

**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2001
5:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bernice G. Scott, Chair; J.D. "Buddy" Meetze; L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.; Susan Brill; Thelma M. Tillis

OTHERS PRESENT: Joan Brady, Paul Livingston, Joseph McEachern, James Tuten, Ash Miller, T. Cary McSwain, Larry Smith, Brad Farrar, Amelia Linder, Ashley Jacobs, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Andy Metts, Sherry Wright-Moore, Michael Criss, Pam Davis, Ralph Pearson, Mike Byrd, Monique Walters, Marsheika Martin

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 25, 2001: Regular Session

Ms. Tillis moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. McSwain requested for the Solid Waste Collection Contract to be discussed in Executive Session. This item will be placed under Information/Discussion.

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

I. ITEMS FOR ACTIONS

a. Lease Agreement: Columbia Owens/STARBASE

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to give first reading approval of a lease agreement with STARBASE to place a temporary portable classroom building on the Columbia Owens Downtown Airport property. The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. Ordinance: Closing of Vahalla Drive to through Truck Traffic

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to recommend first reading approval of an ordinance closing Vahalla Drive to through truck traffic. The vote in favor was unanimous.

c. Ordinance: Closing of Summit Parkway to Through Truck Traffic

Ms. Brill moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to recommend first reading approval of an ordinance closing Summit Drive to through truck traffic. The vote in favor was unanimous.

d. Award of Contract: Phase II, Haskell Heights Sanitary Sewer

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve an award of contract to B&B Construction Company for Phase II of the Haskell Heights sewer project.

Mr. McSwain stated the State Department changed the requirement in the grant adding additional money, which would put the County over budget. He reported staff would need to do some things to correct it. Mr. McSwain stated any changes to the total amount would be brought back to Council. He stated if it changes, the amount would go down.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

II. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

a. Report on Engineering Contracts

This item is pending.

III. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

- a. Animal Control Ordinance (Spay/Neuter Policy)**
- b. Animal Shelter Agreement with City of Columbia**

Mr. Milton Pope, Assistant County Administrator, reported County and City representatives met and the meeting was positive. He stated the City would forward a copy of the draft agreement to the County.

Point of Personal Privilege

Ms. Tillis inquired on the lateness of the Committee receiving agendas. Staff reported back-up information is usually the hold-up and will work on getting the agendas out in a more timely manner.

Mr. Meetze requested for Mr. McSwain to find out why Mayor Bob Coble cancelled a scheduled meeting regarding water/sewer issues.

IV. Executive Session

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to go into Executive Session to discuss the Solid Waste issue. The vote in favor was unanimous.

=====
The Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 5:15 p.m. and came out at approximately 5:53 p.m.
=====

It was moved and seconded to come out of Executive Session. The vote in favor was unanimous.

a. Solid Waste

Ms. Tillis moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to forward this item to full Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:54 p.m.

Submitted by,

Bernice G. Scott
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Ordinance to create a Special Assessment District

A. Purpose

Kahn Development would like the County to designate The Village at Sandhill, in northeast Richland County, as a Special Assessment District under the Public Works Improvement Act (S.C. Code §§ 4-35-1, et seq.) and to issue bonds on behalf of the District.

B. Background / Discussion

Kahn Development proposes to create a new community, The Village at Sandhill, between Two Notch Road, Clemson Road, and North Springs Road on land that it is purchasing from Clemson University. This community may include retail businesses, dining, entertainment and lodging facilities, administrative and institutional offices, an apartment and condominium community, and a retirement community. Kahn Development would like the County to designate The Village at Sandhill as a special assessment district and to issue bonds on behalf of the District. The bond proceeds would be used to pay for infrastructure improvements (streets, water and sewer lines, storm sewer, public parking lots, etc.) for Sandhills. The cost for the improvements is currently estimated to be approximately \$20 million. See attached Summary provided by Kahn Development.

State law provides for the creation of special assessment districts and they are a variant of the special tax districts provided for under Home Rule. The general law was revised recently to expand the types of projects that can be funded with special assessments. In the past the County has used special assessments for a sewer project, the Greenview—Fairwald Sewer Assessment District, but there have been no special assessment districts approved under the new version of the law. Consequently the County has no policy or procedure for reviewing requests and no precedent as basis for evaluating requests.

