



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

**JANUARY 26, 2010
6:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: December 22, 2009 [pages 4-6]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Ambulance Fee Billing Service Accounting Change [pages 8-12]
3. City of Columbia Grant-Gills Creek Watershed [pages 14-15]

4. County Offices to be Closed the Day After Christmas [pages 17-19]
5. FY 2008 Special Resurfacing and full Depth Patching Project Change Order [pages 21-23]
6. NESL agreement language and NextGen Fund Freeze [pages 25-26]
7. Phone Tree Messaging Software Update [pages 28-29]

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

8. Increase the Capacity of Bread and Breakfast Lodging to make them more profitable [pages 31-38]
9. Video System for Council Chambers [pages 40-41]

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: December 22, 2009 [pages 4-6]

Reviews

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2009 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, Jim Manning, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Janet Claggett, Dale Welch, Stephany Snowden, Tamara King, Amelia Linder, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 24, 2009 (Regular Session) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Pope stated that Item #7—Phone Tree Messaging Software Update should be an action item instead of an Item for Discussion.

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

\$100,000 Hospitality Tax Allocation, Public Information – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval and requested that additional questions of Council members be forwarded to staff prior to the January 5th Council meeting. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Washington moved, seconded by Ms. Smith, to reconsider this item. A discussion took place.

The motion for reconsideration failed.

Approve Match Amount/DNA Backlog Reduction Grant from Sheriff's Department – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Washington, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Charge for Copies of Documents Subject to Council or Staff Review – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that the item be tabled. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Transportation Work Sessions – Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Phone Tree Messaging Software Update – Mr. Washington moved to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Hutchinson moved to table this item.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for denial.

Mr. Washington made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Smith, to hold this item in committee. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Increase the Capacity of Bed and Breakfast Lodging to make them more affordable – The committee requested that staff bring recommendations back to Council regarding options for properties zoned Rural Commercial.

Video System for Council Chambers – Staff is to bring back information regarding options with Time Warner Cable when available.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:54 p.m.

Submitted by,

Joyce Dickerson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Ambulance Fee Billing Service Accounting Change [pages 8-12]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Ambulance Fee Billing Service Accounting Change

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the funding associated with the new process regarding payment to the billing service company for the collection of ambulance fees.

B. Background / Discussion

Effective July 1, 2009, Richland County began contracting with a new billing service company, EMSMC, for ambulance fee collection. While the previous billing service vendor provided the county with net payments (i.e. total revenue less the company collection fee), EMSMC provides the county with gross payments. Richland County is now responsible for remitting a payment for the collection fee back to the company. Therefore, the Finance Department needs to increase the expenditure budget to pay the collection fees. This accounting change will have a net effect of zero on the County budget.

C. Financial Impact

No financial impact. This is an accounting change only.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the increase to the revenue and expenditure budgets to allow for the appropriate accounting of the EMSMC collection processes.
2. Alternative (1) is the only viable option. If alternative (1) is not approved, the County will not be able to work within the parameters of EMSMC's procedures.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve alternative (1).

Recommended by: Daniel Driggers **Date:** January 10, 2010

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/13/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date:

Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 1/13/10

Recommend Council denial

FY 09 - Hospitality Tax Fund - Committee Members Recommendations

Applicant Name	Project Name	Appropriated		Project Costs	Request FY 09	Request % of total cost	Committee Recommendations FY09
		FY07	FY08				
Auntie Karen Foundation	Legends of ...2009	\$ 545	\$ 4,500	\$ 208,910	\$ 30,800	15%	\$ 10,000
Celebrate Freedom Foundation	2009 CFF Air & Ground Show: Thunder at Ft. Jackson	\$ 10,000	\$ 12,650	\$ 202,000	\$ 25,000	12%	\$ 15,000
Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival	Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 109,000	\$ 75,000	69%	\$ 5,000
Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce	Friends of Our Forces/The Welcome Guide	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 151,000	\$ 35,000	23%	\$ 25,000
Central Carolina Community Foundation	15th Annual International Festival of Wines and Food	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,400	\$ 15,000	27%	\$ 5,000
				Total recommended dollars to appropriate:	\$		\$ 60,000
				Total funds available to appropriate:	\$		\$ 119,981
				Remaining balance of funds unappropriated:	\$		\$ 59,981

