Purchase** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to recess until at 7:00 p.m. and reconvene after the Zoning Public Hearing. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to reconvene at 8:32 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Township Auditorium

a. **Operating Support** – Mr. McEachern moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval pending recommendation from staff.

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

Financing Options for Olympia Improvements – This item is still being analyzed.

Business Service Center Ordinance – Mr. Pope briefed Council regarding this item.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:46.

Submitted by,

Kit Smith, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Funding Request: Wood + Partners, Task 2, Entertainment/Recreation Complex

A. Purpose

Council is requested to approve \$29,500 plus reimbursable expenses (up to \$5,000) in unallocated Hospitality Tax funds for Wood + Partners to proceed with Task 2 (Program Definition, Market Assessment, and Financial Planning) of the planning process for the Entertainment/Recreation Complex Master Plan.

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.

Task 1, Public Opinion & Customer Organizations Surveys (approved by Council in May 2005), has been completed. Survey results are forthcoming.

At this time, Council is requested to approve **Task 2: Program Definition, Market Assessment and Financial Planning**, which includes the following items:

- Conduct Kick-Off Meeting with Presentation of Task 1 Findings
- Evaluate Potential Areas in County, Existing Facilities & Demographics
- Rank Potential Areas for Suitability
- Prepare Matrix of Business Factors—Revenue Factors, Complexity of Operation & Breadth of Markets Served
- Formulate Design Parameters with Indicators of Market Support, Prototypical Sizing & Site Carrying Capacity
- Prepare Financial Analysis including Usership, Per Capita Expenditures, Revenue, Operating Expenses, Net Operating Income & Debt Service
- Present Findings to Project Steering Committee

C. Financial Impact

Wood + Partners has quoted \$29,500 plus reimbursable expenses for the completion of Task 2. (\$5,000 is suggested as the amount for reimbursable expenses associated with Task 2. Any of these reimbursable expenses not required would revert to the Hospitality Tax Fund Balance.) Therefore, the financial impact would be \$34,500. The Hospitality Tax account has adequate unallocated funds to cover these expenses.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve Wood + Partners to proceed with Task 2, Program Definition, Market Assessment and Financial Planning, and also approve the allocation of \$34,500 (assuming up to \$5,000 in reimbursable expenses) in unallocated Hospitality Tax funds.
2. Do not approve Wood + Partners to proceed with Task 2.

E. Recommendation

Administration recommends Alternative 1, approve Wood + Partners to proceed with Task 2, Program Definition, Market Assessment and Financial Planning, and also approve the allocation of \$34,500 (assuming up to \$5,000 in reimbursable expenses) in unallocated Hospitality Tax funds.

Recommended By: Staff Department: Administration Date: February 8, 2006

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are available as stated.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/17/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/21/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of Task 2 at a cost not to exceed \$34,500. Funds are available from Hospitality Tax revenues.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Adoption of Internal Audit Project List and Consideration of Project Funding for FY 06

A. Purpose

Council is asked to adopt the list of internal audit projects as recommended by the Internal Audit Committee. Council is also asked to consider whether it would like to proceed with one or more of the audits at the top of the list during the current budget year, or wait until the next budget process.

B. Background / Discussion

During the November 15, 2005 meeting of the Internal Audit Committee, the committee recommended the following list of potential internal audit projects. These include:

<u>Recommended Audit</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>
Finance Department Performance Audit	\$17,000 - \$25,000
Treasurer's Office Performance Audit	\$17,000 - \$25,000
Human Resources Performance Audit	\$17,000 - \$25,000
Planning and Development Services Performance Audit	\$21,000 - \$29,000
Performance Measurement Refinement	\$20,000
Procurement Audit	\$17,000 - \$25,000
Countywide Fee Study	\$25,000
Timekeeping Audit	\$13,000 - \$17,000
Roads and Drainage Maintenance Performance Audit	\$17,000 - \$25,000
Detention Center Performance Audit	\$21,000 - \$29,000
Magistrate Court Audit	\$13,000 - \$17,000
Animal Care Performance Audit	\$13,000 - \$17,000
County/City Service Consolidation Review	TBD
Emergency Management Performance Review	\$13,000 - \$17,000
Register of Deeds Audit	\$5,300 - \$7,000

