

**Subject:** RE: previous discussion on PARD grants, my overdue analysis (OIG: Attn Mr. Meyer)  
**From:** Alesha Cushman (acushman@scprt.com)  
**To:** kat\_fay@ymail.com;  
**Date:** Friday, October 5, 2012 10:39 AM

Ms. Fay,

I was out of the office Wednesday and Thursday sorry that I am just now responding to your email and voicemail. I have reviewed your suggestions and would like to say thank you for your input and thorough review of the PARD grant. SCPRRT will certainly take into consideration all your comments and recommendations. Should you have any additional questions or suggestions please don't hesitate to contact me.

Alesha C. Cushman

Grants Coordinator

SC Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

1205 Pendleton Street

Columbia, SC 29201

803-734-0185

Fax 803-734-1042

[acushman@scprt.com](mailto:acushman@scprt.com)

**From:** Kat Fay [[mailto:kat\\_fay@ymail.com](mailto:kat_fay@ymail.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2012 7:47 PM  
**To:** Alesha Cushman  
**Cc:** [oig@oig.sc.gov](mailto:oig@oig.sc.gov)  
**Subject:** previous discussion on PARD grants, my overdue analysis (OIG: Attn Mr. Meyer)

Ms. Cushman,

I apologize about the long interim since we last talked. I am just now getting to my analysis. We discussed PARD grants at length, and adding a detection sub process to increase oversight and assure

the governmental recipient is doing what they need to be doing when they use the monies on property that is not owned by a governmental unit.

It is much more effective when developing a sub process to 'hook' both the input, and the output, onto those that already exist (FYI - if you care to delve into business process design and business process modeling, there is much reference available on the topic) And I don't want to do work that's already done when a process 'tweak' might be enough.

Here's a first suggestion. I didn't notice a definitions section. Maybe I missed it. If it's not there, suggest put one in to define some things. Definitions would be helpful.

- "public land" - does any kind of lease qualify as 'public' land.

- Two kinds of agreement are mentioned but same word is used. Agreement between sponsor and recipient (leased land) and agreement between sponsor and SCPRT. Suggest different nomenclature for each.

Could you please send me any procedures the department already has per the following:

Page 7 - how is the sponsor's "Control and Tenure" assessed. To refresh, we discussed a proposed addition of a kind of 'checklist' that the Sponsor had to look at certain things about the non-governmental recipient. Is there specific parts of the application that are salient to assessment, if not do you have a preference where a detection check list can be added.

Page 7 - Section A - when it says 'agreement', is it referring to the agreement between the sponsor and SCPRT, or, between the sponsor and the recipient?

Page 8 - item 4 - do you already have an existing checklist or procedure that defines 'adequate lease' and identifies the elements thereof?

Page 9 - Development. Does the department have a written definition of 'public land'?

- When the sponsor uses the funding to develop a facility on land that doesn't belong to the government unit, do you have any procedure that does any trade off or valuation of the non-government entity's increase in net worth, including the revenue the entity is making, and keeping for private use, and the value the public receives? What metric is examined to do a fiscal analysis, if any?

Okay that's all i have for now. thanks, katrina 864-684-7682