Fiscal Year 2014-15
Agency Budget Plan

FORM A — SUMMARY

Recurring Funds
(FORM B
Decision Packages)

My agency is submitting the following recurring decision packages (Form B): 539 & 712

For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):

- [X] Requesting a net increase in recurring General Fund appropriations.
- [ ] Not requesting a net increase in recurring General Fund appropriations.

Capital & Non-Recurring Funds
(FORM C
Decision Packages)

My agency is submitting the following one-time decision packages (Form C):
715, 1314, 1320, 1323, 1326, 1329

For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):

- [X] Requesting capital and/or non-recurring funds.
- [ ] Not requesting capital and/or non-recurring funds.

Provisos

For FY 2014-15, my agency is (mark "X"):

- [X] Requesting a new proviso and/or substantive changes to existing provisos.
- [X] Only requesting technical proviso changes (such as date references).
- [ ] Not requesting any proviso changes.

Please identify your agency’s preferred contacts for this year’s budget process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Contact: Amy Duffy</td>
<td>(803) 734-3272</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ADuffy@scppt.com">ADuffy@scppt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Contact: Yvette Sistare</td>
<td>(803) 734-1759</td>
<td><a href="mailto:YSistare@scppt.com">YSistare@scppt.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have reviewed and approved the enclosed FY 2014-15 Agency Budget Plan, which is complete and accurate to the extent of my knowledge.

AGENCY DIRECTOR
(Sign/Date):
Duane Parrish
10/1/13

This form must be signed by the department head – not a delegate.

A-1
FORM B – PROGRAM REVISION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE

Undiscovered SC Enhancement Grant Program

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT

$1,000,000

What is the net change in requested appropriations for FY 2014-15? This amount should correspond to the decision package’s total in PBF across all funding sources.

ENABLING AUTHORITY

What state or federal statutory, regulatory, and/or administrative authority established this program? Is this decision package prompted by the establishment of or a revision to that authority?

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REQUEST

Mark “X” for all that apply:

- Change in cost of providing current services to existing program audience.
- Non-mandated change in eligibility / enrollment for existing program.
- Change in case load / enrollment under existing program guidelines.
- Non-mandated program change in service levels or areas.
- Loss of federal or other external financial support for existing program.
- Exhaustion of fund balances previously used to support program.
- X Proposed establishment of a new program or initiative.

RECIPIENTS OF FUNDS

This grant program will be open to rural tourism attractions that are owned/operated by local or state government entities or not-for-profit organizations (provided that they apply through a government organization) and will support only those projects that have already completed all planning phases and demonstrated the financial capacity to meet the match funding requirements.

What individuals or entities would receive these funds (contractors, vendors, grantees, individual beneficiaries, etc.)? How would these funds be allocated – using an existing formula, through a competitive process, based upon predetermined eligibility criteria?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agency Name:</strong></th>
<th>SC Parks, Recreation &amp; Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Code:</strong></td>
<td>P280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Request(s)**

This does not relate to any other requests.

*Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?*

**Matching Funds**

The match requirement for the grant will be a 1:1 ratio. The grant program match will not allow in-kind contributions to meet the match requirements of the program. Grant funds may only be used for hard costs associated with project construction, but may not be used for ancillary development costs such as landscaping or general recurring maintenance needs.

*Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.*

**Funding Alternatives**

SCPRT does not have any other means to support a grant program of this size.

*What other possible funding sources were considered? Could this request be met in whole or in part with the use of other resources, including fund balances? If so, please comment on the sustainability of such an approach.*

**Summary**

The primary goal of the Undiscovered SC marketing program is to spread the benefits of tourism to South Carolina’s rural areas by promoting destinations that lack the individual resources to create widespread, significant exposure for their respective tourism attractions, events and amenities.

South Carolina’s rural areas contain some of our state’s greatest cultural attractions and recreational opportunities; however, many of these attractions lack the financial resources for development, which limits their ability to evolve into significant tourism drivers for their respective destinations.

For the purpose of enhancing South Carolina’s Undiscovered tourism inventory through targeted rural tourism development, the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism proposes the creation of an Undiscovered SC Enhancement Grant Program.

