
R2020-20 TO AMEND R2019-067 SETTING OUT THE CITY'S 2020 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA TO INDICATE CITY COUNCIL'S SUPPORT FOR SENATE BILL 869, THE "BEACH PRESERVATION TRUST ACT".

Applicant/Purpose: Council/to amend the City's Legislative Agenda for 2020 to indicate support for SB869.

Brief:

- R2019-067, approved 11-26-19 set out Council's position on 8 bills filed but not acted upon in 2020 (all opposed in part or in whole except S227):
 1. Highest Priority: H4431 - SC Business License Tax Reform.
 2. High Priority: H4745 - Legacy County-Wide Hospitality Fees.
 3. High Priority: H4262/SB638- Small Wireless Facilities Deployment.
 4. Priority: H4516 Rental of Residential Building.
 5. Priority: Bill H3274: Cigarettes and Nicotine Products.
 6. Priority: HB3968/S590: Asset Forfeiture & Private Property Act.
 7. H4482: Housing Attainability Act.
 8. S394: Auxiliary Containers.
 9. S227: Millage Rate Increase Limitations.
- The resolution also calls upon the legislature to consider new legislation to:
 1. Amend the distribution of Federal opioid funds for greater local discretion.
 2. Amend State law to change the process of reclamation of tenant's possessions.
 3. To grant representation on the Grand Strand Water & Sewer Authority's Board.
- The proposed amendment is to indicate Council's support for S869 "The Beach Preservation Trust Act".

Issues:

- The proposal dedicates a revenue source (25% of State 5% Admissions Tax Revenues - estimated at \$8.4 million annually) to meet 50% of the local match requirement for beach renourishment or to repair storm damage to the dunes or the beach.
- As proposed the Trust Fund would be administered by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism.
- Typically 65% of beach renourishment costs are covered by the Army Corps of Engineers. The remaining 35% local match has been split equally by the City & State.

Public Notification: Normal meeting notification.

Alternatives:

- Do not approve a legislative agenda for the 2020 session.
- Amend the proposed agenda.

Financial Impact: This bill certainly makes the State's funding of local match requirements a much more certain thing. Without this dedicated source of funding, the State's portion of the local match is subject to annual appropriation in the State budget.

Manager's Recommendation: I recommend approval.

Attachment(s): Proposed agenda.

RESOLUTION R2020-020

CITY OF MYRTLE BEACH
COUNTY OF HORRY
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

**RESOLUTION R2020-020 AMENDING R2019-067
SETTING OUT THE CITY'S 2020 LEGISLATIVE
AGENDA TO INDICATE CITY COUNCIL'S
SUPPORT FOR SENATE BILL 869, THE "BEACH
PRESERVATION TRUST ACT".**

WHEREAS, the South Carolina legislature convened on Tuesday January 14, 2020; and

WHEREAS, there are a number of bills filed in 2019 that are of significant concern to the City of Myrtle Beach that were not acted upon by the Legislature, and remain on the table for consideration in the 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City also desired to submit several new matters for the consideration of the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desired to respectfully articulate a position on these matters of legislative significance to our local Delegation in the form of this Legislative Agenda; and

WHEREAS, City Council approved R2019-067 on November 26, 2019 as a mean of conveying these positions to the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, now that the Legislature is in session, it will be necessary to amend the City's Legislative Agenda to set forth City Council's position on newly introduced legislation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council,

1. Hereby amends the attached summary of its 2020 Legislative Agenda to indicate support for proposed Senate Bill S869, "The Beach Preservation Trust Act".
2. Respectfully requests that the Horry County Legislative Delegation consider this additional position.
3. Directs the Manager to immediately send notice of Council's position on this matter to each member of the Horry County legislative Delegation upon approval of this resolution.

SIGNED, SEALED and DATED, this 25th day of February, 2020.