Council is asked to approve both the list and ranking of these internal audit projects as recommended by the Internal Audit Committee. At its discretion, Council may wait to fund specific projects in the upcoming budget year, or approve a budget amendment to undertake one or more of these audits in the current fiscal year.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with approving the list as recommended by the Internal Audit Committee. If Council should choose to undertake one or more of the projects listed above in the current fiscal year, a budget amendment would be needed to cover the cost of the project(s) selected. Cost estimates are listed above.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the list of internal audit projects as submitted by the Internal Audit Committee only. Selection and funding for specific projects would be addressed in the upcoming budget year.
2. Approve the list of internal audit projects as submitted by the Internal Audit Committee only and authorize spending to complete one or more projects during the current fiscal year by passing a budget amendment.
3. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the list of internal audit projects as recommended by the Internal Audit Committee. The decision of whether to fund one or more of the projects in the current fiscal year is at the discretion of Council.

Recommended by: Staff **Department:** Administration **Date:** February 3, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Approval of option 2 would require the identification of funds and possibly a budget amendment.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/17/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: All alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/22/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that the Council adopt the proposed list of internal audit projects; however, because of the recent organizational changes in the Finance Department, it is recommended that the Finance Department performance audit be placed at a lower priority to give the current management time to institute planned changes. It is further recommended that, due to the fact that no funding exists in the current budget for internal audit projects, initiation of the projects not begin until after July 1, 2006. Funds will be proposed in the FY 06-07 budget for this purpose.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of One (1) Tractor/Mower

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase in the amount of \$109,836.44, for one (1) Caterpillar Challenger tractor with a Little Mower Inc. integrated mower system attachment. This equipment will be purchased for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works.

B. Background / Discussion

This unit was authorized in the current budget, but as a result of manufacturer and sales tax increases, the cost will exceed the \$100,000.00 limit requiring County Council approval. It will be replacing a 1996 model Case tractor/mower currently in the Fleet equipment inventory (Unit AF008). This request furthers the plan to replace the older tractor/mowers in the County fleet with newer, safer and more efficient equipment. The Council had previously authorized the purchase of two of these units, which are now in service. The older units are often in need of repair and therefore unavailable for use for extended periods. For Council's information, the American Public Works Association guidelines recommend replacement of this type of equipment at eight years. As mentioned last year, the upgrades in the quality of the power train and mower assemblies will enhance reliability and provide more efficient service to the County. Enhanced operator safety and efficiency remain a leading consideration in choosing this equipment. The enclosed cab will allow operators to perform their work in a wider variety of weather conditions, and will protect them from environmental hazards to which they are currently exposed. These potential hazards include, but are not limited to, choking dust and pollen, flying debris, and stinging insects. This is a significant improvement over the older equipment and will minimize downtime and improve the ability of the Roads and Drainage Division to perform their mission in a safe, effective, and efficient manner. This is to be purchased from the State Contract, and funding is available in the Division's budget.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County will be the purchase cost of \$109,836.44, available in the current budget of the Roads and Drainage Division of Public Works. The budget account is 3020735-5314. The financial breakdown is as follows:

Cat Challenger Tractor w/ Little Mower Assy.	\$123,356.29
16 % State Contract Discount, per unit	\$ 19,737.01
Sales Tax (6%)	\$ 6217.16
Total Cost, per unit	\$109,836.44

The difference in cost of this equipment from last year's purchase price is a result of a manufacturer's price increase due to higher steel costs, and an increase in the state sales tax from five percent to six percent.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives available:

1. Approve the request to purchase the Caterpillar Challenger Tractor/Mower unit. This will increase the efficiency and work capacity of the Division as they work to fulfill the Public Works mission. Additional positive impacts are a reduction in the environmental and safety risks to the County employees. It will allow for continuation of the equipment replacement plan to upgrade this section of the Roads and Drainage Division with newer, improved tractor/mowers.
2. Do not approve the request to purchase the Caterpillar Challenger Tractor/Mower unit. This will result in increased expenditure of County funds to continue repairing the older units, with increased downtime limiting equipment availability and negatively impacting the ability of the Division to effectively accomplish their mission. Additionally, it will continue to expose the County employees to the environmental health and safety risks associated with this older type of equipment.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the request for the purchase of a Caterpillar Challenger Tractor with the Little Mowers, Inc., integrated mowing system attachment.