C. Financial Impact

There is no direct initial financial impact associated with this request. No existing revenues will be diverted or used for the special assessment district and all expenses in creating the district or issuing the bonds are payable from the proceeds of the bonds.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to designate The Village at Sandhill as a Special Assessment District, contingent upon a favorable feasibility study, and issue bonds on behalf of the District.
2. Establish guidelines, policies or procedures for applications and evaluating requests for the creation of special assessment districts. These policies and procedures should distinguish between districts created for existing residents or users, such as the sewer districts formerly created, and districts being created for new subdivisions or planned communities which might be based on the County's general planning objectives for best practices and principles.
3. Approve a feasibility study at Kahn Development's expense for the proposed project and use this project as a way to set guidelines for new planned communities.

4. Deny the request to approve a feasibility study and/or to designate The Village at Sandhill as a Special Assessment District and issue bonds on behalf of the District.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council enter an Executive Session to receive legal advice regarding this request.

Recommended by: Larry Smith Department: Legal Date: November 20, 2001

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Daniel Driggers Date: 11/21/01
Comments: See financial impact section

Administration

Approved by: J. Milton Pope Date: 11-21-01
Comments: The decision to grant this request is solely a policy decision of County Council however Administration's favorable recommendation would be contingent upon a positive feasibility study (for Richland County).

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Ordinance Amendment

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to amend Chapter 22, Planning; Article III, of the Richland County Code (the *Land Development Ordinance*) to stipulate minimum separation distances between new driveways that provide access to new subdivisions of land.

B. Background / Discussion

The SC Department of Transportation has promulgated a manual of guidelines for the management of encroachments onto the state highway system entitled, Access and Roadside Management Standards (the Standards). This document reads in its introduction, “The Department’s desire to satisfy the public’s need for efficient and safe traffic movement has to be weighed against property owners’ needs for adequate access while taking into consideration significant changes in traffic and roadside characteristics.” The Richland County Planning Commission and Planning Department staff share this objective.

The Standards also stipulate that when issuing encroachment permit for driveways, the Department, “does not relieve the applicant of the need to comply with local requirements.” However, Richland County now has no requirements for driveway separation. Furthermore, the Department routinely chooses not to enforce the requirements contained in the Standards.

The text amendment to the land development regulations is intended to adopt the SC Department of Transportation’s driveway standard as a local requirement for the subdivision of land. By doing so, the County may independently enforce the driveway separation distances considered to be necessary by the State for highway safety. The Planning Commission will be empowered to deny the approval of subdivision plans that do not meet these standards under the authority of local law.

The two versions of the amendment to this Request for Action are:

- 1) The text as recommended by the Planning Commission. This recommended text regulated driveways on County roads as well as those on State roads. This presents a problem because all of the County roads inside residential subdivisions would fit the definition. Consequently, developers of subdivisions would need to provide shared driveways for standard adjacent lots or build on lots much wider than is now required.
- 2) A staff revision of the text recommended by the Planning Commission that eliminates two potential problems. It deletes County roads, and thus roads in subdivisions, from regulation of driveway separation. It also deletes the language providing for variances of the provisions because this sentence is a duplication of section (Sec. 22-25) that allows variances of all of the provisions design standards in the land development regulations.

Following is the language proposed by the Planning Commission. The strike and insert indicate staff recommended revisions.