This grant program will be designed to provide matched funding assistance for the “bricks & mortar” development of attractions that will generate increased non-local tourism visitation to South Carolina’s Undiscovered travel destinations. In addition to generating new tourism visitation, these attractions will boost current tourism impacts by encouraging longer stays and increased visitor spending.
The underlying benefit of this program is that it will allow SCPRT to work with local, rural communities in the development of tourism attractions that complement our state’s existing tourism infrastructure. In steering this process, SCPRT can better ensure that approved projects are those that will both optimize use of state resources, are coordinated with SCPRT’s Undiscovered marketing direction, and provide the greatest comprehensive benefit to the state’s rural tourism industry.

Provide a summary of the rationale for the decision package. Why has it been requested? How specifically would the requested funds be used?
### Method of Calculation

How was the amount of the request calculated? What factors could cause deviations between the request and the amount that could ultimately be required in order to perform the underlying work?

### Future Impact

SCPRT will not incur any recurring operating cost increase to support this program. SCPRT will use existing staff to administer this grant program.

Will the state incur any maintenance-of-effort or other obligations by adopting this decision package? What impact will there be on future capital and/or operating budgets if this request is or is not honored? Has a source of any such funds been identified and/or obtained by your agency?

### Prioritization

SCPRT would not be able to proceed with this program without general fund support.

If no or insufficient new funds are available in order to meet this need, how would the agency prefer to proceed? By using fund balances, generating new revenue, cutting other programs, or deferring action on this request in FY 2014-15?
### INTENDED IMPACT

What impact is this decision package intended to have on service delivery and program outcomes, and over what period of time?

### PROGRAM EVALUATION

The ultimate goal of this program will be to generate increased visitor spending and assist projects that will have a direct impact on our state’s economy, those projects that collect state admissions tax will be given higher priority during grant cycles. The effectiveness of this program will be measured by analyzing tax collections such as state admissions tax, accommodations tax or sales tax.

How would the use of these funds be evaluated? What specific outcome or performance measures would be used to assess the effectiveness of this program?
**AGENCY NAME:** SC Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
**AGENCY CODE:** P280  
**SECTION:** 49

## Form B – Program Revision Request

### Decision Package

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

### Title

Parks and Recreation Development Fund – Increase in other fund authorization

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

### Amount

$500,000

What is the net change in requested appropriations for FY 2014-15? This amount should correspond to the decision package’s total in PBF across all funding sources.

### Enabling Authority

Section 51-23-20

What state or federal statutory, regulatory, and/or administrative authority established this program? Is this decision package prompted by the establishment of or a revision to that authority?

### Factors Associated with the Request

Mark “X” for all that apply:

- Change in cost of providing current services to existing program audience. **X**
- Non-mandated change in eligibility / enrollment for existing program.
- Change in case load / enrollment under existing program guidelines.
- Non-mandated program change in service levels or areas.
- Loss of federal or other external financial support for existing program.
- Exhaustion of fund balances previously used to support program.
- Proposed establishment of a new program or initiative.

### Recipients of Funds

The PARD grant program is a state funded non-competitive reimbursable grant program for eligible local government or special purposes district entities within each county which provide recreational opportunities.

What individuals or entities would receive these funds (contractors, vendors, grantees, individual beneficiaries, etc.)? How would these funds be allocated – using an existing formula, through a competitive process, based upon predetermined eligibility criteria?
**Related Request(s)**

None

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

**Matching Funds**

The local government grantees are responsible for the 20% match required on these grant funds.

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

**Funding Alternatives**

What other possible funding sources were considered? Could this request be met in whole or in part with the use of other resources, including fund balances? If so, please comment on the sustainability of such an approach.

SCPRT’s other fund authorization for the Parks and Recreation Development fund was $1,352,000 for FY12/13 of which $1,244,392 was expended. The grantees have three years to spend the funds once allocated. As of September 19, 2013 the PARD program has $868,809 in grant funds allocated to grantees and $1,746,657 pending allocation by the Legislative Delegations. SCPRT needs the additional other fund authorizations to meet the future financial demands of the program.

