



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Bernice G. Scott
District 10

Damon Jeter
District 3

Norman Jackson, Chair
District 11

Kit Smith
District 5

Bill Malinowski
District 1

May 27, 2008

5:00 PM

REVISED

**Richland County Council Chambers
County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street**

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

A. April 22, 2008: Regular Meeting

[Pages 3 – 5]

Adoption of Agenda

I. Items for Action

A. Request to approve an extension of the American Engineering Construction Management Contract, the Power Engineering Resident Contract Representative Contract, and the Power Engineering Consultant Services Contract for the purpose of completing the Broad River Waste Water Treatment Plant construction project

[Pages 6 – 8]

B. Request to approve a change order in the amount of approximately \$290,000.00 with Crowder Construction Company for the purpose of constructing an additional influent force main line at the Broad River Waste Water Treatment Plant

[Pages 9 – 10]

C. An ordinance amending the Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article III, Building Code, Section 6-82; Article IV, Electrical Code, Sections 6-96 and 6-97; Article V, Fire Prevention Code; Article VI, Gas Code; Article

[Pages 11 – 18]

VII, Mechanical Code; Article VIII, Plumbing Code, Sections 6-153 and 6-154; Article IX, Swimming Pool Code, Sections 6-168 and 6-169; Article X, Property Maintenance, Section 6-182; so as to adopt the 2005 edition of the National Electrical Code and the 2006 editions of the International Residential Code, International Building Code, International Fire Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code, and International Property Maintenance Code

- D. Request to approve the awarding of a contract to Center for Watershed Protection in the amount of \$248,532.85 the purpose of developing the Crane Creek Watershed Management Plan [Pages 19 – 21]
- E. Ordinance authorizing the transfer of deed to the City of Columbia for Jim Hamilton Boulevard [Pages 22 – 28]
- F. Request to approve the awarding of a construction contract to First Class Construction, LLC., for Phase I of the Judicial Center Courtyard Repairs project in the amount of \$171,600.00 [Pages 29 – 30]
- G. Request to approve the purchase of a replacement tri-axle dump truck for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works for an amount not to exceed \$125,000.00 [Pages 31 – 32]

II. Items for Discussion / Information

- A. Overview of licensing and location requirements for community residential care facilities
- B. Report from the Citizens' Committee for Animal Issues regarding amendments to the county's vicious dog ordinance [Pages 33 – 36]
- C. Discussion of modifications to Hobart Road [Pages 37 – 38]
- D. Discussion of turn lane installation on Holly Ridge Road [Page 39]

Adjournment

Staffed by: Joe Cronin

**Richland County Council
Development and Services Committee
April 22, 2008
5:00 PM**



In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

Members Present:

Chair: Norman Jackson
Member: Damon Jeter
Member: Bill Malinowski
Member: Bernice G. Scott

Absent: Kit Smith

Others Present: Joseph McEachern, Valerie Hutchinson, L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Joyce Dickerson, Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Joe Cronin, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Jennifer Dowden, Teresa Smith, Chief Harrell, Rodolfo Callwood, Geo Price, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 25, 2008 (Regular Session) – Mr. Malinowski noted that a vote was not recorded for the Adoption of the Agenda.

Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to approve the minutes as corrected. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. McEachern requested that the workplace smoking ban ordinance be added to the agenda under Items for Action.

Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to add the workplace smoking ordinance to the agenda under Items for Action.

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

PRESENTATION

Update on revised federal air quality standards: Myra Reece, SCDHEC Bureau of Air Quality – Ms. Myra Reece gave a brief update regarding EPA lowering the ground level ozone standard.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Request to approve a construction contract for the Bonbon Lane capital improvement project – Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve a construction contract for Phases I & II of the Stoops Creek capital improvement project – Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve a Memorandum of Understanding between Richland County and Clemson University Co-operative Extension Service for the Partnership in Environmental Program (Carolina Clear) – Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Request to approve the purchase of an existing office building to house the Utilities Department Administration and Engineering Divisions – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Smoking Ban Ordinance – Mr. Jeter moved to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The motion died for lack of a second.

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

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Discussion of on-premises digital display devices – This item was held in committee. A Council work session is to be scheduled.

Discussion of modifications to Hobart Road – This item was held in committee.