BRENDA BETHUNE, MAYOR

ATTEST:

JENNIFER STANFORD, CITY CLERK



PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE AGENDA PROCESS

Highest Priority – H4745 – Legacy County Hospitality Fees

- **BRIEF:** This bill would legislatively re-authorize and restore the previous County Hospitality Fee, which is the subject of a lawsuit between the City of Myrtle Beach (on behalf of 6 other municipalities in Horry County) and the County. Once the expired fee is restored the bill provides that the funds be used to build an interstate or roads connecting to such interstates. The bill also provides that the County shall “distribute the statutory tax imposed by the municipality..” back to the municipality less up to 1% for cost of collections.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** The City & Horry County have been in mediation for several months to resolve this dispute. While bound by a confidentiality agreement, both sides have publicly indicated that an agreement in principle has been reached. The proposed legislation jeopardizes the approval of this agreement. The City is strenuously opposed.
- **RATIONALE:** H4745 is an unprecedented intrusion into a local issue that is well on the way to being resolved by the parties in dispute.

Highest Priority – H4745 – Legacy County Hospitality Fees

- **Status of Bill:** Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.
- **Sponsors:** Fry, Clemmons, Crawford, & McGinnis.

Highest Priority – H4431 – SC Business License Tax Reform

- **BRIEF**: This bill radically alters the existing business license structure by nearly eliminating fees for businesses not domiciled in the jurisdiction in which the license is levied, and by redefining the basis of the fee from “Gross Revenues” to “Business Taxable [Net] Income”.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION**: The City supports previous efforts to make the business license ordinance more uniform from one jurisdiction to the next, and the development of a “portal” to greatly simplify the payment of fees by businesses that operate in multiple jurisdictions. The amendments proposed in this bill, however, go to the heart of the City’s ability to operate, and are strenuously opposed.
- **RATIONALE**: As proposed this bill would have a devastating impact on the City’s ability to maintain current service levels and to fund basic public services including Police, Fire, Infrastructure Maintenance, Recreation, etc. Further the bill would transfer a greater proportion of the costs of local government to the residential sector, away from non-residents that purchase the goods or consume the services. The bill is a disincentive for new businesses to locate within the corporate limits, and an incentive for existing businesses to move out of a municipality.

Highest Priority – H4431 – SC Business License Tax Reform

- **Status of Bill:** In House Committee on Labor, Commerce, and Industry
- **Sponsors:** Jordan, Fry, Rose, Atkinson, Forrest, Anderson, Hyde, B. Cox, Elliott, Morgan, B. Newton, Rutherford, Long, Magnuson, Clemmons, Davis, Taylor, Hewitt and Pope

HIGH PRIORITY - H4262/SB638: Small Wireless Facilities Deployment

- **BRIEF:** These bills prohibits local authorities from denying, regulating, or charging for collocation of small cell wireless facilities; requires these facilities be classified as permitted uses; and generally exempts them from zoning review/approval. These bills also include requirements relating to applications, fees, application review, issuance of permits, and collocation of small wireless facilities. These bills prohibit state and local governments from regulating design, engineering, construction, installation, or operation of cellular facilities. Lastly, these bills give the administrative court jurisdiction over related disputes, and prohibits local authorities from requiring that wireless providers name them as additional insureds on the provider's insurance policy.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** Oppose as written. Do not oppose the provisions relating to compensation to these companies. Discuss with sponsors to arrive at a position that recognizes communities' aesthetic investments, and the need to provide indemnification for the local units in which this infrastructure is deployed.
- **RATIONALE:** The City benefits from deployment of small cell infrastructure throughout the community, and is not opposed to the restrictions on fees that can be charged to such firms for the use of the rights-of-way. The City has, however, spent millions to improve the aesthetic appeal of these areas. The City is committed to a process allowing for needed cellular service improvements, and has adopted "safe-harbor" provisions to this effect. The City also opposes the proposed prohibition that leaves the local units exposed to the financial consequences of accidents involving this infrastructure.