Applicant Name	Project Name	Committee Member Scores			Average
		Emore	Sims	Tunell	
Auntie Karen Foundation	Legends of ...2009	86	85	86	85.5
Celebrate Freedom Foundation	2009 CFF Air & Ground Show: Thunder at Ft. Jackson	91	93	62	85.75
Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival	Lower Richland Sweet Potato Festival	87	100	42	69.75
Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce	Friends of Our Forces/The Welcome Guide	96	95	85	90.25
Central Carolina Community Foundation	15th Annual International Festival of Wines and Food	85	89	52	75.25
				Threshold average:	81.3

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

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010 GENERAL FUND ANNUAL BUDGET TO APPROPRIATE \$500,000 OF ADDITIONAL REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES TO THE NON-DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET DUE TO NEW ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES ASSOCIATED WITH AMBULANCE FEE COLLECTIONS.

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 five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) be appropriated to the Fiscal Year 2009-2010 General Fund revenue and non-departmental expenditure budget due to new accounting procedures associated with ambulance fee collections. Therefore, the Fiscal Year 2009-2010 General Fund Annual Budget is hereby amended as follows:

REVENUE

Revenue appropriated July 1, 2009 as amended:	\$ 136,187,861
Appropriation of General Fund additional revenue:	\$ <u>500,000</u>
Total General Fund Revenue as Amended:	\$ 136,687,861

EXPENDITURES

Expenditures appropriated July 1, 2009 as amended:	\$ 136,187,861
Increase to non-departmental budget:	\$ <u>500,000</u>
Total General Fund Expenditures as Amended:	\$ 136,687,861

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 _____, 2009.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Paul Livingston, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2009

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

City of Columbia Grant-Gills Creek Watershed [pages 14-15]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: City of Columbia Grant – Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan Implementation/No Personnel/Match

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the grant that was received by Richland County Stormwater Management in the amount of \$80,000 from the City of Columbia/Gills Creek Watershed Association for the implementation of part of Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan. County Council is being requested to approve grant monies since the grant proposal was not part of Grant Budget Request for 2009-2010.

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County Stormwater Management is an active and vocal participant in Gills Creek Watershed Association (GCWA). The Gills Creek Watershed Association in connection with Richland County Stormwater Management had applied for a \$100,000 grant from the City of Columbia to assist funding the restoration projects in Gills Creek Watershed. A \$100,000 grant was approved by City of Columbia and \$80,000 of that grant money is identified to be utilized for Devils Ditch capital improvement project (CIP). The project site is both in City and County jurisdictions. Devil's Ditch CIP is a well coordinated effort of GCWA, Richland County and City of Columbia and will be designed and constructed with Richland County Stormwater Manager as project manager. The matching money (100%) for the grant was funded in FY 10 Stormwater Division Budget and is available for encumbrance. There is no approval for additional funds required other than project management and grant monies management by Stormwater Manager.

C. Financial Impact

The total grant approved is \$80,000 with 100% match from Stormwater Management Division Budget

Grant Program	Costs
City of Columbia Grant	\$80,000
Stormwater Budget	\$80,000
Total Project Approval Cost	\$160,000

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the grant and project to assist GCWA and Stormwater Management with the implementation of Watershed Management Plan.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding. This impacts the initiatives of Stormwater Management.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the City of Columbia Grant for assisting GCWA and Richland County Stormwater Management with Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan Project.

Recommended by: Srinivas Valavala **Department:** Department of Public Works **Date:** November 12, 2009

David Hoops Department of Public Works November 12, 2009

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: _____
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: _____

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 1/14/10
 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: 1/19/10
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: _____

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

County Offices to be Closed the Day After Christmas [pages 17-19]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Observed Christmas Holidays Consistent with State Government

A. Purpose

County Offices will usually close the day after Christmas to coincide with South Carolina's State Government and the neighboring Counties of Lexington and Fairfield and the City of Columbia.

B. Background / Discussion

Origin of Issue:

County Council

Lead Department:

Human Resources

What are the Key Issues (Precipitation of Project):

Richland County consistency of observed Christmas Holiday with State Government and other local Governments in the Midlands.

Date Ready for Implementation:

Upon Council approval

Multiple Year Project:

No

Estimated Work Hours for Completion

Approximately \$250,000 for holiday pay. 15 hours to develop plans for implementation, change current policies, holiday calendars, Employee Handbooks, and HR Guidelines and communicate to employees.