Discussion of turn lane installation on Holly Ridge Road – This item was held in committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:53.

Submitted by,

Norman Jackson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Broad River Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant – Construction Management and Inspection Contracts

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request County Council's approval to extend the existing construction management and construction inspection contracts through the end of the construction project.

B. Background

Power Engineering Co., Inc. is the design engineer for the Broad River WWTP. Their initial contract was executed in September 2000. At that time, the level of construction was anticipated to be much less than was eventually required. Their initial contract only anticipated a twelve month construction period. The final construction contract allows an eighteen month construction period, plus a three month start-up period. Therefore, the engineer's contract needs to be extended for this period to meet the construction company's completion date.

American Engineering Company has been hired as the Construction Manager for this project. Their initial contract was executed in July 2006. The contract period was established to be twenty-four months. Therefore, this contract also needs to be extended to coincide with the completion date of the construction contract.

C. Discussion

The construction of the Broad River WWTP has progressed very smoothly to this point. This is partly due to the great team of engineers, construction managers and contractors that are working on this project. The project is on schedule and within budget. Currently change orders have been requested for less than 1% of the construction cost. This fact is remarkable on a project of this size and complexity. The engineers and construction managers are monitoring every detail to insure that Richland County receives a quality product. The engineering and construction management team needs to remain intact through the completion of this project.

D. Financial Impact

The construction management services contract needs to be extended an additional seven months at a cost of approximately \$154,000.00. The engineer's resident contract representative contract also needs to be extended for an additional seven months at a cost of approximately \$142,216.00. The engineering consultant services contract needs to be extended through project completion and start-up at a cost of approximately \$220,000.00.

Approximately \$1,000,000.00 in unencumbered project funds plus \$2,300,000.00 in accrued interest is available for use toward the completion of this project. No additional funds will be required to extend these contracts.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the contract extension.
2. Disapprove the contract extension.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that the American Engineering Construction Management Contract, the Power Engineering Resident Contract Representative Contract and the Power Engineering Consultant Services Contract be extended through the completion of the Broad River WWTP construction project.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts **Department:** Utilities **Date:** 5/13/08

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/21/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Comments included are based on the recommended financing options and not on the merits of the project. It is unclear but the current agenda contains at least two ROA's that request utilizing funds from the Broad River bond. It appears that one extends the existing contract until the end of the existing project for \$516k and the other is for an expansion of the scope for additional work totaling \$290k. As of today the project fund has approx \$100k of unencumbered funds available for other use. The fund does have cash from interest that has been earned on the bond however the draft of the county financial policies recommends that those funds not be appropriate until a rebate analysis is completed to calculate any required arbitrage payment. Approval to use those funds would require a budget amendment. We would recommend:

a) An analysis be completed to ensure that all necessary funds are available to complete the existing project and those required funds be earmarked prior to expanding the scope to incorporate additional work.

b) Prior to approving the use of interest earned that we have a rebate analysis completed in order to reduce the risk of a cash requirement from an arbitrage payment at a future date.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/21/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: My approval is contingent on availability of funds.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 5-22-08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/22/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval contingent upon verification of available funds by the Finance Director.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Broad River Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant
Additional Work – Hollingshed Creek Force Main

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request Council's approval to expand the existing wastewater treatment plant construction contract to include an additional influent force main line.

B. Background

Crowder Construction Company began construction of the Broad River Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) in May 2007. The construction has progressed very smoothly and is currently on schedule and within budget.

Currently the WWTP design includes only one influent line to transport all the wastewater from the old WWTP to the new WWTP. A second influent line is needed to insure that adequate capacity exists to eliminate the possibility of overflows and subsequent environmental pollution. This line has been designed and permitted for construction. It was originally planned to have developers construct this line under a sewer extension agreement. With the sewer extension agreement program on hold, an alternate construction plan must be developed.

C. Discussion

Crowder Construction Company is currently on site and has the capability of constructing this second influent line. They have offered a change order in the amount of approximately \$290,000.00 to construct this 2040 foot line extension. This price has been reviewed by the design engineer, the construction manager and representatives from the Utilities Department and is believed to be fair and reasonable.