Recommended by: Bill Peters, Fleet Mgr. **Department:** Public Works **Date:** 02/14/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Based on Fleet Manager recommendation.
Funds are available in current budget.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 2/21/06
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/21/06
✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 2/21/06

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval. Funds were included in the current fiscal year budget; no additional funding is required.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Grant Match Approval/No Personnel/No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve 4 grants in the amount of \$310,977.67. There is no match request for these programs.

The grants are as follows:

- Sober or Slammer Mini-Grant
- Law Enforcement Network Mini-Grant
- 2003 Part II Buffer Zone Protection Plan
- 2005 Buffer Zone Protection Plan

B. Background / Discussion

These applications became available after the grant budget request was submitted and there was no longer an avenue to request additional funds. These grants do not involve personnel, or match funds. A general synopsis of each program is attached. Full copies may be obtained from the Grant Development Manager, Ms. Audrey Shifflett.

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

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact to the county. These grants do not require any matching funds.

D. Alternatives

1. Accept the grant awards.
2. Do not approve and refuse to accept the grants.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve the grants amounting to \$301,977.67.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy **Dept.:** Sheriff's **Date:** 01-26-06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Based on no personnel or match funds required.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 2/21/06

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 2-22-06

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval no funds required.

January 26, 2006

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

1. Sober or Slammer Mini-Grant

The overall goal of this project is to acquire equipment, incentives, and meeting costs associated with the Sober or Slammer statewide program. The Richland County Sheriff's Department is the lead agency for the Fifth Judicial Circuit. The Office of Highway Safety awarded these funds directly. **There was no application submitted and no formal award letter.**

There is no match needed from the Richland County Council. The grantor amount is \$10,000.

2. Law Enforcement Network Mini-Grant

The overall goal of this project is to acquire equipment, incentives, and meeting costs associated with the SC Law Enforcement Network statewide program. The Richland County Sheriff's Department is the lead agency for the Fifth Judicial Circuit. The Office of Highway Safety awarded these funds directly. **There was no application submitted and no formal award letter.**

There is no match needed from the Richland County Council. The grantor amount is \$19,500.

3. 2003 Part II Buffer Zone Protection Plan

This program will allow for the purchase of needed equipment to secure volatile locations in Richland County in response to a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosive threat or occurrence, or a natural disaster event.

There is no match needed from the Richland County Council. The grantor amount is \$122,477.67.

4. 2005 Buffer Zone Protection Plan

This program will allow for the purchase of needed equipment to secure volatile locations in Richland County in response to a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosive threat or occurrence, or a natural disaster event.

There is no match needed from the Richland County Council. The grantor amount is \$150,000.

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF MATCH REQUESTED: \$0

TOTAL AMOUNTS OF AWARDS: \$301,977.67

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Grant Match Approval/No Personnel / \$7,488 Match

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve 2 grants in the amount of \$44,576 with a match amount of \$7,488. There are no personnel costs associated with these programs.

The grants are as follows:

JABG – Community Crime Prevention Program

Grantor \$12,848 + Match \$1,428 = \$14,276

This grant allows us to conduct a Character Education Camp in the three local school districts in Richland County. Approximately 40 to 50 rising 6th graders attend the program free of charge to them and their families. Supplies, food, transportation costs, and field trip admissions are included in the budget. A service learning project is conducted by the children in each of the camps and the money raised is donated to a charity of their choice.

VOCA Reverted Funds – Victims of Violent Crimes Direct Services Program

Grantor \$24,240 + Match \$6,060 = \$30,300

This program will allow each of the Victim Advocates to purchase laptop computers for the purpose of taking field or in-home reports from victims of crime. It will also allow for the purchase of a passenger van in order to transport families to and from shelters or for other services as needed.

B. Background / Discussion

These applications became available after the grant budget request was submitted and there was no longer an avenue to request additional funds. These grants do not involve personnel. Full copies may be obtained from the Grant Development Manager, Ms. Audrey Shifflett.