Process to Date:

Research has been completed to confirm consistency with other local governments in the Midlands and State Government holidays.

Process Plan for Future Action:

Develop communication plans, change existing policies, holiday calendars, Employee Handbooks, and HR Guidelines on holidays.

Reference:

South Carolina's State Government and some neighboring Midlands Counties of Lexington, Kershaw, and Fairfield are usually closed for three days (including the day after Christmas). In addition, the city of Columbia observes Christmas holidays consistent with SC State Government. All other holidays for these Counties coincide with those of Richland County.

C. Financial Impact

- 1. TBD

D. Alternatives

- 1. Approve the additional requested observed Holiday
- 2. Do not approve the additional requested observed Holiday

E. Recommendation

Human Resources prepared this action at the request of County Administration.

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation. This is a policy decision for Council.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Human Resources prepared ROA at the direction of County Administration.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 1/19/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy question and left, therefore, to the Council’s discretion. If the Council elects to go forward with this motion, it should be noted that the cost of adding a day to the existing list of holidays is approximately \$250,000 in terms of compensation, as stated above.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

FY 2008 Special Resurfacing and full Depth Patching Project Change Order [pages 21-23]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Special Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project Change Order #3

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve Change Order #3 in the amount of \$98,316.95 for REA Contracting LLC for overages encountered due to the continuing degradation of the roads included in the FY 2008 special resurfacing and full depth patching project.

B. Background / Discussion

The resurfacing and full depth patching list was established by the R&D and Engineering Divisions.

Florence and Hutchenson, Inc., (F&H) completed the design and specifications for the FY 2008 Special Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project. The project was advertised on October 9, 2008 for a period of 31 days. A pre-bid meeting was held on October 28, 2008, and bids for the project were opened on November 18, 2008.

Rea Contracting LLC has been determined to be the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The following information includes the results of the bid opening.

BIDS

Contractor	Total Bid Amount
Rea Contracting LLC	\$ 745,855.22
Sloan Construction Company Inc.	\$ 783,423.57
C.R. Jackson	\$ 863,132.81
CBG Inc.	\$ 904,214.20

C. Financial Impact

The Department of Public Works & Roads and Drainage Division account 3020735.5272 has sufficient funding for Change Order #3 in the amount of \$98,316.95.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and they are as follows:

1. Approve Change Order #3 for Rea Contracting LLC for the FY 2008 Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project in the amount of \$98,316.95.
2. Do not approve Change Order #3 for Rea Contracting LLC.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve Change Order #3 for REA Contracting LLC for the FY 2008 Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project in the amount of \$98,316.95. A recommendation by F&H to approve Change Order #3 for Rea Contracting LLC is attached.

Recommended by: David Hoops, PE Department: Public Works Date: 11/12/09

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/14/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/15/10

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: 1/19/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:



Florence & Hutcheson, Inc.

CONSULTING ENGINEERS

September 30, 2009

Mr. David Cable
Department of Public Works
400 Powell Road
Columbia, SC 29203

RE: Richland County 2008 Special Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project

Dear Mr. Cable:

A contract modification is required for the additional work completed on Richland County 2008 Special Resurfacing and Full Depth Patching Project. Due to additional work necessary to properly construct the project, Rea Contracting has completed \$98,316.95 of additional work on the project. This change order covers the following areas completed to date (3.77 miles): (Steeplecrest North Dr., Steeplecrest South Dr., Palmetto Stakes Dr., Riverwalk Way, Forest Walk Ct., Bow Hill Ct., Margate Ct., Hedgefield Rd., Clarion Rd., Woodspur Rd., Woodspur Ct., Misty Glen Cir., Westlake Farms Dr., Derby Run Ct., and Ascot Ct.). The additional quantities have been verified by F&H with field measurements along with daily work journals and asphalt tickets supplied by Rea Contracting. Please amend the contract with Rea Contracting as follows:

	<u>Original</u>	<u>Addition</u>	<u>New</u>
	<u>Contract (plus prev. COs):</u>	<u>to Contract:</u>	<u>Contract Total:</u>
Total	\$753,910.12	\$98,316.95	\$852,227.07

Florence & Hutcheson will make the necessary modifications to payment applications and continue with the completion of the rest of the project. If we can be of further assistance in this matter please do not hesitate to call at 254-5800.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE & HUTCHESON, INC.