D. Financial Impact

Currently approximately \$1,000,000.00 in unencumbered project funds plus \$2,300,000.00 in accrued interest is available for additional construction and engineering services. No additional funds should be required.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the change order for the additional work by Crowder Construction Company.
2. Require the advertising and bidding of the additional work. Having two different contractors working in the same area may cause conflict and project delays.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Crowder Construction Company's construction contract be amended to include the additional influent line construction at a cost not to exceed \$290,000.00.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts **Department:** Utilities **Date:** 5/13/08

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 5/21/08

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Comments regarding recommendation: Comments included are based on the recommended financing options and not on the merits of the project. It is unclear but the current agenda contains at least two ROA's that request utilizing funds from the Broad River bond. It appears that one extends the existing contract until the end of the existing project for \$516k and the other is for an expansion of the scope for additional work totaling \$290k. As of today the project fund has approx \$100k of unencumbered funds available for other use. The fund does have cash from interest that has been earned on the bond however the draft of the county financial policies recommends that those funds not be appropriate until a rebate analysis is completed to calculate any required arbitrage payment. Approval to use those funds would require a budget amendment. We would recommend:

a) An analysis be completed to ensure that all necessary funds are available to complete the existing project and those required funds be earmarked prior to expanding the scope to incorporate additional work.

b) Prior to approving the use of interest earned that we have a rebate analysis completed in order to reduce the risk of a cash requirement from an arbitrage payment at a future date.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 5/21/08

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: I recommend approval if we can fund the project.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 5-22-08

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 5/22/08

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval contingent upon verification of available funds by the Finance Director.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Adoption of 2005 & 2006 Construction Codes

A. Purpose

Council is asked to consider an ordinance to adopt the 2005 edition of the National Electrical Code and the 2006 editions of the International Residential Code (Including Appendix G), International Building Code, International Fire Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Mechanical Code, International Plumbing Code, and International Property Maintenance Code

B. Background / Discussion

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina codes are regulated for adoption by South Carolina division of LLR.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to adopt for a positive enforcement program for up to date codes.
2. Do not approve and will continue to use out dated codes.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to adopt the 2006 construction codes and 2005 National Electrical Code, NEC.

Recommended by: Donny Phipps **Department:** Building Codes & Inspections **Date:** 5/13/08

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/19/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 5-19-08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: The South Carolina Building Codes Council (BCC) formally adopted the construction related codes for mandatory enforcement by

all jurisdictions within the state. The mandatory codes must be implemented by July 1, 2008. If Richland County fails to adopt the updated codes, it will not be in compliance with State Law.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/20/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-08HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 6, BUILDINGS AND BUILDING REGULATIONS; ARTICLE III, BUILDING CODES, SECTION 6-82; ARTICLE IV, ELECTRICAL CODE, SECTIONS 6-96 AND 6-97; ARTICLE V, FIRE PREVENTION CODE; ARTICLE VI, GAS CODE; ARTICLE VII, MECHANICAL CODE; ARTICLE VIII, PLUMBING CODE, SECTIONS 6-153 AND 6-154; ARTICLE IX, SWIMMING POOL CODE, SECTIONS 6-168 AND 6-169; ARTICLE X, PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, SECTION 6-182; SO AS TO ADOPT THE 2005 EDITION OF THE NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE AND THE 2006 EDITIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESIDENTIAL CODE, INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE, INTERNATIONAL FUEL GAS CODE, INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL CODE, INTERNATIONAL PLUMBING CODE, AND INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE;

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

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article III, Building Codes; Section 6-82, Adopted; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-82. Adopted.

(a) There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 International Residential Code, and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. The construction, alteration, repair, or demolition of every one- and two-family dwelling structure shall conform to the requirements of this Code.

(b) There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 International Building Code, including Chapter 1 (Administration), and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. The construction, alteration, repair, or demolition of every building or structure (other than a one or two family dwelling structure) shall conform to the requirements of this Code.

SECTION II. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article IV, Electrical Code; Section 6-96, Purpose; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-96. Purpose.

The purpose of this article is to provide for regulating the installation, alteration, and maintenance of all electrical installations that are not regulated by the ~~2003~~ 2006 International Residential Code.

SECTION III. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article IV, Electrical Code; Section 6-97, Adopted; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-97. Adopted.