HIGH PRIORITY - H4262/SB638: Small Wireless Facilities Deployment

- **Status of Bill:** Passed House. In Senate Committee on Judiciary.
Passed to subcommittee: Gambrell, Hutto, Massey, Sabb, Climer
- **Sponsors:** Regulations and Administrative Procedures Committee

PRIORITY – H4516 Rental of Residential Building

- **BRIEF**: This bill prohibits counties and municipalities from enacting or enforcing regulations to restrict the rental of a residential dwelling to short-term guests.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION**: Oppose. This proposal would nullify the prohibition of short-term rentals (less than 30 days) in residentially zoned districts. These prohibitions are necessary to maintain the quality of life in the for our residents.
- **RATIONALE**: This bill preempts a very important decision that should reflect the unique needs of different communities. As a City with millions of annual tourists, it is important to safeguard Myrtle Beach's permanent residential areas from those in which our tourists stay. This bill effectively pre-empts longstanding zoning prohibitions on the rental of properties for less than 30 days in a residentially zoned district.

PRIORITY – H4516 Rental of Residential Building

- **Status of Bill:** In House Committee on Labor, Commerce, and Industry
- **Sponsors:** Reps. Hewitt and Hill

PRIORITY - Bill H3274: Cigarettes and Nicotine Products

- **BRIEF**: Provides that cities, towns and counties may not enact any laws, ordinances, or rules pertaining to ingredients, flavors, licensing of cigarettes, electronic cigarettes, tobacco products, or alternative nicotine products. Any laws, ordinances, or rules enacted by a political subdivision prior to January 1, 2019 are not subject to this preemption.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION**: Oppose. Now that vaping has been shown to significantly increase health risks, especially among youth, the State should not take a position to increase those risks still further.
- **Rationale**: To approve this law in view of the associated health risks opens a real potential of huge additional health care costs for the individual and for all levels of government. Further the bill does not recognize the unique nature of each community. Again this is a decision better left to the discretion of local government leaders to recognize the potential costs and benefits that such facilities may have in that community.

PRIORITY - Bill H3274: Cigarettes and Nicotine Products

- **Status of Bill:** Passed House. Out of Senate Committee on Medical Affairs. Report favorable with amendments.
- **Sponsors:** Reps. Simrill, Rutherford, Ligon, Taylor, Loftis, Hixon, Gilliard, West, Bannister and King

PRIORITY: HB3968/S590: Asset Forfeiture & Private Property Act

- **BRIEF:** This bill changes the current rules relating to the forfeiture of assets directly related to criminal activity. There are two types of forfeitures – those made voluntarily & those made in Civil Court pursuant to a Judge's order. 75% of each forfeiture is awarded to the arresting agency; 20% goes to the local Solicitor; and 5% goes to the State. Of the amount retained by the local agency, the first \$1,000 may be used for any related purpose, and the remainder must be used for drug enforcement. The funds cannot supplant those already budgeted. During the past year a report from the Upstate identified abuses of the current law. The proposed amendment makes such forfeitures (including weapons) subject to action in the related felony, and restricts the distribution to local law enforcement to "investigation costs excluding salaries" (balance to the State's General Fund).
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** Request that the Sponsors meet with the SC Police Chief's Association to work out a position that provides adequate oversight of the uses of these funds without taking away this important law enforcement tool.
- **RATIONALE:** The vast majority of law enforcement agencies, including the City of Myrtle Beach, have followed the existing law rigorously. Current law already provides a means by which a defendant can dispute the forfeiture. Given the nationwide battle to curb the opioid epidemic, this is not the time to take tools away from law enforcement. The abuses of the few can be dealt with effectively by tweaking the current law.

PRIORITY: HB3968/S590: Asset Forfeiture & Private Property Act

- **Status of Bill:** In House Committee on Judiciary

- **Sponsors:** Reps. Clemmons, Cobb-Hunter, Rutherford, Mace, Allison, Caskey, Clary, Cogswell, Crawford, Daning, Fry, Gagnon, Hewitt, Hixon, Johnson, Magnuson, McKnight, B. Newton, W. Newton, Pendarvis, Rose, G.R. Smith, Taylor, Yow, King, R. Williams, Jefferson, Henegan, Ott, Simmons, Mack, Gilliard, Alexander, Anderson, Atkinson, Bailey, Bamberg, Bannister, Brawley, Burns, Chellis, Chumley, Clyburn, Collins, B. Cox, W. Cox, Dillard, Elliott, Erickson, Forrest, Forrester, Garvin, Govan, Hart, Hayes, Herbkersman, Jordan, Loftis, McDaniel, McGinnis, Morgan, Norrell, Rivers, Robinson, Sandifer, G.M. Smith, Stavrinakis, Stringer, Thayer, Thigpen, Trantham, Weeks, Wheeler, Whitmire, S. Williams, Willis, McCoy, Long, Sottile, Ligon, Young, Blackwell, Kimmons, Henderson-Myers, Brown, Bennett, Bales, Ridgeway, Funderburk, Parks, Hill, Huggins, Ballentine, Kirby, Hiott, White, Moore, Hosey, Howard, West and Lucas