WES LOCKARD, P.E.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

NESL agreement language and NextGen Fund Freeze [pages 25-26]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: NESL settlement agreement language and NextGen fund freeze

A. Purpose

County Council is requested, per Mr. Malinowski's motion, to require the County Legal Department to meet with the attorneys who drafted the NESL Settlement Agreement to determine the meaning of the language due to a potential breach of the Agreement and to freeze all transfer of funds to NextGen until an audit can be performed.

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County signed a Settlement Agreement with the Northeast Sanitary Landfill whereby the County would act as a conduit for \$1,000,000 to be paid by NESL to a newly formed community development corporation chosen by Richland County.

There is at present a question as to what a portion of the settlement language means. Mr. Malinowski requests that Council require the Richland County legal department to meet with the attorneys who created the settlement agreement to determine the meaning of the language due to a potential breach in the agreement. In addition, a freeze should be placed on any funds forwarded to NEXTGEN until an audit can determine that the funds are being spent in accordance with the agreement, which will only be determined after a meeting with the parties who created the agreement and a determination that the agreement is correct according to what council's original intentions were.

C. Financial Impact

There is no known financial impact associated with this request beyond attorney's fees to the outside counsel who drafted the agreement on the County's behalf.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request.
2. Do not approve the request.

E. Recommendation

Council discretion.

Recommended by: Elizabeth A. McLean Department: Legal Date: 1/12/10

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/13/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Milton Pope

Date: 1-13-10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Phone Tree Messaging Software Update [pages 28-29]

Reviews

From: DALE WELCH
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 12:35 PM
To: ROXANNE ANCHETA
Cc: JANET CLAGGETT
Subject: Phonetree update and my talking points for A&F

With the help of Phonetree support IT spent approximately 55 hours over 6 weeks working with 2 separate Phonetree callback systems trying to get them to work properly.

There were 2 problems:

1. Loud humming sound in the background
2. The recording would frequently get cut off while the called party was listening.

Neither of these problems could be resolved and it was concluded that the system had a compatibility problem with our fully VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) county-wide phone system. The Phonetree system was sent back before the 30 day trial was up and we are awaiting a \$1 600 refund.

IT has been looking into other phone callback systems since Phonetree didn't work properly. In trying to keep costs down we settled on hardware based systems housed locally versus web based hosted systems. The hardware systems had an upfront cost plus a cost based on the volume of calls. The web based systems charge per call only and there is no hardware needed however the cost was substantially higher than the hardware based system and would cost much more per year to use.

2 systems have been reviewed so far: Synrevoice, and Spitfire. We participated in online demos for both systems.

Synrevoice Cost \$8495 for the entry level system (which is similar to the capabilities of the Phonetree system we tested at \$1 600). If configured similar to Phonetree with capacity to call the majority of households in the county within 4 days the Synrevoice system would cost \$41,600 versus \$14,100 for Phonetree. Synrevoice has an annual maintenance fee of \$3,600

Spitfire cost \$1,600 for the entry level system, same as Phonetree. Configured similar to Phonetree with capacity to call the majority of households in the county within 4 days the Spitfire system would cost \$9,500, well under the \$14,100 for Phonetree. Spitfire does not have an annual maintenance program. Service hours would be purchased on an as needed basis.

When we contacted both vendors about a 30 day trial period neither of them offered it. When we asked what our recourse was if their system did not work with our VoIP system we received the following response:

- Spitfire (they would not give a yes or no answer):
 - We will work with you until we get it to work,
 - We have thousands of these systems running all over the world.

- We will go through a pre-install with you before we ship to make sure everything will work,
- Then we will walk you through the setup, remote install & training (all included with the price)
- Synrevoice
 - Has a satisfaction guarantee

We have been unable to locate another vendor that will allow us a 30 day trial period. We will need direction from Council on how to proceed.

Note: School District One uses a callback phone system called "School Messenger" and it is a web based system. They can contact 12,000 students per day and cost them approximately \$40,000 annually.

*Dale Welch
Network/Telecom Div Chief
Richland County IT Dept
803-576-2017*

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Increase the Capacity of Bread and Breakfast Lodging to make them more profitable [pages 31-38]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to consider an Ordinance to amend the Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 26, Land Development; so as to allow Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns as a permitted Use in RC Rural Commercial Districts.