The workmanship, construction, maintenance, or repair of all electrical work shall conform to the requirements set forth in the ~~2002~~ 2005 edition of the National Electrical Code, published by the National Fire Prevention Association.

SECTION IV. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article V, Fire Prevention Code; is hereby amended to read as follows:

ARTICLE V. FIRE PREVENTION CODE

Sec. 6-113. Purpose.

The purpose of this article is to apply the provisions of the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Fire Code to all buildings and structures that are not regulated by the ~~2000~~ 2006 edition of the International Residential Code.

Sec. 6-114. Adopted; applicability, etc.

(a) There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Fire Code, including Chapter 1 (Administration), and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. ~~In addition, the following appendices of the 2003 edition of the International Fire Code are hereby adopted:~~

- ~~(1) Appendix B, Fire-Flow Requirements for Buildings;~~
- ~~(2) Appendix E, Hazard Categories;~~
- ~~(3) Appendix F, Hazard Ranking; and~~
- ~~(4) Appendix G, Cryogenic Fluids—Weight and Volume Equivalents.~~

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to violate the code adopted by this section, to permit or maintain such violation, to refuse to obey any provision thereof, or to fail or refuse to comply with any such provision or regulation except as variation may be allowed by action of the county fire marshal in writing. Proof of such unlawful act or failure to act shall be deemed prima facie evidence that such act is that of the owner. Prosecution or lack thereof of either the owner or the occupant shall not be deemed to relieve the other.

(c) The provisions of the code adopted by this section shall apply equally to both public and private property. It shall apply to all new and existing structures and their occupancies, ~~including buildings, structures, equipment, etc., and,~~ except as otherwise

specified by ordinance, ~~to existing structures and their occupancies including buildings, structures, equipment, etc.~~, which constitute a clear and present hazard to life or to property.

(d) This section shall be deemed an exercise of the police powers of the county for the preservation and protection of the public health, peace, safety and welfare, and all its provisions shall be liberally construed for that purpose.

Sec. 6-115 – 6-124. Reserved.

SECTION V. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article VI, Gas Code; is hereby amended to read as follows:

ARTICLE VI. GAS CODE

Sec. 6-125. Purpose.

The purpose of this Article is to provide for regulating the installation, alteration, and maintenance of all piping extending from the point of delivery of gas for use as a fuel and designated to convey or carry the same gas appliances, and regulating the installation and maintenance of appliances designated to use such gas as a fuel, in all buildings and structures that are not regulated by the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Residential Code.

Sec. 6-126. Adopted.

There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Fuel/Gas Code, and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. The installation, workmanship, construction, maintenance, or repair of all gas work shall conform to the requirements of this Code.

Sec. 6-127 – 6-138. Reserved.

SECTION VI. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article VII, Mechanical Code; is hereby amended to read as follows:

ARTICLE VII. MECHANICAL CODE

Sec. 6-139. Purpose.

The purpose of this Article is to provide for regulating the installation, alteration, and maintenance of all mechanical systems and other related appurtenances that are not regulated by the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Residential Code.

Sec. 6-140. Adopted.

There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 International Mechanical Code, including Chapter 1 (Administration), and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. ~~In addition, Appendix A, Combustion Air Openings and Chimney Connector Pass Throughs of the 2003 International Mechanical Code is hereby adopted.~~ The installation of mechanical systems, including alterations, repair, replacements, equipment, appliances, fixtures, and/or appurtenances shall conform to these Code requirements.

Sec. 6-141 – 6-152. Reserved.

SECTION VII. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article VIII, Plumbing Code; Section 6-153, Purpose; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-153. Purpose.

The purpose of this Article is to provide for regulating the installation, alteration, and maintenance of all plumbing and other related appurtenances that are not regulated by the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Residential Code.

SECTION VIII. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article VIII, Plumbing Code; Section 6-154, Adopted; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-154. Adopted.

There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2003~~ 2006 International Plumbing Code, including Chapter 1 (Administration), and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. The installation, workmanship, construction maintenance or repair of all plumbing work shall conform to the requirements of this Code.

SECTION IX. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article IX, Swimming Pool Code; Section 6-168, Adopted; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-168. Adopted.

~~Appendix G Chapter 31~~ of the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International ~~Residential Building~~ Code and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. (regarding swimming pools, spas and hot tubs), is hereby ~~adopted verbatim~~ and incorporated by reference to include one and two family residential.