**Summary**

Provide a summary of the rationale for the decision package. Why has it been requested? How specifically would the requested funds be used?
**Method of Calculation**

How was the amount of the request calculated? What factors could cause deviations between the request and the amount that could ultimately be required in order to perform the underlying work?

**Future Impact**

The state will not incur any other obligations with this decision package. The decision package does not change the structure of the program.

**Prioritization**

The agency may have to delay reimbursements to the local government grantees if authorization is not sufficient to meet the demands of the program.

If no or insufficient new funds are available in order to meet this need, how would the agency prefer to proceed? By using fund balances, generating new revenue, cutting other programs, or deferring action on this request in FY 2014-15?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTENDED IMPACT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What impact is this decision package intended to have on service delivery and program outcomes, and over what period of time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROGRAM EVALUATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would the use of these funds be evaluated? What specific outcome or performance measures would be used to assess the effectiveness of this program?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING Appropriation REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE 715

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE State Park Sewer Repairs – Phase 2

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT $3,000,000

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM II D. State Parks (50650000)

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

The General Assembly granted a partial request in FY2013-2014 to fund two sewer repair projects: Table Rock ($250,000) and Santee ($300,000). However, the two other large projects for Myrtle Beach and Oconee were not funded. We are requesting funds for these two parks, Myrtle Beach $1,000,000 and Oconee $2,000,000.

These funds are needed to repair an aged and failing sewer system at these two State Parks that make a considerable profit. The current system causes many problems that are expensive to have repaired as well as taking valuable staff time and serving as a major inconvenience to the park visitors. If these systems should suffer a catastrophic failure the parks would have to close for emergency repairs, which would not only greatly increase the cost for repairs but also result in a significant revenue loss for these parks.

These two parks as shown below have many reservations each year. The numbers below do not include day visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oconee</td>
<td>15,717</td>
<td>15,736</td>
<td>15,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach</td>
<td>56,805</td>
<td>57,052</td>
<td>54,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.
**Agency Name:** South Carolina Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
**Agency Code:** P280  
**Section:** 49

### Related Request(s)
This is not associated with any other budget request.

**Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?**

### Matching Funds
None

**Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.**

### Funding Alternatives
The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million in deferred maintenance.

**What other possible funding sources were considered?**

### Long-Term Planning and Sustainability
The State Park Service is spending operating funds earned from revenue to support this aged failing system. Currently the cost of repairs is substantial given the ages of the current systems. The replacement of these systems would produce both immediate and residual savings for the State Park Service by providing new sewage infrastructure that does not frequently demand staff time and temporary repairs.

**What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?**

### Other Approvals
SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support these replacements/repairs. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.

**What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)**
DECISION PACKAGE 1314

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE State Parks Asbestos Abatement & Mold Removal – Phase 2

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT $400,000

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM II D. State Parks (50650000)

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

The General Assembly funded Phase 1 in the FY2013-2014 Capital Reserve Fund.

Phase 2 is needed to continue this project that was originally funded four years ago and further funded last year. The one million dollars funded in FY2007-2008 has been spent on abating asbestos in State Park Service facilities; however many parks still having facilities containing asbestos material. These funds will also help address issues that have arisen that require extensive work to remove mold from multiple facilities.

The General Assembly funded Phase 1 of the project last FY for $200,000.

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.
**Agency Name:** South Carolina Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
**Agency Code:** P280  
**Section:** 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Related Request(S)</strong></th>
<th>This is not associated with any other budget request.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year?  Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Matching Funds</strong></th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding Alternatives</strong></th>
<th>The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million in deferred maintenance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What other possible funding sources were considered?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Long-Term Planning and Sustainability</strong></th>
<th>SCPRT received $200,000 in FY13/14 for phase 1 of the project. The full amount requested was $1,000,000 with $200,000 the first year and $400,000 for each phase 2 and phase 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Approvals</strong></th>
<th>SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support this project. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)**
**FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST**