SECTION I. *The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 22, Land Development Regulations; Article III, Minimum Design Standards; Section 22-23, Lots; is hereby amended to add a new subsection as follows:*

- (h) *Driveways. All subdivisions whose principal access is on a state ~~or county~~ maintained road shall conform to the requirements described below:*

Driveway Separation Standards

<i>Road Speed Limit (mph) *</i>	<i>Minimum Spacing (ft) **</i>
<i>30 or less</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>35</i>	<i>150</i>
<i>40</i>	<i>200</i>
<i>45</i>	<i>250</i>
<i>50</i>	<i>300</i>
<i>55 plus</i>	<i>350</i>

Notes:

** Speed limits are determined by SCDOT*

*** The minimum spacing is measured between the driveway centerlines*

Maximum Number of Driveways

<i>Length of Frontage (ft) **</i>	<i>Maximum Number</i>
<i>200 or less</i>	<i>1*</i>
<i>200 to 600</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>600 to 1000</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1000 to 1500</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1500 plus</i>	<i>4, plus 1 for each 500 feet of frontage</i>

Notes:

** Frontage widths of 200 feet or less, a one-way-pair may be used if the internal circulation permits and wrong movements are extremely difficult*

*** The frontage widths apply to the parent parcel prior to the proposed project*

~~*Upon a request by an applicant, the Planning Commission may waive the driveway separation requirements if it finds that extraordinary circumstances exist in a specific case.*~~

C. Financial Impact

There is no public financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Enactment of the recommended text to amend the land development regulations in order to provide county regulation of driveway separation in new subdivisions on both county and state roads.
2. Enactment of the recommended text to amend the land development regulations in order to provide county regulation of driveway separation in new subdivisions on state roads only.
3. Denial of the recommended text to amend the land development regulations.

4. Return these amendments to the land development regulations to the Planning Commission for further study.

E. Recommendation

Recommended by: The Richland County Planning Commission Date: 9/10/01

The Planning Commission recommends alternate number one: enact the recommended text to amend the land development regulations in order to provide county regulation of driveway separation in new subdivisions on both county and state roads.

However, Planning Department staff suggests that the two minor amendments to the draft ordinance be made in order to make application of the ordinance more practical.

F. Approvals

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia Linder Date: 9/19/01
Comments:

Administration

Approved by: J. Milton Pope Date: 9/19/01
Comments:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Award of Contracts

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request County Council's consideration of the selection of engineering firms to provide engineering services on an "as-needed" basis for Public Works road projects

B. Background / Discussion

At its meeting of February 4, 1997 the County Council approved the selection of two engineering firms to provide "on-call" engineering services to the Public Works Department for road related projects. Contracts for engineering services were subsequently awarded to LPA Group, Inc. and Florence and Hutcheson, Inc. This arrangement by which two firms are under long term contracts for engineering services on an as-needed basis has proven to be very beneficial to the County in that engineering for a project can be initiated almost immediately without having to go through the selection process for each individual project. It should be noted that the selection of the firms was carried out in accordance with the RFQ process for procurement of professional services specified in County ordinance.

Since these contracts have now been in effect for four years, a new RFQ was advertised in June 2001 to allow other engineering firms to compete for them. The responses were received in the Procurement Department on July 19, 2001 and subsequently reviewed by a selection committee composed of:

Ralph Pearson	Public Works Department
Chris Truluck	Public Works Department
Andy Metts	Utilities Department
Ash Miller	County Administrator's Office

The firms submitting qualifications for these contracts were:

- LPA Group (LPA)
- Civil Engineering Consulting Services (CECS)
- Jordan, Jones and Goulding (J, J & G)
- Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung (H, G, B & D)
- Clark Patterson Associates (C P A)
- TBE Group, Inc. (T B E)
- Site Blauvelt Engineers
- Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. (Stantec)
- Power Engineering Co, Inc.(Power)
- Florence & Hutcheson, Inc. (F & H)
- Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA)

The factors by which the firms were evaluated were:

Performance History	35 points
Professional Qualifications	25 points
Previous Experience with County	25 points
<u>Location</u>	<u>15 points</u>
Total	100 points

Below is a tabulation of the types of design projects contemplated under this contract and the firms judged to be most qualified for them:

<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>1st Choice</u>	<u>2nd Choice</u>	<u>3rd Choice</u>
Pavement Reconstruction	LPA	WSA	F&H
Resurfacing	LPA	WSA	F&H
Paving	LPA	WSA	F&H
Widening	LPA	WSA	F&H
Sidewalks	LPA	WSA	F&H
Bridges	LPA	WSA	F&H
Drainage Improvements	LPA	WSA	F&H
Traffic Studies	LPA	WSA	F&H
Pavement management	WSA	Stantec	LPA
CAD/GIS Applications	WSA	Stantec	LPA