SECTION X. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article IX, Swimming Pool Code; Section 6-169, Additional Requirements; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-169. Additional requirements.

In addition to the requirements imposed by the ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Building Code ~~and by Appendix G of the 2003 edition of the International Residential Code~~, the following administrative requirements are hereby enacted:

- (1) A licensed swimming pool contractor shall be responsible for securing a permit from the County Building Official for the installation of an in-ground swimming pool.
- (2) In the event an approved wall, fence, or other substantial structure to completely enclose the proposed pool is not in existence at the time an application is made for the permit to install a pool, it shall be the responsibility of the property owner to have the enclosure installed prior to the final inspection and, further, to ensure that said structure remains in place as long as the swimming pool exists.

SECTION XI. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article X, Property Maintenance; Section 6-182, Adoption; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-182. Adopted.

The ~~2003~~ 2006 edition of the International Property Maintenance Code and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc., is hereby adopted verbatim and incorporated by reference.

SECTION XII. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

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

SECTION XIV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective from and after July __, 2008.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Joseph McEachern, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2008

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Award of Engineering Services for Preparation of Crane Creek Watershed Management Plan Project to Center for Watershed Protection from Richland County Department of Public Works Stormwater Management Division's Budget

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the award of Crane Creek Watershed Management Plan contract to Center for Watershed Protection in the amount of \$248,532.85 from Stormwater Management FY08 budget.

B. Background / Discussion

Crane Creek Watershed Association (CCWA) is an initiative of Stormwater Management Division for an organized improvement of Crane Creek Watershed area. The association formation is a step towards sustainable development and watershed approach that Richland County took in the implementation of its stormwater management plan. The strategic plan development is in progress and is being prepared by University of South Carolina. Management committee is under formation with aim to develop goals and objectives to the group. A parallel effort is being made to develop a technical watershed management plan that will aid in implementation of strategic plan. Crane Creek Watershed Management Plan (CCWMP) project is a technical initiative in making Crane Creek watershed a "national model".

Proposals for CCWMP preparation were solicited on January 28, 2008 with a due date of April 04, 2008. Request for proposal was sent to all 20 pre-qualified/qualification in-process engineering firms and was advertised on Richland County website and South Carolina Business Opportunities (SCBO) website. Proposals were received from seven engineering firms. Others either declined the opportunity or not responded. The received proposals were reviewed in-house. After a rigorous evaluation process through April 2008, Center for Watershed Protection was recommended for award of the project. The project is divided into four tasks and is anticipated to be completed in thirteen months from Notice to Proceed (NTP) date.

C. Financial Impact

The cost of the contract for developing the CCWMP is \$248,532.85. The Public Work's Stormwater Management Division has total funding available for this project in FY 08 in the as per budget approved by Council. Council approval is needed authorizing the award of contract to Center for Watershed Protection. Center for Watershed Protection proposed performing the work with below costs.

CCWMP Task I	\$27,794.05
CCWMP Task II	\$60,716.10
CCWMP Task III	\$96,734.10

CCWMP Task IV	\$63,288.60
Total Cost for CCWMP Project	\$248,532.85

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request in full, and exactly as presented by the Department of Public Works. **Reason:** The request involves no new financial impacts. CCWMP is a vital project for future CCWA efforts and guides future restoration, retrofit, mitigation, recreation, conservation, environmental best management practice projects in the Crane Creek watershed area.
2. Do not approve the recommendations, and send it back to the Department of Public Works. **Consequences:** Anticipated delay in preparing the CCWMP and there by its implementation. It will impact the momentum of the CCWA which was an initiative of Richland County. It will also negatively impact the watershed approach Stormwater management tool for implementation of its stormwater management plan.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the award of contract to Center for Watershed Protection in the amount of \$248,532.85 from Stormwater Management’s FY08 budget for the purpose of funding preparation of Crane Creek watershed Management Plan Project.

Recommended by: Srinivas Valavala, DPW Stormwater Manager
Teresa C. Smith, P.E., Director of Public Works
Department: Public Works **Date:** 05/08/2008

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 5/19/08
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Funds are available in the FY08 budget

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 5/19/08
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date: 5/19/08
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 5/19/08

Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommend Council denial

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Deed of Jim Hamilton Blvd to City of Columbia

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve an ordinance deeding fee simple ownership of Jim Hamilton Blvd to the City of Columbia.