**DECISION PACKAGE**  
1320  
*Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).*

**TITLE**  
Comfort Station Renovations – Various Parks  
*Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.*

**AMOUNT**  
$500,000  
*How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?*

**BUDGET PROGRAM**  
II D. State Park Service (50650000)  
*Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.*

These funds will be used to renovate the 1970’s wing walled comfort stations. The comfort stations at Myrtle Beach, Edisto Beach, Hunting Island, Table Rock, Oconee, Santee and Dreher Island State Parks will be renovated to meet the current needs of our park customers. In addition, these renovations will include updated plumbing and electrical components such as tankless water heaters, water efficient restroom facilities, motion-activated light sensors and energy efficient HVAC units – all of which will help reduce public utility consumption and decrease operating costs for the parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Total Visitors FY 2013</th>
<th>Total Site Reservation Nights FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dreher Island State Park</td>
<td>214,948</td>
<td>16,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisto Beach State Park</td>
<td>318,612</td>
<td>27,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Island State Park</td>
<td>1,075,180</td>
<td>50,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach State Park</td>
<td>1,229,420</td>
<td>52,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oconee State Park</td>
<td>215,808</td>
<td>11,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee State Park</td>
<td>115,317</td>
<td>15,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Rock State Park</td>
<td>308,132</td>
<td>9,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,477,417</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,415</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED REQUEST(S)</th>
<th><strong>Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MATCHING FUNDS | **No matching funds are required for this project.**  
**Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.** |
| FUNDING ALTERNATIVES | **The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million is deferred maintenance.**  
**What other possible funding sources were considered?** |
| LONG-TERM PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY | **The ability to maintain up to date facilities has a direct impact on customer satisfaction and the revenue earned by park system. These renovations are critical to our campers and customers of our day use facilities to the continue revenue stream that make the parks over 88% self-sufficient with a goal of becoming 100% operationally self-sufficient by the end of CY2014. In addition, these renovations will produce greater energy efficiency and reduce water consumption, providing these parks with greater operational cost savings in subsequent years.**  
**What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?** |
| OTHER APPROVALS | **SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support this project. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.**  
**What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)** |
FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST

**DECISION PACKAGE**

1323

*Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).*

**TITLE**

State Park Cabin Renovations

*Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.*

**AMOUNT**

$1,000,000

*How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?*

**BUDGET PROGRAM**

II D. State Park Service (50650000)

*Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.*

These funds will be used to renovate the interior of cabins at Table Rock, Oconee, Devils Fork, Cheraw, Hickory Knob and Poinsett State Parks. The interior of these cabins have not been updated in over 10 years. The funds will be used to renovate the interiors and provide new furnishings in order to bring these facilities up to basic accommodations industry standards and better meet current consumer needs. These updated accommodations facilities will also yield greater revenue generation potential for each of these parks through modest rate adjustments and increases in consumer demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Total Visitors FY 2013</th>
<th>Total Cabin Reservation Nights FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheraw State Park</td>
<td>138,996</td>
<td>1,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devils Fork State Park</td>
<td>175,590</td>
<td>4,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory Knob State Resort Park</td>
<td>253,780</td>
<td>3,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oconee State Park</td>
<td>215,808</td>
<td>3,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poinsett State Park</td>
<td>100,244</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Rock State Park</td>
<td>308,132</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,192,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,820</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED REQUEST(S)</th>
<th>Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATCHING FUNDS</td>
<td>No matching funds are required for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million is deferred maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What other possible funding sources were considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG-TERM PLANNING</td>
<td>Renovations are critical to the continued revenue flow of the State Park Service. Renovated cabins/villas have a higher rental rate as well as a higher occupancy rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER APPROVALS</td>
<td>SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support this project. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST

DECISION PACKAGE: 1326

Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).

TITLE: Road Maintenance

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

AMOUNT: $1,000,000

How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?

BUDGET PROGRAM: II D. State Park Service (50650000)

Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

SUMMARY: The South Carolina State Park Service is responsible for maintaining over 150 miles of paved roads throughout the park system. Well maintained roads are essential to our guests whether it be for day use, camping or lodging. Our customers need a well maintained road system to access the sites with camping equipment, recreational vehicles and supplies needs for a stay at the park. This includes access to day use facilities and marinas/boat ramps.