B. Background / Discussion

Currently, Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns are permitted in the RC Rural Commercial District with special requirements, including a maximum of five (5) guest rooms per home/inn. At the December 22, 2009 Administration and Finance Committee meeting, the Committee unanimously voted in favor of requesting staff to explore options for properties zoned Rural Commercial so as to increase the capacity of such lodging to make them more profitable.

Staff reviewed the request and recommends that Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns remain with special requirements in the RC Rural Commercial District, for the following reasons:

The need to amend the Land Development Code is normally necessitated by the inability or difficulty of applicants to establish projects due to the strict provisions of the code. Staff is unable to determine if the special requirements for Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns are excessive because of the insufficient number of requests that have been presented to the department, either by submittal of plans or pre-application meetings.

However, if Council should desire to increase the capacity then staff recommends allowing Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns as a permitted Use in the RC Rural Commercial District. The proposed ordinance is attached.

C. Financial Impact

None. This ordinance is revenue neutral.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the amended language to the Land Development Code, and forward it to the Planning Commission for their recommendation.
2. Approve alternative ordinance language, and forward it to the Planning Commission for their recommendation.
3. Do not approve the ordinance amendment.

E. Recommendation

Staff recommends approving Alternative No. 3.

Recommended by: A&F Committee

Date: December 22, 2009

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers:

Date: 1/14/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion. Based on section c there is no financial impact.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 1/20/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This is left to the Council's discretion; however, if Council should desire to increase the capacity, staff recommends allowing Bed and Breakfast Homes / Inns as a permitted use in the RC Rural Commercial District.

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

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 26, LAND DEVELOPMENT; ARTICLE V, ZONING DISTRICTS AND DISTRICT STANDARDS; SECTION 26-141, TABLE OF PERMITTED USES WITH SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS, AND SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS; “BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL SERVICES” OF TABLE 26-V-2.; AND ARTICLE VI, SUPPLEMENTAL USE STANDARDS; SECTION 26-151, PERMITTED USES WITH SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS; SO AS TO ALLOW “BED AND BREAKFAST HOMES/INNS” AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE RC RURAL COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT.

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

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 26, Land Development; Article V, Zoning Districts and District Standards; Section 26-141, Table of Permitted Uses, Permitted Uses with Special Requirements, and Special Exceptions; “Residential Uses” of Table 26-V-2.; is hereby amended to read as follows:

(ORDINANCE CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE)

USE TYPES	TROS	RU	RR	RS-E	RS-LD	RS-MD	RS-HD	MH	RM-MD	RM-HD	OI	NC	RC	GC	M-1	LI	HI
<u>Business, Professional and Personal Services</u>																	
Accounting, Tax Preparation, Bookkeeping, and Payroll Services											P	P	P	P	P	P	
Advertising, Public Relations, and Related Agencies											P	P	P	P			
Automatic Teller Machines											P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Automobile Parking (Commercial)											P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Automobile Rental or Leasing																	
Automobile Towing, Not Including Storage																	
Automobile Towing, Including Storage Services																	
Banks, Finance, and Insurance Offices											P	SR	SR	P	P	P	
Barber Shops, Beauty Salons, and Related Services		SR							SR	SR	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns		P	SR						SR	SR	P	P	SR P	P	P		
Body Piercing Facilities														SR			
Building Maintenance Services, Not Otherwise Listed														P	P	P	P
Car and Light Truck Washes (See also Truck Washes)													SR	P	P	P	P
Carpet and Upholstery Cleaning Services														P	P	P	P
Computer Systems Design and Related Services											P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Clothing Alterations/Repairs; Footwear Repairs											P	P	P	P	P		
Construction, Building, General Contracting, with Outside Storage															SR	SR	P
Construction, Building, General Contracting, without Outside Storage											P	P	P	P	P	P	P
USE TYPES	TROS	RU	RR	RS-E	RS-LD	RS-MD	RS-HD	MH	RM-MD	RM-HD	OI	NC	RC	GC	M-1	LI	HI
Construction, Heavy, with Outside Storage															SR	SR	P