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

C. Financial Impact

	Amount
Match funding request	\$7,488
Total	\$7,488

D. Alternatives

1. Accept the grant awards.
2. Do not approve and refuse to accept the grants.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff's Department recommends that Council approve the grants.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy **Dept.:** Sheriff's **Date:** 2-14-06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Grant does not include personnel. Funding is available from the countywide match appropriated for the current year.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/21/06

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

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

Administration

Reviewed by: J.Milton Pope Date: 2-22-06

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Funding is available from the countywide match appropriated for the current year.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Grant Match Approval/No Personnel

A. Purpose

The Richland County Sheriff's Department in partnership with Alvin Glenn Detention Center wrote a grant request in December of 2004 for One AFIS Workstation, Three Live Scan Devices and printers, an interface with the Jail Management System, the ability to upload finger and palm print information directly to the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, and an information retrieval system for multiple law enforcement agencies. Due to reduced funding coming from the federal level to the state, our grant request was reduced by the grantor to One AFIS Workstation, and Two Live Scan Devices and printers.

County Council is requested to approve the amount of \$47,000 to *fully implement* a grant program awarded through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety on July 1, 2005. County Council approved the initial award (139,072) and match (46,358) for a total amount of 185,430.

B. Background / Discussion

An upgraded LIVE SCAN Device would allow the detention center to fingerprint and palm print arrestees. It would have the capability to print multiple copies of the prints after scanning them only once. It would also provide a better quality control so that there would be fewer rejected fingerprint cards. It would also allow the person to be positively identified on the spot. Gasoline costs and manpower hours would be saved as the prints could be electronically submitted to SLED immediately. This would allow SLED to verify the prints more quickly so that we could hold persons wanted for other crimes. All of the finger and palm prints would be electronically uploaded to SLED and to an archive server. The archive server could be accessed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and would be utilized by various agencies that may need to review finger and palm prints.

In 2001, the Richland County Detention Center fingerprinted 19,915 individuals for criminal purposes. In 2002, that number increased to 19,950. In 2003, 19,625 individuals were fingerprinted for criminal purposes. A tremendous amount of time is spent entering information into the jail management system about the arrestee. In order to save additional time, the plan is to interface the jail management system with the LIVE SCAN Device so that information does not have to be entered twice. We have met with the jail management system vendor and understand that they, and the LIVE SCAN vendor will both have to provide software changes to have the systems work together. We have asked for funds in the budget to cover the costs that each vendor would charge for their part in this interface.

Overall full implementation of this project will:

- Reduce the chance of a serious offender or wanted criminal being released from the detention center due to mistaken identity.

- Reduce the number of keyed errors from fingerprint cards to the Jail Management System.
- Reduce manpower hours used to key in information.
- Reduce manpower hours of local law enforcement as they will no longer manually retrieve fingerprint cards, add case information to the back of them, and then drive them to SLED.
- Increase the number of crimes solved in all of Richland County due to the new palm print capabilities of the Live Scan Devices.

C. Financial Impact

	Amount
Match funding request	\$47,000
Total	\$47,000

D. Alternatives

1. Provide additional funds.
2. Do not approve.

E. Recommendation

The Sheriff’s Department recommends that Council approve the \$47,000 for full implementation of a program that will have a positive impact for multiple agencies within the criminal justice system in Richland County.

Recommended by: Hubert F. Harrell, Chief Deputy **Dept.:** Sheriff’s **Date:** 02-15-06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/21/06

- Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation because request does not include a funding source. We recommend that a funding source be identified prior to approval. A budget amendment may be required dependant on funding source used. Original grant award of \$185,430 that was approved during the FY 06 budget included a County match of 25% or \$46,358. Due to changes in the grant award, it would now be \$185,430, but require a 50% match or \$93,358. This would require an additional \$47,000.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/22/06

- Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Concur with Finance Director (see above).

Administration

Reviewed by: Milton Pope

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: I recommend approval of this funding request. Funds have been identified in the 2005 Bond issuance for sheriff vehicle replacement in the amount of \$2,048,548. We have spent \$1,803,101 to fulfill our plan to replace 80 vehicles which we have done. This has left a residual \$245,447. The \$47,000 match can be funded from this source and the \$198,447 will be used as a debt service payment to pay down the principal on the bond.

This is a unique opportunity to spend existing funds (passed for public safety purposes) to create operational efficiencies, protect our public and have the opportunity manage cost.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: GIS Professional Services

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request County Council's consideration of updating a qualified list of professional services firms with whom we may negotiate and contract to provide GIS-related services on an "as-needed" basis for County projects

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County solicited a Request for Qualifications (RFQ # RC-014-Q-0506), for GIS Professional Services from qualified firms to assist the County with data collection and conversion, business processes, and programming and database technology projects related to GIS Implementation across thematic departments (GIS Implementation Plan). The RFQ was publicly solicited on October 13, 2005. Responses were received in the Procurement Department on November 17, 2005. The solicitation was divided into three specific categories, as shown below. Ten submittals were received and were subsequently reviewed, evaluated, and a recommendation made by a selection and evaluation team composed of five evaluators. The evaluators recommended eight of the ten firms as qualified to do business with the County.