B. Background / Discussion

Jim Hamilton Blvd. is approximately 3500 feet long goes from Airport Blvd. on the West end to Ott Road (S-111) on the East end and serves as the entrance to Owens Field, Richland County Airport.

The city limits of The City of Columbia are on both sides of Jim Hamilton Blvd and on each end. The entire area, including the airport is entirely within the corporate limits of the City of Columbia.

In February 1986, a letter was sent to Mr. David Johnson, City Engineer for the City of Columbia, by Ralph Pearson, former Richland County Engineer, requesting the City of Columbia accept Jim Hamilton Blvd. into the city road system. According to the letter, some improvements and repairs were made. Some time shortly afterward, the City of Columbia requested As-Built plans for Jim Hamilton Blvd. In June 1986, these As-Built were sent to the City of Columbia by the Richland County Engineers Office.

In the intervening time, there have been various letters, meetings and discussions amongst these same parties in regards to the City's take over of this Road. It appears that we are now approaching a conclusion of this matter, facilitated by the County's rebuilding of this road in July of 2006. The County utilized a portion of our annual "C" fund resurfacing monies, for that year, to perform this construction.

C. Financial Impact

There will no additional financial impact to Richland County. In fact this will be one less road that Richland County will have to maintain.

D. Alternatives

- 1) Deed. to The City of Columbia.
- 2) Do not deed Jim Hamilton Blvd to the City and Richland County will continue to have maintenance responsibility for this road within the City limits.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve this deed and convey ownership of Jim Hamilton Blvd. to the City of Columbia

Recommended by: Teresa Smith, Director

Department: Public Works

Date: May 6, 2008

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/19/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 5/19/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a discretionary decision of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/19/08

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-08HR

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING DEED TO THE CITY OF COLUMBIA
FOR JIM HAMILTON BOULEVARD, A COUNTY MAINTAINED ROAD

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

SECTION I. The County of Richland and its employees and agents are hereby authorized to grant a deed for the road known as Jim Hamilton Boulevard to The City of Columbia, as specifically described in the Deed to Real Estate (Street), which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this ordinance shall be deemed unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses shall not be affected thereby.

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after _____, 2008.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

By: _____
Joseph McEachern, Chair

Attest this _____ day of
_____, 2008.

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

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

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

**DEED TO REAL ESTATE
(STREET)**

Know All Men by These Presents, That

RICHLAND COUNTY

(hereinafter whether singular or plural the "Grantor") in the State aforesaid, for and in consideration of the sum of one (\$1.00) Dollar to the Grantor paid by the

CITY OF COLUMBIA

(hereinafter whether singular or plural the "Grantee") has granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and release unto the said Grantee, its successors and assigns forever, the following described property:

All that certain piece, parcel or tract of land and street improvements on, in, under and through it, situate, lying and being in the City of Columbia, County of Richland, State of South Carolina, being shown and described as a public street, known as **Jim Hamilton Boulevard**, having a right-of-way of sixty (60) feet in width, extending for a total of 3,274.39 lineal feet from Airport Road to South Ott Road and containing 4.47 acres, as shown on a final plat of **Jim Hamilton Boulevard**, prepared for the City of Columbia, South Carolina by Construction Support Services (CSS), Joel K. Nichols, S.C.P.L.S. #20474, sheet 1 of 1, dated March 1, 2007, last revised April 10, 2008. Said plat being on file in the office of the Department of Utilities and Engineering, City of Columbia, South Carolina under file reference #214-10A. A copy of said plat being attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit "A".

All measurements being a little more or less and reference to said plat being craved for a more definite and specific description.

DERIVATION: Deed Book 330, Page 131

TAX MAP#: 13702 (Portion)

PREPARED BY: City of Columbia Department of Utilities & Engineering

GRANTEE'S ADDRESS: City of Columbia
c/o Finance Department
P.O. Box 147
Columbia, SC 29217

bdm

TOGETHER with all and singular, the rights, members, hereditaments and Appurtenances to the said premises belonging or in anywise incident or appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid rights to the Grantee, its successors and assigns, as aforesaid, forever.