H4482: Housing Attainability Act

- **BRIEF**: This bill requires state agencies, counties, and municipalities to prepare a detailed, specifically prescribed housing impact analysis for any action that could impact certain housing costs (including property taxes, sales prices, rental rates, etc.). The bill also requires an annual report on the fulfillment of the Housing Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION**: Oppose. Nearly every local decision could arguably effect housing costs.
- **RATIONALE**: The study requirements are overly broad, and beyond the capability of most local units. This action significantly stifles local government actions to improve the quality of living in each community. The industry has other options for monitoring proposals that could effect housing costs.

H4482: Housing Attainability Act

- **Status of Bill:** In Committee on Ways and Means
- **Sponsors:** Reps. Simrill, Pendarvis, S. Williams, Rivers, Clyburn, Simmons, Gilliard, Alexander, Anderson, Garvin, Hosey, Ott, Hill, Kirby, Henderson-Myers, Brawley, Cobb-Hunter, Robinson, Moore, Hewitt, Henegan, McDaniel, Ligon and Forrest.

S394: Auxiliary Containers

- **BRIEF:** This bill provides that any regulation of “auxiliary containers” must be done by the General Assembly, rather than local governments. The bill contains a number of exemptions including exemptions for city and county owned property, and public beaches. Auxiliary containers are defined as bags, cups, packages, containers, bottles or other packaging designed primarily for protecting merchandise, food, or beverages from or at a food service or retail facility.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** Oppose. While the City does not at present have any restrictions on auxiliary containers, this legislation would prohibit the City from adopting any in the future.
- **Rationale:** This legislative exemption act does not recognize unique community differences of each unit, and the effect those differences may have on the need for differing policy positions. This is a matter better left to the discretion of local officials to recognize these unique circumstances.

S394: Auxiliary Containers

- **Status of Bill:** Out of Senate Committee on Labor, Commerce, and Industry. Report favorable.
- **Sponsors:** Senators Talley and Climer

S227: Millage Rate Increase Limitations

- **BRIEF:** This bill allows a municipality without an operating millage on January 1, 2019 to impose a millage in an amount up to one-third of the amount of their General Fund. Current law restricts the amount of the millage increase that a town may impose based on the previous millage rate. When the basis is zero, it is mathematically impossible to begin to levy any millage rate at all.
- **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** Support. While this law has no effect on the City of Myrtle Beach, we recognize that smaller units of local government may need to impose property taxes in order to fund municipal services.
- **RATIONALE:** Although this bill doesn't directly affect Myrtle Beach, it allows the City to support those small municipalities who may need to adopt their millage after the effective date.

S227: Millage Rate Increase Limitations

- **Status of Bill:** Passed in Senate. Out of House Committee on Ways and Means. Report favorable. Requested for debate.
- **Sponsor:** Senator Grambrell

S869: Beach Preservation Trust Act (proposed amendment for 02/25/2020)

▪ **BRIEF:** This bill sets aside funding to:

- Providing matching funds to qualifying municipal & county governments for the restoration of eroded public beaches and enhancement of public beach access.
- Restoring beaches & sand dunes on an emergency basis after significant storm damage.

The funding source would be 25% of the State's 5% Admissions Taxes which would go into a Trust Fund administered by the State Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism. These funds would be held by the Department to meet up to 50% of the local share of beach renourishment projects. The local unit would have to come up with the remaining match.

▪ **RECOMMENDED POSITION:** Support.

- **RATIONALE:** As nearly all the beaches in the state have recently been renourished, the purpose of this bill is to develop an ongoing funding source that can build up over time to fund 50% of the local match for the next round of beach renourishment projects. In past projects, the federal share normally is 65% of the total, and the state and local units split the remaining 35%. The trust fund could also be used to repair beaches & dunes damaged by major storms. The State projects an annual contribution from this source starting at \$8.4 million.