The firms selected and approved by Council will be placed on a list that shall include all firms considered highly qualified to perform GIS Professional Services. The County will be able to request proposals from firms on the listing with which the County can negotiate and award a contract. All firms on the final selection and approved list are considered "selected firms" or "qualified firms" with whom the Director of Procurement may negotiate. This process will allow all the selected and approved firms an opportunity to compete for projects.

Whenever GIS Professional services are required, a Request for Proposal will be sent to a firm on the list and will remain open for fifteen days. All proposals submitted will be reviewed, evaluated, negotiated and an award will be made to the firm providing a fair cost and value to the County to include attainment of our goals of fifteen percent Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, Small and Local Business participation, and assuring local economic impact in our County.

After establishment of the initial qualification listing, firms interested in providing GIS Professional services to the County will be able to submit their qualifications, together with a list of the types of work for which they would like to be considered. An evaluation team will evaluate all submittals and make their recommendation; the Procurement Office shall review the recommendations. The qualified listing will be updated with the newly qualified firms. The Procurement Director will continue to compile and maintain an up-to-date list of the qualified firms. The evaluation and selection team will consist of a minimum of three County employees.

On December 4, 2001 County Council approved a listing of GIS Professional Services firms to provide similar required services over a three year period. That process proved to be efficient and effective in GIS project development. As the latest RFQ will update this procurement practice and be open to add other qualified firms, as described above, approved vendors may be contracted to provide services on an ‘as-needed’ basis for a period not to exceed five years. Thus, firms on the qualified list will have to update their qualifications no less than every two years.

The Director of Procurement reviews the team evaluation and selections, conducts research and analysis as to location, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, responsiveness, and responsibility. Once the assessment is made a recommendation is provided to Council.

The firms recommended for placement on a listing of approved firms to provide GIS Professional services in the areas for which they were qualified are listed below in alphabetical order:

Data Collection, Conversion, and Maintenance

Minority Owned

Location

EarthData		Maryland
Wilbur Smith Associates		Richland County
WK Dickson		Richland County
Woolpert		Richland County

Business Processes

Minority Owned

Location

EarthData		Maryland
GTG, Inc.		North Carolina
Wilbur Smith Associates		Richland County
Woolpert		Richland County

Programming and Database Technologies

Minority Owned

Location

Bradshaw Consulting Services		Aiken County
EarthData		Maryland
Timmons Group		Virginia
US Computing	YES	Richland County
Wilbur Smith Associates		Richland County
Woolpert		Richland County

C. Financial Impact

Funding for the GIS Professional services projects are included in the GIS annual Budget and bond funds specific to the GIS Implementation Plan. No funding, therefore, is requested.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve establishing a listing of qualified GIS Professional Services firms from which we can negotiate and award contracts.

Under this alternative, the selected firms will provided an opportunity to compete by a proposal on each project, negotiate, and contracts would be awarded for on-call GIS Professional services. Projects would be awarded to the firm(s) identified as providing a fair cost and who is the most qualified, responsive, and responsible for the type of project for which solicited. An effort will be made to distribute the work equitably among the firms.

2. Award no contracts

Under this alternative, initiation of the GIS services for a project would require a formal Request for Proposal (RFP), appointment of a selection team, evaluation and selection of the most qualified firm and approval of the selection by County Council. This is a 2 to 3 month process.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve alternative number one.

Recommended by: Rodolfo A. Callwood **Department:** Procurement **Date:** 2/14/2006

Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/17/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/17/06

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Acquisition of land to the north of the Richland County C&D Landfill

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve negotiations for the purchase of fifty-six (56.84) + acres of property north of the current Richland County Landfill Site.

B. Background / Discussion

The purpose of the acquisition of this property is to extend the buffer around the landfill site, possibly provide for additional borrow material for landfill operations, and address any future potential environmental or public health concerns.

DHEC requires mitigation efforts to contain the below-ground methane plume that is typically associated with a landfill. The purchase of this additional property shall extend our northern property boundary and the point of compliance approximately 1,800 feet and, thereby, ensures containment of any methane plumes that potentially remains on County property in the future.