The roads at Myrtle Beach, Barnwell and King Mountain are in need of repaving to maintain the parks visitation numbers.

With well over 1 million visitors each year, Myrtle Beach State Park contains the highest trafficked roads in the State Park system. Consistent use by heavy vehicles, such as RVs, has created significant damage to these roads. The roads at Barnwell State Park and Kings Mountain State Park have also experienced significant damage from weather and use and have deteriorated beyond the point of temporary solutions such as patching. Addressing these deteriorating roads not only enhances the visitor experience for each of these parks, but will also alleviate visitor concerns over potential tire or vehicle suspension damage that can be caused by poor road conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Total Visitors FY 2013</th>
<th>Total Reservation Nights FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnwell State Park</td>
<td>42,438</td>
<td>2,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Mountain State Park</td>
<td>129,288</td>
<td>9,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach State Park</td>
<td>1,229,420</td>
<td>54,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,401,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,399</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AGENCY NAME:</strong></th>
<th>South Carolina Parks, Recreation &amp; Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY CODE:</strong></td>
<td>P280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION:</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Related Request(s)

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

### Matching Funds

No matching funds are required for this project.

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

### Funding Alternatives

The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million in deferred maintenance.

What other possible funding sources were considered?

### Long-Term Planning and Sustainability

The State Park Service has invested funds in the maintenance of these roads; however, SPS does not have sufficient funding to repave the roads which are desperately needed.

What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?

### Other Approvals

SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support this project. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.

What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)
**FORM C – CAPITAL OR NON-RECURRING APPROPRIATION REQUEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION PACKAGE</th>
<th>1329</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide the decision package number issued by the PBF system (“Governor’s Request”).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Sesquicentennial Splash Pad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>$500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much is requested for this project in FY 2014-15?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET PROGRAM</th>
<th>II D. State Park Service (50650000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sesquicentennial State Park is located in an urban area surrounded by developed communities. The State Park Service thinks this is an ideal location for the addition of a splash pad. The park currently has over 200,000 visitors and in turn the projected revenue from the splash pad is projected to be over $150,000 per year with an average admission cost of $4.00 per person.

The addition of this splash pad could provide the revenue necessary to make this park operationally self-sufficient. Currently the park receives its highest volume of visitation during the spring months. Given its suburban surroundings and high local population density, a splash pad will serve as a significant visitation driver during the summer season, especially during the summer break months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Total Visitors FY 2013</th>
<th>Total Reservation Nights FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sesquicentennial State Park</td>
<td>211,749</td>
<td>5,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provide a summary of the project and explain why it is necessary.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AGENCY NAME:</strong></th>
<th>South Carolina Parks, Recreation &amp; Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY CODE:</strong></td>
<td>P280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION:</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELATED REQUEST(S)

Is this decision package associated with other decision packages requested by your agency or other agencies this year? Is it associated with a specific capital or non-recurring request?

### MATCHING FUNDS

No matching funds are required for this project.

Would these funds be matched by federal, institutional, philanthropic, or other resources? If so, identify the source and amount.

### FUNDING ALTERNATIVES

The State Parks do not generate funding to cover daily operations as well as large capital projects. State Parks currently have over $140 million in deferred maintenance.

What other possible funding sources were considered?

### LONG-TERM PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY

The additional revenue provided by this splash pad could make this park self-sufficient and provide all maintenance and operating cost associated with this project.

What other funds have already been invested in this project (source/type, amount, timeframe)? Will other capital and/or operating funds for this project be requested in the future? If so, how much, and in which fiscal years? Has a source for those funds been identified/secured?

### OTHER APPROVALS

SCPRT does not currently have the funds to support this project. Therefore, we have not obtained any approvals from JBRC.