S869: Beach Preservation Trust Act (proposed amendment for 02/25/2020)

- **Status of Bill:** Introduced on January 14, 2020. Currently, in Senate Committee on Fish, Game, and Forestry.
- **Sponsor:** Senator Campsen

New Legislative Proposal: Amend the Process of Distributing Federal Opioid Funds to Allow Greater Local Discretion

Explanation:

- The House's Opioid Abuse Prevention Study Committee report entitled "January 2019 Update to Findings and Recommendations" includes the following recommendation:

"Encourage the Development of Community Coordinating Councils. Update: Several communities across the state have developed coordinated efforts through local leadership, law enforcement, healthcare providers, and stakeholders to include partners in the public and private sectors, and faith-based organizations to address OUD at the local level. DAODAS is continuing to work with and support additional community coalitions through the Empowering Communities for Healthy Outcomes (ECHO) model that specifically addresses prescription drug abuse and misuse."

- The City respectfully request that the distribution of Federal Opioid funding be adjusted to allow funding of such local agencies, and consultation with such agencies with respect to the distribution of Federal Opioid funding within the jurisdiction of such agency.
- The City is currently engaged in an effort to develop such a partnership between units of local government in Horry and Georgetown Counties.
- The City respectfully requests that each unit of local government be allowed input into the distribution process so that the unique needs of each community may be addressed.

New Legislative Proposal: Amend Landlord and Tenant Act to Change Process of Reclamation of Tenant's Possessions.

Explanation:

- Per current law:

"Personal property belonging to a tenant removed from a premises as a result of an eviction ... which is placed on a public street or highway shall be removed by the appropriate municipal or county officials after a period of 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, & holidays, & may also be removed by these officials in the normal course of debris or trash collection before or after a period of 48 hours.... The notice of eviction must clearly inform the tenant of the provisions of this section. The municipality or county and the appropriate officials or employees thereof have no liability in regard to the tenant if he is not informed in the notice of eviction of the provisions of this section."

- The application of this law often results in the removal of these items from the roadway by persons other than the tenant, & an unsightly scattering of the tenants' possessions along the roadway, which the City may be illegally unable to mitigate.
- The City respectfully requests that the Legislature consider re-establishing the previous requirement that gave the tenant 48 hours to remove belongings from the interior of the structure, or, upon the landlord's request and at the landlord's expense, and upon the magistrate's order, any other remedy for the removal of the tenant's personal possessions that is at least as likely to reunite the tenant with their belongings.

New Legislative Proposal: Board Representation on the Grand Strand Water and Sewer Authority's Board of Directors

Explanation: The City of Myrtle Beach is the largest single customer of Grand Strand Water and Sewer Authority, but has no dedicated representation on the Authority's eight member Board of Directors. Recent events have highlighted the need to engage in planning the infrastructure needs of this growing community on a regional basis. The current number of Board Members is set by State law. An amendment of this law would be necessary to ensure City representation on the Board.

South Carolina General Assembly
123rd Session, 2019-2020

S. 869

STATUS INFORMATION

General Bill

Sponsors: Senator Campsen

Introduced in the Senate on January 14, 2020

Currently residing in the Senate Committee on Fish, Game and Forestry

Summary: Beach Restoration and Improvement Trust Fund

HISTORY OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

12/11/2019 Senate Prefiled

12/11/2019 Senate Referred to Committee on Fish, Game and Forestry

01/14/2020 Senate Introduced and read first time

01/14/2020 Senate Referred to Committee on Fish, Game and Forestry

CHAPTER 25

Beach Preservation Trust Act

Section 51-25-10. As used in this chapter:

(1) 'Trust fund' means the South Carolina Beach Preservation Trust Fund.

(2) 'Department' means the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism.

(3) 'Beach renourishment' means the artificial establishment and periodic renourishment of a beach with sand that is compatible with the existing beach in a way so as to create a dry sand beach at all stages of the tide, as described in Section 48-39-270, to include where considered appropriate and necessary by the OCRM, groin construction and maintenance to extend the life of such projects.