And the Grantor does hereby bind Grantor and Grantor's successors and assigns, to warrant and forever defend all and singular the said premises unto the said Grantee, its successors and assigns, against the Grantor and the Grantor's successors and assigns and against every person whomsoever lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.

WITNESS the hand and seal of the Grantor by the undersigned this _____ day of _____ 2008.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF

RICHLAND COUNTY

Witness

By: _____

Witness

Title: _____

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 2008 by _____ of _____
(Name and Title of Officer) (City and State)

on behalf of Richland County.

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES _____

ATTORNEY CERTIFICATION

I, _____, an attorney licensed to practice in the
State of _____ do hereby certify that I supervised
the execution of the attached Deed to Real Estate for Jim Hamilton Boulevard from
Richland County, Grantor, to the City of Columbia, Grantee, this _____ day of _____
_____, 200_____.

State Bar or License Number _____

Document Execution Checklist

() Explain Right of an Independent Attorney to Review – We represent the City not the Grantor(s).

____ Accepted ____ Declined

() Checked Grantor(s) identification

() Explain Nature of Document

- a) Deed to Utilities – Conveys line to City and gives easement.
- b) Deed to Street – Conveys street to City.
- c) Declaration of Covenant – Requires Grantor(s) or any future owner to file a petition to annex the property to the City if it ever becomes contiguous.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Richland County Judicial Center Courtyard Repairs Project – Phase I

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request is to seek County Council’s approval to enter into a construction contract with the lowest responsive bidder for the repair of the courtyards on the fourth floor of the Richland County Judicial Center.

B. Background

The Judicial Center has three courtyards placed within separate areas on the fourth floor of the building. Each courtyard is surrounded by offices and conference rooms. There have been numerous reports of water intrusion at the rooms surrounding these courtyards. Phase I of the project is to stop the water intrusion at the two smallest courtyards which are currently affected the most during any rain event. Phase II of the project will be to stop the water intrusion at the largest courtyard. The affects of the water intrusion at the larger courtyard are minimal compared to the other two and therefore has been designated Phase II due to funding limitations and the fact that this courtyard is not completely bordered by offices. The funds have been obtained to cover the construction cost of Phase I which has been designed to stop water intrusion into surrounding offices as well as the offices directly below on the lower floor.

C. Discussion

Engineering plans have been prepared and permitted for Phase I of the Courtyard project. These plans were advertised and bids were received on April 24, 2008. The following is a list of bidders from the lowest to the highest:

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | First Class Construction, LLC. | \$ 143,000.00 |
| 2. | Tyler Construction, Inc. | \$ 1,295,000.00 |

The design engineer has evaluated these bids and has recommended contract award to the lowest most responsive bidder, First Class Construction, LLC., in the amount of \$ 143,000.00. There will be a twenty percent contingency included to cover any unanticipated obstacles bringing the total amount to \$ 171,600.00.

D. Financial Impact

This amount is within the currently budgeted available funds to complete the construction of this phase of the courtyard project.

E. Alternatives

1. Award the construction contract to the most responsive bidder so the repairs can be scheduled and stop water intrusion into the interior of the facility and the employee's offices.
2. Award the construction contract to any other bidder after future advertisement.
3. Do not award the contract at this time.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the award of a construction contract to First Class Construction, LLC., for Phase I of the Judicial Center Courtyard Repairs project in the amount of \$171,600.00.

Recommended by: John C. Mincy **Department:** Facilities & Grounds **Date:** 05/01/08

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/20/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of a Tri-Axle Dump Truck

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase for an amount not to exceed \$125,000.00, for a new tri-axle dump truck. This equipment will be purchased for the Projects crew of the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works, with funds previously approved in the budget. The budget account is 3020735.5313. A bid process conducted by the Procurement Department will determine the exact final cost, with the most responsive and responsible vendor being awarded the purchase.