Failure to extend the property boundary could result in the requirement of costly active mitigation efforts in the future. These costs could total more than \$1,000,000. This approach is, by far, the most economical.

C. Financial Impact

This acquisition of this property was included in the Fiscal Year 2005 (FY-05) budget request and rolled over for Fiscal Year 2006 (FY-06) budget.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the negotiations for acquisition of the property to increase the buffer, provide for additional borrow material, and address future environmental impacts.
2. Do not approve the negotiations for acquisition of the property. This will require other, more costly means of methane mitigation.

E. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is recommended.

Recommended by: John Hixon

Department: Public Works

Date: 2/7/06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/17/06

✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are currently available in the FY 06 budget

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/21/06

✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/23/06

✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend that the Council authorize the staff to negotiate a price for this acquisition, and, provided the negotiated price is no greater than the appraised value, authorize the staff to proceed with the purchase of the property. Funds have been budgeted for this purpose.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Budget Amendment to Provide Certain Exemptions to the Road Maintenance Fee

A. Purpose

Council is asked to pass a budget amendment that would provide certain exemptions to the County's Road Maintenance Fee.

B. Background / Discussion

Pursuant to Ordinance Number 043-01HR, the Road Maintenance Fee is a \$15.00 fee that has been included on motor vehicle tax notices since January 2002. The proceeds from these fees are deposited into the County Road Maintenance Fund and are used specifically for the maintenance and improvement of the County road system.

During the motion period of the Council meeting on December 6, 2005, Councilman Joe McEachern asked the Administration and Finance Committee to consider the possibility of providing exemptions to the Road Maintenance Fee for disabled veterans, and citizens who are elderly or handicapped. The changes were discussed during the December meeting of the A&F committee, and were forwarded to the Council retreat in January for further discussion. During the retreat, Council received financial information discussing the impact of these and other exemptions, and directed staff to bring this item back to committee for a vote.

Consistent with Mr. McEachern's request, a budget amendment has been drafted by the Legal Department (attached.) The amendment, if passed by Council, would exempt disabled veterans, citizens over the age of eighty (80) and those who are handicapped from having to pay the County's Road Maintenance Fee. The Council, at its discretion, may also extend the road maintenance fee exemptions to other classes who are exempt from vehicle property taxes, including POW/Medal of Honor/Purple Heart, active military, buses and heavy trucks, and other classes currently exempt.

C. Financial Impact

To offer an exemption to the \$15.00 road maintenance fee for disabled veterans, citizens over the age of eighty (80) and those who are handicapped, the financial impact would be as follows:

Disabled Veterans	\$24,000
Wheelchair	\$22,000
Over 80	\$90,000
<u>Other Disabled</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>
Less Revenue	\$211,000

To extend the exemption to other classes who currently receive an exemption on vehicle property taxes, the impact would include:

POW, Medal of Honor, Purple Heart	\$24,000
Active Military	\$80,000
Buses & heavy Trucks	\$65,000
<u>Other Current Exemptions</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>
Less Revenue	\$214,000

If an exemption is to be offered to all classes listed above, the total impact to the county Road Maintenance fund would be an estimated **\$425,000 annually**. Depending on the exemptions that are offered, is likely that the county would also require additional staff to process applications from citizens seeking exemptions. The financial impact of hiring additional staff is not included in the numbers above.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the budget amendment providing certain exemptions to the Road Maintenance Fee.
2. Do not approve the budget amendment providing certain exemptions to the Road Maintenance Fee.

E. Recommendation

This is a policy decision that is at the request of Council.

Recommended by: Staff Department: Administration Date: December 9, 2005

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/21/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommendation based on incomplete analysis included. The financial impact section states that it would likely require additional staff that is not included in the numbers. What is the cost of this staff and how would it be funded? Additionally there's no discussion on the impact the exemption would have on the Road Maintenance operation. Currently RM is budgeting 100% of the revenue which may imply that a reduction in revenue (through exemptions or otherwise) would require a reduction in service level. If this is approved in the current budget year, it would require another budget amendment to amend the department budget accordingly.

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 2/21/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Both alternatives appear to be legally sufficient; therefore, this request is at the discretion of County Council.