C. Financial Impact

Funding for the engineering services on roadway projects usually comes from either C funds, the Public Works budget, or economic development funds. No funding, therefore, is requested.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available are:

1. Approve award of contracts to three firms recommended by the selection committee.
Under this alternative, contracts would be awarded to LPA, WSA (Wilbur Smith Associates) and F&H (Florence & Hutcheson) for on-call engineering services. Projects would be assigned to the firms identified above as the most qualified for the type of project involved. An effort will also be made to distribute the work equitably among the three firms.
2. Continue the contracts currently in place.
The firms currently under contract are LPA and Florence & Hutcheson
3. Award no contracts
Under this alternative, initiation of the engineering for a project would require the publication of an RFQ, appointment of a selection committee, selection of the most qualified firm and approval of the selection by County Council. This is a 2 to 3 month process.

4. Reject the committee's selection and award to other firms

This is not considered a realistic alternative in that all the firms submitted qualifications in good faith in response to the County's solicitation and the selection was made in accordance with Richland County's ordinance for procurement of professional services.

E. Recommendation

Alternative 1 is recommended.

By: Ralph B. Pearson, P.E.

Department: Public Works

Date: 11/9/01

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Daniel Driggers

Date: November 14, 2001

Comments: As stated in Section C, there is no additional financial impact

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 11/21/01

Comments:

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 11/21/01

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/21/01

Comments: Recommend approval of the award of contracts for engineering services, on an as needed basis, to the LPA Group, Wilbur Smith Associates and Florence & Hutcheson.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Solid Waste Collection Contracts

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to advise the County Council of the termination of the County's contracts with Cloud Sanitation and subsequent action to employee new collectors in the affected service areas.

B. Background / Discussion

On June 26, 2001, at a Special Called Meeting, the County Council gave the County Administrator the authority to terminate contracts with Cloud Sanitation in solid waste collection areas 1, 4 and 5 if service in those areas did not immediately improve. As a result, the contract for area 5 was subsequently terminated and the area was split and reassigned to other solid waste collectors. Also, areas 2 and 3 were combined into one area to make it more consistent, in terms of number of residents, with the other service areas.

On October 4, 2001, Richland County was notified that the liability insurance policy held by Cloud Sanitation had lapsed on August 16, 2001, meaning that Cloud had been operating completely uninsured for approximately seven weeks despite the contractual obligation that adequate insurance must be in place throughout the term of the contract. Furthermore, Cloud Sanitation failed to notify the County of the lapse in insurance; instead, notification came from the insurance company.

The County Code calls for the automatic termination of a contract when the contractor allows his insurance to lapse and does not remedy this situation within fifteen days. Consequently, Cloud Sanitation was issued a notice of termination for all of its contracts with Richland County on October 24.

In anticipation of this action, Administration and Procurement requested informal proposals from solid waste collectors who may be able to assume the collection responsibilities for service areas 1 and 3, which Cloud held prior to the termination. Cloud also had a contract for service area 7; however, this area is subcontracted to Johnson's Garbage Service. The contract for area 7, therefore, has been shifted to Johnson's Garbage Service.

In response to the County's solicitation, proposals for long-term service in areas 1 and 3 were submitted by the following companies:

- Allwaste Services, Inc.
- Johnson's Garbage Service
- Southland Sanitation
- Whitaker Container
- Container Corporation of Carolina and Waste Management, Inc., chose not to submit long-term proposals.