(4) 'OCRM' means the Office of Ocean Coastal Resource Management of the Department of Health and Environmental Control.

Section 51-25-20. There is established the South Carolina Beach Preservation Trust Fund for the purposes of:

(1) providing matching funds to qualifying municipal and county governments for the restoration of eroded public beaches and improvement and enhancement of public beach access; and

(2) restoring beaches and protective sand dunes on an emergency basis after significant storm damage.

Section 51-25-30.

(A) The trust fund must be funded by annual appropriations from admissions tax revenues. The appropriated monies must be credited to the trust fund and maintained separately from the general fund and other funds. The monies credited to the trust fund must be retained and carried forward, along with all interest earned.

- 1 (B) The trust fund must be administered by the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism
2 pursuant to this chapter and its regulations governing grant application review, ranking,
3 and approval.
4
- 5 Section 51-25-40.
- 6 (A) Beginning in Fiscal Year 2020-2021, and each fiscal year thereafter, the General Assembly
7 must appropriate an amount equal to twenty five percent of the general fund portion of
8 admissions tax revenues to the department for credit to the trust fund.
- 9 (B) Allocations of trust fund monies for public beach restoration and maintenance or
10 improvement and enhancement of public beach access must be matched equally by the
11 municipality or county in which a project site is located or by a combination of the county
12 and municipality in which the project site is located.
- 13 (1) If a project site is located within both a municipality and an unincorporated area
14 of a county, then the match must be financed in proportion to the area of the site
15 located within the respective jurisdictions unless otherwise agreed to by the
16 respective jurisdictions.
- 17 (2) The matching requirement of this subsection does not apply to beach
18 renourishment projects within state parks or other state-owned beachfront
19 property.
- 20 (C) Trust fund allocations for a public beach restoration or maintenance project or project to
21 improve and enhance public beach access must be made only to a project approved by
22 the department.
- 23 (D) Municipal and county jurisdictions which apply for matching funds for proposed projects
24 must be:
- 25 (1) ranked in relation to all other qualifying local governmental project applications;
26 and
- 27 (2) approved according to the minimum regulatory criteria for construction within the
28 beach and dune critical area.
- 29 (E) An application for trust fund monies for a public beach restoration or maintenance project
30 or project to improve and enhance public beach access may be accepted by the
31 department only from a municipal or county government with a Local Beach Management
32 Plan approved by the OCRM.
- 33 (F) An application pursuant to this section for matching funds for a public beach
34 renourishment project may be accepted and ranked by the department only if the project
35 first has been fully permitted and approved as otherwise provided by law.
- 36 (G) Allocations of trust fund monies must be made through properly executed written
37 agreements between the department and all the municipal and county project sponsors.
38 The department must be given quarterly financial status reports throughout the project's
39 duration and a final audit report at the project's completion.
- 40 (H) State funds appropriated and designated for funding local efforts pursuant to this section
41 may be used only for the purposes of public beach access improvement and enhancement
42 and public beach restoration and maintenance projects."
43
- 44 SECTION 2. Chapter 40, Title 48 of the 1976 Code is repealed.
45
- 46 SECTION 3. This act takes effect upon approval by the Governor.

Based on the direction provided from Councilman Lowder, we have drafted a proposal to discontinue the use of overtime for ocean rescue coverage. While we appreciate the intent of this, and certainly don't disagree some change is needed, we do not support the removal of all OT for ocean rescue coverage. The need is not the same in the cooler months as it is in the warmer ones. We do believe the current model of eight off-duty personnel is not sustainable for the long term and our ability to cover all eight slots supports this. However, we do not believe completely going to year-round coverage full-bore is the appropriate action at this point. There are unintended consequences of switching to this model I will be happy to discuss in greater detail.

Also, it must be clear that this proposal cannot be implemented this year, we do not have the people. We still fully support the addition of two ocean rescue lieutenants and hope to be able to have them in place by May if they are funded.

Ocean Rescue Proposal without Overtime effective for 2021

- ❖ Requires hiring 18 additional people; 6 per shift.
- ❖ Incentive pay for the rescue swimmers must be implemented, similar to the paramedic compensation.