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 12/15/05

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It should be noted that any reduction in Road Maintenance Fee revenue resulting from the proposed exemptions will have to be made up by alternative revenue sources, such as property taxes, or by reducing the budget of the Road Maintenance Division. Also, exempting one group will likely lead to other groups requesting exemptions as well, and the County will be placed in the position of having to make judgment calls as to which exemptions are reasonable and which are not.

DRAFT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-06HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006 ANNUAL BUDGET (ORDINANCE NUMBER 053-05HR), SECTION 4, SO AS TO PROVIDE CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS TO THE ROAD MAINTENANCE FEE, WHICH HAS BEEN INCLUDED ON MOTOR VEHICLE TAX NOTICES SINCE JANUARY 2002 PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE NUMBER 043-01HR.

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

SECTION I. The Fiscal Year 2005-2006 Annual Budget (Ordinance Number 053-05HR), Section 4, is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 4. A road maintenance fee of \$15.00 on each motorized vehicle licensed in Richland County shall be included on motor vehicle tax notices beginning in January 2002; provided, however, citizens over the age of eighty (80) and those who are handicapped are exempt from having to pay such fee beginning in January 2006. The proceeds will go into the County Road Maintenance Fund and shall be used specifically for the maintenance and improvement of the County road system. Any interest earned on these funds shall accrue to this account. Any contracted attorney's fees incurred, as a result of litigation involving the road maintenance fee shall reduce the interest accrual. All other fees previously approved by the County Council, either through budget ordinances or ordinances apart from the budget, will remain in effect unless and until the County Council votes to amend those fees.

As used in this section:

(1) "Handicapped" means a person who:

- (a) has an obvious physical disability that impairs the ability to walk or requires the use of a wheelchair, braces, walkers, or crutches;
- (b) has lost the use of one or both legs;
- (c) suffers from lung disease to such an extent that he is unable to walk without the aid of a respirator;
- (d) is disabled by an impairment in mobility; or
- (e) is determined by the Social Security Administration or the Veterans Administration to be totally and permanently disabled.

(2) A licensed physician shall certify that the total and permanent disability substantially impairs the ability to walk, unless the applicant is an agency or organization complying with Section 56-3-1910 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after _____, 2006.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2006

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Budget Amendment Transferring \$143,100

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment in the amount of \$143,100 for the purchase of software needed to manage the Local Option Sales Tax collections program.

B. Background / Discussion

With the incorporation of the Local Option Sales Tax as a revenue source for Richland County, the computer system for the Auditor and Treasurer's Offices had to be upgraded with a supplemental software package to handle the tax collections and distributions. The current system was not designed to manage this type of revenue due to the unique way it has to be treated (as a rollback to property taxes).

Local Option Sales Tax collections began nearly a year ago; therefore, the software had to be purchased and installed at that time in order for the Auditor and Treasurer's Offices to be able to manage the Local Option revenue.

It was originally anticipated that the first increments of revenue from the Local Option Sales Tax could be used to purchase the required software. It was later determined by the Legal Department, however, that because of the way the referendum was worded, i.e., 100% of the revenue will be applied to roll back property taxes, the revenue could not be used to purchase the software. Consequently, it is being requested that the Council approve a budget amendment, taking funds from the General Fund fund balance, for the purchase.

C. Financial Impact

The cost of the software is \$143,100. Due to the requirement to begin Local Option collections last spring, the software had to be purchased at that time; therefore, payment has already been made by borrowing funds from other accounts. It is requested that the Council approve the budget amendment in order to reimburse the accounts from which the funds were borrowed.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the budget amendment in order that the accounts from which funds were borrowed can be reimbursed.
2. Do not approve the budget amendment, in which case the accounts from which funds were borrowed will likely be short by the end of the fiscal year.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the budget amendment in the amount of \$143,100, with funds to be taken from the General Fund fund balance.

Recommended by: Staff **Department:** Administration **Date:** 01-26-06

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by (Budget Dir.): Daniel Driggers Date: 2/24/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia R. Linder Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/24/06
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval of the budget amendment in order that the appropriate accounts can be reimbursed; otherwise, these accounts are likely to end in a deficit situation by year's end.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. 10-06HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006 GENERAL FUND ANNUAL BUDGET TO ADD ONE HUNDRED FORTY THREE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$143,100.00) TO THE NON-DEPARTMENTAL SPECIAL CONTRACTS ACCOUNT TO OFFSET START-UP COST FOR THE LOCAL OPTION SALES TAX SOFTWARE.