	TROS	RU	RR	RS-E	RS-LD	RS-MD	RS-HD	MH	RM-MD	RM-HD	OI	NC	RC	GC	M-1	LI	HI
Picture Framing Shops																	
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services, Not Otherwise Listed											P	P	P	P	P	P	
Publishing Industries																	
Real Estate and Leasing Offices											P	P	P	P	P	P	
Recreational Vehicle Parks and Recreation Camps		SR															
Rental Centers, with Outside Storage														SR	P	P	P
Rental Centers, without Outside Storage													P	P	P	P	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Appliance and Electronics													SR	SR	SR	SR	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Automobile, Major															P	P	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Automobile, Minor													P	P	P	P	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Boat and Commercial Trucks, Large															P		P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Boat and Commercial Trucks, Small															P	P	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Commercial and Industrial Equipment															P	P	P
Repair and Maintenance Services, Home and Garden Equipment														P	P		
USE TYPES	TROS	RU	RR	RS-E	RS-LD	RS-MD	RS-HD	MH	RM-MD	RM-HD	OI	NC	RC	GC	M-1	LI	HI
Repair and Maintenance Services, Personal and Household Goods															P	P	
Repair and Maintenance Services, Television, Radio, or Other Consumer Electronics												P	P	P	P	P	
Research and Development Services											SR				P	P	P
Security and Related Services														P	P	P	
Septic Tank Services													P				
Tanning Salons																	
Tattoo Facilities																	
Taxidermists													P	P	P	P	
Theaters, Live Performances															P	P	

SECTION II. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 26, Land Development; Article VI, Supplemental Use Standards; Section 26-151, Permitted Uses with Special Requirements; Subsection (b) Permitted uses with special requirements listed by zoning district; Paragraph (10) Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns.; is hereby amended to read as follows:

- (10) Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns - (RR, RM-MD, RM-HD, ~~RC~~)

SECTION III. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 26, Land Development; Article VI, Supplemental Use Standards; Section 26-151, Permitted Uses with Special Requirements; Subsection (c) Standards; Subparagraph (10) Bed and Breakfast Homes/Inns; Clause a; is hereby amended to read as follows:

- a. Use districts: Rural Residential; Residential, Multi-Family, Medium Density; Residential, Multi-Family, High Density; ~~Rural Commercial.~~

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

SECTION VI. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after _____, 2010.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
_____, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2010

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Video System for Council Chambers [pages 40-41]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Video System for Council Chambers

A. Purpose

Richland County Council is requesting an estimate of what the cost would be to have the ability to re-broadcast council meetings, to include committee, zoning public hearings etc.

B. Background / Discussion

At the direction of Richland County Council, the Office of Public Information has done preliminary research of the cost to provide a HD video system for council chambers which would consist of three high definition robotic broadcast cameras and with a remote control, a high definition switcher with integrated multi-viewer and wall mounted broadcast HD monitor and a universal format converter allowing the signals to be down converted for recorded broadcast.

C. Financial Impact

It is important to that this preliminary estimate includes only the cost of the video system that would need to be needed to re-broadcast council meetings. It is currently estimated that the council meets for approximately 15 hours a month and consideration would need to be given for the cost of storing and archiving meetings. A request has been made to Richland County IT to begin researching the costs involved in adequately archiving council meetings. The preliminary estimate for the equipment costs is \$69,394.00.

EQUIPMENT NEEDED
ROBOTIC CAMERA SYSTEM – 3 CAMERAS
MONITOR/SWITCHER WITH MULTI- VIEWER
INCLUDES TRAINING AND PARTS AND LABOR WARRANTY

D. Alternatives

1. The alternatives are to that council may direct staff to move forward with further researching the total cost of re-broadcasting council meetings to include archiving and storage costs and staff to work with procurement to secure requests for proposals. The alternative is that council may determine that staff should not move forward with researching this endeavor.

E. Recommendation

It is the recommendations of the Richland County Office of Public Information that Council review the proposal as information and give PIO time to build a cable television platform that would support such a future endeavor. Staff is currently working with Richland County Procurement to purchase equipment to begin broadcasting on Time Warner Cable Channel 2.

Recommended by: Stephany Snowden Department: PIO Date: 12/09/09

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers: Date: 12/10/09
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Approval would require the identification of funds either in the current budget or through a budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 12/10/09
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date: 12/10/09
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope Date: 12-10-09
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: I recommend that the funding portion of this issue be forwarded to the FY10/11 budget process **if** Council approves a policy position of televising public meetings.