For service area 3, proposals were received from Johnson's Garbage Service, Southland Sanitation and Whitaker Container Service. The terms and prices were as follows:

- **Johnson's Garbage Service**

- Five-year contract
 - Year 1: \$11.00 per household per month
 - Year 2: \$11.50 per household per month
 - Year 3: \$12.00 per household per month
 - Year 4: \$12.50 per household per month
 - Year 5: \$13.00 per household per month
- Three-year contract
 - Year 1: \$11.00 per household per month
 - Year 2: \$11.50 per household per month
 - Year 3: \$12.00 per household per month

- **Southland Sanitation**

- Five-year contract: \$9.92 per household per month
- Three-year contract: \$10.98 per household per month (negotiated to \$9.92 with a three percent increase per year)

- **Whitaker Container Service**

- Five-year or three-year contract: \$10.50 per household per month

Based on a five-year contract term, Southland Sanitation submitted the most advantageous proposal at \$9.92 per household per month for the life of the contract. The proposal represents an annual increase over the previous cost of \$190,428. With a three-year contract, the cost was negotiated with Southland at \$9.92 for the first year, but with an increase of three percent per year for the remaining two years.

Annualized, Southland's proposal for the first year, whether for a three- or five-year contract term, will cost the County \$1,079,454, compared to the next most advantageous proposal, submitted by Whitaker Container, which would have cost the County \$1,142,568, a difference of \$63,114.

For service area 1, proposals were received from Allwaste Services and Southland Sanitation. The terms and prices were as follows:

- **Allwaste Services**

- Five-year contract: \$8.79 per household per month
- Three-year contract (negotiated): \$9.64 per household per month

- **Southland Sanitation**

- Five-year contract: \$8.78 per household per month
- Three-year contract: \$9.98 per household per month

Even though Allwaste's proposal was one penny higher than Southland's for a five-year contract, the three-year contract was significantly lower. For Allwaste, the five-year cost represents an increase of \$60,348 per year over the amount formerly being paid to Cloud; the three-year contract represents a \$185,461 increase. Following the conclusion of the negotiations, Allwaste representatives were advised that the County could not enter into a contract unless and until the company's lawsuit against the County was settled.

Annualized, Allwaste's proposal for the first year of a three-year contract will cost the County \$1,418,930, compared to the next most advantageous proposal, submitted by Southland, which would have cost the County \$1,468,976, a difference of \$50,046.

Because of the emergency situation that existed and the immediate need to provide collection services in areas 1 and 3 following Cloud's termination, verbal approval by the County Administrator was given to Southland and Allwaste to begin preparations to undertake collections in these areas under the terms outlined above. Subsequently, three-year contracts were awarded to these companies by the County Administrator.

Based on the proposals that were submitted and follow-up negotiations with Southland and Allwaste, it is apparent that the County would save significantly on the cost of each contract if the term were to be extended from three to five years. The Council is, therefore, requested to consider such an extension for Southland in area 3 and Allwaste in area 1, as well as for Johnson in area 7. In addition to cost savings that these extensions would generate, the extensions would also stagger the terms of the County's solid waste collector contracts so that all contracts would not come up for bid at the same time.

C. Financial Impact

As noted above, the cost proposed by Allwaste for area 1 for a three-year contract represents an annual increase of \$185,461 over the amount of the previous contract. The increase is reduced to \$60,348 if the contract is extended to five years, which will save the County \$125,113.

The cost proposed by Southland for area 3 for a three-year contract represents a \$190,428 annual increase over the previous contract, plus three percent per year for the remaining two years. The increase will stabilize at \$190,428 if the contract is extended to five years, which will save the County approximately \$32,000 in the first year and \$65,000 in the second year.

The Council recently elected to delay a proposed solid waste fee increase of \$5 per year per household with the understanding that the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund will run a deficit in the current fiscal year. The increased costs for collections in areas 1 and 3 will add to this deficit, which is estimated to be \$650,000 including the increased costs in these two service areas.

D. Alternatives

1. Extend the contracts awarded to Southland, Allwaste and Johnson from three to five years. This alternative would save the County a significant amount of money and would stagger the terms of the solid waste collection contracts as opposed to having them all come up for bid at the same.
2. Leave the contract terms as they are, meaning that all contracts, including the ones just awarded to Southland, Allwaste and Johnson, would expire in December 2004.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that the contracts awarded to Southland, Allwaste and Johnson be extended from three to five years.

Recommended by: Tony McDonald, Assistant County Administrator

Date: 11/20/01

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/21/01

Comments: See Financial Impact section. Because the revenue is gathered from a service fee, the decision to allow fund to run in a deficit will affect subsequent years required fee structure.