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

SECTION I. That the amount of One Hundred Forty Three Thousand One Hundred Dollars (\$143,100.00) be appropriated to the FY 2005-2006 Non-Departmental budget. Therefore, the Fiscal Year 2005-2006 General Fund Annual Budget is hereby amended as follows:

REVENUE

Revenue appropriated July 1, 2005 as amended:	\$107,250,788
Appropriation of Fund Balance:	<u>143,100</u>
Total General Fund Revenue as Amended:	\$107,393,888

EXPENDITURES

Expenditures appropriated July 1, 2005 as amended:	\$107,250,788
Add to Non-Departmental Special Contracts budget:	<u>143,100</u>
Total General Fund Expenditures as Amended:	\$107,393,888

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

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

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

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2005

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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



**International Downtown Association
2006 Spring Conference**

TITLE SPONSOR

\$10,000

Title Sponsorship Benefits Include:

- Your company will receive the designation as the official Title Sponsor of the International Downtown Association's 2006 Spring Conference in Columbia, South Carolina April 22 – 24 at the Marriott Hotel. Your company's name will be displayed on the front cover and the inside text of the promotional material mailed to 4000-6000 members, prospects, and industry professionals.
- Formal recognition from the podium at the Opening General Session, Closing General Session, and at the event which you are sponsoring.
- Screen Time! Name, logo and/or tagline will be displayed on screen in each general session room during seating, prior to the beginning of each keynote session.
- Your company's name will appear in all official publications and promotional materials produced for the conference.
- Your logo will be displayed on the inside of the title page of the program booklet.
- You will receive one full page, b/w (8^{1/2} X 11) ad in the sponsor section of the program booklet.
- Your company name or logo will appear on all conference signage.
- Your company name or logo will appear on the conference tote bags.
- Opportunity to insert company promotional material in conference tote bags, or the option of a guest room drop, which will give your item individual attention.
- Your company name or logo will be displayed on the International Downtown Association's web site with hotlink capability.
- Your company will receive three complimentary conference registrations, valued at \$475 each for a total value of \$1,425, and may purchase additional conference registrations at the reduced rate of \$240.

- A representative from your organization will have the opportunity to be one of the conference's key note speakers.

For Further Information Contact:

Matt Kennell – President & CEO

City Center Partnership, Inc.

803.233.0620

matt@citycentercolumbia.sc



CITY CENTER
PARTNERSHIP, INC.
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

Karel J. Givens

Mayor of City Center Columbia

1530-C Main Street
Columbia, SC 29201
phone 803.233.0620
fax 803.233.0621
www.citycentercolumbia.sc
karel@citycentercolumbia.sc

HAND DELIVERED

February 9, 2006

Mr. Milton Pope
Interim County Administrator
Richland County
PO Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202

Dear Milton:

As you know, in just a couple of months the International Downtown Association Spring Conference is to be held in Columbia. We have included a number of programs along with this letter for your distribution to county staff and or council members and would welcome the opportunity to do personally brief county leaders on the conference.

Per recent inquiries by County Council Chairman and fellow CCP board member Tony Mizzell, we would like to request sponsorship of this conference by Richland County to help us go over the top on our fund raising goal for the event. As noted at a recent CCP Board meeting, fund raising is going very well, with \$30,000 in Accommodation Tax funds from the City of Columbia committed, as well as generourous donations by Block By Block, Wilbur Smith Associates, Holmes Smith Developments, Nelson Mullins, and others, but we still need about \$19,000 for some unfunded items including tote bags, gifts for attendees, flowers, food, and decorations for receptions.

A contribution from Richland County toward the costs of these items would be much appreciated and would allow us to spend the next 60 days on planning the event rather than continued fund raising.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and for the ongoing support and leadership by Richland County.

Sincerely,



Matt Kennell
President and CEO

cc: Hon. Tony Mizzell
Hon. Paul Livingston
Fred Delk



1530-C Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

1530-C Main Street ~ Columbia, South Carolina 29201 ~ (803) 233-0620

RICHLAND COUNTY FUNDS FOR IDA CONFERENCE

Items	Cost	Comments
Tote Bags	\$5,000	
Gifts for Bags	\$8,000	
Flowers/Decorations for receptions	\$2,000	
Food for Reception on April 23rd	\$4,000	
Total	\$19,000	