What approvals have already been obtained? Are there additional approvals that must be secured in order for the project to succeed? (Institutional board, JBRC, BCB, etc.)
**Agency Name:** South Carolina Parks, Recreation & Tourism  
**Agency Code:** P280  
**Section:** 49

### Form D – Proviso Revision Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>49.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cite the proviso according to the State Budget Division’s renumbered list for FY 2014-15 (or mark “NEW”).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Destination Specific, Tourism Marketing Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide the title from the FY 2013-14 Appropriations Act or suggest a short title for any new request.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Budget Program</strong></th>
<th>II G. State Film Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Decision Package</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this request associated with a decision package you have submitted for FY 2014-15? If so, cite it here.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Requested Action</strong></th>
<th>Amend – Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choose from: Add, Delete, Amend, or Codify.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Agencies Affected</strong></th>
<th>No other agencies are affected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which other agencies would be affected by the recommended action? How?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary</strong></th>
<th>This proviso allows SCPRT to use unexpended Wage and Supplier Rebate funds from the prior year to fund marketing and capital projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summarize the existing proviso. If requesting a new proviso, describe the current state of affairs without it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATION

Technical amendment to change the fiscal year.

Explain the need for your requested action. For deletion requests due to recent codification, please identify SC Code section where language now appears.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact of this proviso varies with the availability of funds. The proviso uses the unexpended balance of the Wage and Supplier Rebates to fund projects. However, this amount based on activity in the Film Office varies widely based on demand.

Provide estimates of any fiscal impacts associated with this proviso, whether for state, federal, or other funds. Explain the method of calculation.
From the funds set aside pursuant to the Motion Picture Incentive Wage Rebate, for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 2014-2015 unexpended funds carried forward from the prior fiscal year shall be transferred from the Department of Revenue to the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and may be utilized for the Destination Specific Tourism Program. The Destination Specific program shall not exceed twelve million dollars when combining all source of funds. Any unexpended wage rebate carry forward funds not used for the Destination Specific program can be used by the department for capital improvements to the state's Welcome Centers, for deferred maintenance and capital projects at state parks, and for Marketing/Advertising. From the funds set aside pursuant to the Motion Picture Incentive Supplier Rebate, for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 2014-2015 unexpended funds carried forward from the prior fiscal year shall be transferred from the Department of Revenue to the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and may be utilized for Marketing/Advertising, for capital improvements to the state's Welcome Centers, and for deferred maintenance and capital projects at state parks. These funds shall be carried forward from the prior fiscal year into the current fiscal year and be expended for the same purpose.

Paste FY 2013-14 text above, then bold and underline insertions and strikethrough deletions. For new proviso requests, enter requested text above.
### Form D – Proviso Revision Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>PRT – State Park Service Admissions Tax Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Program</strong></td>
<td>II D. State Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Package</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Action</strong></td>
<td>ADD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Agencies Affected</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This proviso would allow SCPRT to retain the state admission tax collected at the State Parks and use the funds for supporting general operations within the State Park Service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number:**
Cite the proviso according to the State Budget Division’s renumbered list for FY 2014-15 (or mark “NEW”).

**Title:**
Provide the title from the FY 2013-14 Appropriations Act or suggest a short title for any new request.

**Budget Program:**
Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section.

**Decision Package:**
Is this request associated with a decision package you have submitted for FY 2014-15? If so, cite it here.

**Requested Action:**
Choose from: Add, Delete, Amend, or Codify.

**Other Agencies Affected:**
Which other agencies would be affected by the recommended action? How?

**Summary:**
Summarize the existing proviso. If requesting a new proviso, describe the current state of affairs without it.
One of the goals of SCPRT is to have the State Park Service operationally self-sufficient by the end of CY2014. However, the demands on the State Park Service funds continue to increase as the state benefits such as health and retirement increase as well as factors the agency has no control over such as water, power and gas. The additional funds will greatly assist the State Park Service with these demands but have little impact on the overall state tax revenues.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The fiscal impact of this proviso is estimated to be $240,000. It would not exempt SCPRT from remitting local admissions tax.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED PROVISO TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(PRT: State Park Service) The South Carolina State Park Service is exempt from remitting Admissions Tax to the Department of Revenue on the admission fees collected at the South Carolina State Parks. The amount equivalent to the tax shall be earmarked in the State Park Service’s budget for the purpose of supporting general operations.

*Paste FY 2013-14 text above, then bold and underline insertions and strikethrough deletions. For new proviso requests, enter requested text above.*