Coverage from mid-May until Labor Day

- Provide two 24-hour on-duty ocean rescue units with a crew of two.
- Provide one on-duty daytime ocean rescue unit with a crew of two.
- Provide an on-duty third ambulance.
- Will still have BC Mitchell and the two ocean rescue lieutenants available if the 2020 plan is approved.

Remainder of the Year Coverage

- One on-duty water rescue unit with a crew of two, year-round, 24 hours per day, every day.
- Ability to staff a second on-duty ocean rescue unit as the weather dictates. More than likely the second unit will be staffed over spring break, then in May & Sept. as well.
- Any overage of personnel will be assigned to fire apparatus in an attempt to meet the national standard of four personnel staffing.
- Will still have BC Mitchell and the two ocean rescue lieutenants available if the 2020 plan is approved.

Cost

- Hire 18 entry-level firefighters at the current salary of \$35,819 = \$644,742 salary only.
- Overtime savings of approximately \$100,000.
- Anticipated salary savings with the retirements of Maxwell, Lewis, Floyd = \$115,000.
- One time cost of recruit school training, \$995 x 18 people = \$17,910.
- Initial cost of gear, uniforms, etc., \$5,000 x 18 people = \$90,000

Below is an additional model that we prefer. It builds off the foundation we want to lay this year with the two ocean rescue supervisors, and is just the next step. This is a hybrid system of increased on-duty staffing along with a decrease in overtime. Obviously, the summertime is the busiest time for all of us, but especially on the beach. The coverage data shows we can support filling overtime slots for five people. This plan will utilize 4 overtime people.

Ocean Rescue Proposal with Hybrid On-Duty & Overtime effective for 2021

- ❖ Requires hiring 9 additional people; 3 per shift.
- ❖ Incentive pay for the rescue swimmers must be implemented, similar to the paramedic compensation.

Coverage from mid-May until Labor Day

- Provide one 24-hour on-duty ocean rescue unit with a crew of two.
- Provide two off-duty daytime ocean rescue units with a crew of two. Four, 8-hour OT slots.
- Provide an on-duty third ambulance.
- Will still have BC Mitchell and the two ocean rescue lieutenants available if the 2020 plan is approved.

Remainder of the Year Coverage

- Staff one on-duty water rescue unit with a crew of two, year-round, 24 hours per day, every day.
- Ability to staff additional off-duty ocean rescue units as the weather dictates. Probably staff two OT slots over spring break, May & Sept.
- Any overage of personnel will be assigned to fire apparatus in an attempt to meet the national standard of four personnel staffing.
- Will still have BC Mitchell and the two ocean rescue lieutenants available if the 2020 plan is approved.

Cost

- Hire 9 entry-level firefighters at the current salary of \$35,819 = \$322,371 salary only.
- Overtime savings of approximately \$36,000.
- Anticipated salary savings with the retirements of Maxwell, Lewis, Floyd = \$115,000.
- One time cost of recruit school training, \$995 x 9 people = \$8,955.
- Initial cost of gear, uniforms, etc., \$5,000 x 9 people = \$45,000.

See the tables below for a rough cost calculation and comparison.

Rough Cost Comparison for Salary Only

Table 1: No Overtime Model

18 Entry Level Firefighters	18	\$35,819	\$644,742
Overtime Reduction			\$100,000
Anticipated Salary Savings			\$115,000
Total Projected			\$429,742

Table 2: Hybrid On-duty & Summer OT Model

9 Entry Level Firefighters	9	\$35,819	\$322,371
Overtime Reduction			\$36,000
Anticipated Salary Savings			\$115,000
Total Projected			\$171,371

Rough Cost Comparison for Initial Training & Clothing

Table 3: No Overtime Model

Initial Training	18	\$995	\$17,910
Initial Gear, Uniforms, etc.	18	\$5,000	\$90,000
Start-up Cost Projection			\$107,910

Table 4: Hybrid On-duty & Summer OT Model

Initial Training	9	\$995	\$8,955
Initial Gear, Uniforms, etc.	9	\$5,000	\$45,000
Start-up Cost Projection			\$53,955