Procurement

Approved by: Rodolfo A. Callwood

Date: 11-21-01

Comments:

Public Works

Approved by: Christopher S. Eversmann, PE Date: 21 November 2001

Comments: Recommend approval of alternative (1) listed in paragraph D. above.

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder Date: 11/21/01

Comments: Council will have to decide how to address the deficit issue.

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 11/21/01

Comments: It is recommended that the contracts awarded to Southland, Allwaste and Johnson be extended from three to five years.

**Service Area 1 (Northwest Richland County)
Allwaste Services, Inc.**

Year	Previous Annual Cost (\$8.38 per Household per Month)	New Annual Cost 3 Yr. Contract (\$9.64 per Household per Month)	Additional Annual Cost for 3 Yr. Contract	New Annual Cost 5 Yr. Contract (\$8.79 per Household per Month)	Additional Annual Cost for 5 Yr. Contract	Savings: 5 Yr. vs. 3 Yr. Contract
1	\$ 1,233,468.96	\$ 1,418,930.88	\$ 185,461.92	\$ 1,293,817.68	\$ 60,348.72	\$ 125,113.20
2	\$ 1,233,468.96	\$ 1,418,930.88	\$ 185,461.92	\$ 1,293,817.68	\$ 60,348.72	\$ 125,113.20
3	\$ 1,233,468.96	\$ 1,418,930.88	\$ 185,461.92	\$ 1,293,817.68	\$ 60,348.72	\$ 125,113.20
4				\$ 1,293,817.68		
5				\$ 1,293,817.68		

**Service Area 3 (North Central Richland County)
Southland Sanitation, Inc.**

Year	Previous Annual Cost (\$8.17 per Household per Month)	New Annual Cost 3 Yr. Contract (\$9.92 per Household per Month) *	Additional Annual Cost for 3 Yr. Contract	New Annual Cost 5 Yr. Contract (\$9.92 per Household per Month) **	Additional Annual Cost for 5 Yr. Contract	Savings: 5 Yr. vs. 3 Yr. Contract
1	\$ 889,026.72	\$ 1,079,454.72	\$ 190,428.00	\$ 1,079,454.72	\$ 190,428.00	\$ -
2	\$ 889,026.72	\$ 1,111,838.36	\$ 222,811.64	\$ 1,079,454.72	\$ 190,428.00	\$ 32,383.64
3	\$ 889,026.72	\$ 1,145,193.51	\$ 256,166.79	\$ 1,079,454.72	\$ 190,428.00	\$ 65,738.79
4				\$ 1,079,454.72		
5				\$ 1,079,454.72		

* With a three-year contract, the cost escalates by 3% each year in the second and third years.

** With a five-year contract, the cost remains stable for the entire term of the contract.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Support Letter

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to provide a letter to Central Midlands Council of Governments in support of a grant for Phase 1 renovations of the Curtis-Wright Hangar.

B. Background / Discussion

On December 6, 2001 the City of Columbia, on behalf of the Curtiss-Wright Hangar Association and the Celebrate Freedom Foundation, will submit to Central Midlands Council of Governments an application for a Transportation Enhancement Grant for phase 1 renovation of the Curtis-Wright Hangar.

Phase 1 renovations are primarily structural renovations to the supporting columns and truss system and include a new roof. This, of course, is a necessary step in the rehabilitation of this historic structure. The timing of the enhancement grant application is critical, as the money available is fiscal year 2002 funding, which permits construction in calendar year 2002. The Curtis-Wright Hangar Association sees this initial sum (approximately \$200,000) as a significant boost to their fundraising efforts.

County Council requested to submit a letter of support to be included in the application package.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve a letter of support.
2. Do not approve.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve a letter of support.

Recommended by: Ash Miller

Department: Administration

Date: 11/21/01

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 11/21/01

Comments: No financial impact as indicate above

Legal

Approved as to form by: Amelia R. Linder

Date: 11/21/01

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 11-21-01

Comments: Administration recommends approval of this request and also that this request be reviewed and considered by the Airport Commission.