B. Background / Discussion

This unit will be replacing AH003, a 1997 Ford truck in the Fleet inventory with a mileage in excess of 150,000 miles. This truck has exceeded the American Public Works Association (APWA) recommended life cycle for this equipment. The old unit has a GVW rating of only 54,000 lbs., resulting in multiple trips to haul sufficient fill material and stone to the job sites. The new unit will have a third axle, increasing the legally allowable weight load to 72,000 lbs., reducing the number of trips required and increasing efficiency while reducing fuel usage. The chassis, engine and drive train configuration have been calculated to provide more reliable, productive and fuel efficient service to the County throughout the life of the unit. Additionally, the new equipment will be required to meet the latest U.S. EPA diesel emission standards, reducing the nitrous oxide and particulate emissions of the County. These specifications offer a significant improvement over the current equipment and will minimize downtime and improve the ability of the Roads and Drainage division to perform their mission in a safe, efficient, and cost effective manner. This unit will be purchased through the bid process, and funding is available in the Division's budget.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County will be the purchase cost, available in the current budget of the Roads and Drainage Division of Public Works. The budget account is 3020735-5313. The purchase amount for this equipment will not exceed \$125,000.00, although the final cost will be determined by the bid process.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives available:

1. Approve the request to purchase the replacement tri-axle dump truck. This will increase the equipment reliability and fuel efficiency while reducing repair costs and down time. It will also minimize environmental and safety risks to the employees through reductions in harmful emissions.

2. Do not approve the request to purchase the replacement tri-axle dump truck. This will require the Roads and Drainage Division to continue using a unit past its effective lifecycle, negatively impacting efficiency and fuel usage. It will also continue to expose the employees to the environmental health and safety risks associated with this older type of equipment.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve the request for the purchase of a replacement tri-axle dump truck for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works.

Recommended by: Bill Peters, Fleet Mgr. **Department:** Central Garage **Date:** 05/08/08

F. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 5/19/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 5/20/08

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Citizen's Committee for Animal Issues
908 Cedar Springs Road
Blythewood, SC 29016

April 30, 2008

The Honorable Norman Jackson, Chairman
Development and Services Committee
Richland County Council
PO Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202

Dear Councilman Jackson:

At the request of Richland County Council, the County's Citizen's Committee for Animal Issues met April 23, 2008. All committee members were present; also attending were Sandra Haynes, Richland County Animal Care & Control Director, and Clark Frady, Assistant Animal Care Director.

The Animal Care Committee re-affirmed that it does not advise or support a breed ban in the County. In February the Committee reported its position to the Development and Services Committee and provided County Council materials from respected animal organizations that support this position. Although a recent newspaper article indicated the County might consider a breed ban, it is this committee's belief, based on the advice of staff, that the Council is no longer considering banning specific breeds.

The Committee focused its deliberations on a proposal for the County to limit the number of dogs that County residents may own. The Committee does not advise or support a number limitation.

We reviewed several examples from other jurisdictions that limit dog ownership including the requirement for kennel construction for three or more dogs as is the case in the City of Columbia along with other city and county ordinances that impose limits based on zoning, population density, type of residence, dog size, and case-by-case approval by a governing body. We also reviewed position statements on dog number limits from the American Kennel Club, the Humane Society of the US and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Our committee takes the position that limiting the number of dogs an individual may own is ineffective because it fails to address the root problem of irresponsible pet ownership. Whether they own fifteen dogs, five or one, irresponsible owners will still allow their animals to run loose, fight, leave a mess in a neighbor's yard, or bark all night. The County's existing vicious dog, nuisance, and sanitation ordinances already can be enforced when a dog owner allows one or more dogs to create a problem.

Limit laws require a great deal of manpower to enforce uniformly and can be evaded by irresponsible pet owners. If an owner decides to exceed the limit, the individual will

deliberately fail to register his dogs with the County or get rabies shots from his veterinarian to evade detection. Without a grandfather clause, another awful consequence for law-abiding citizens is to force responsible owners to surrender their excess animals to shelters that already are overcrowded, leading to even higher euthanasia rates. Over 19,000 unwanted pets are euthanized each year in Richland and Lexington Counties. A limit on dog ownership will only drive that number up. A grandfather clause would require every dog in the county to be microchipped or tattooed and tracked with a unique identifier, which would be costly to the County and to pet owners.


One of the most serious problems for Richland County's Animal Care & Control has not yet been addressed by Council; it is the need for additional animal care/control officers and personnel. In 1998, at the request of this committee, and with the approval of County Council, the National Animal Control Association (NACA) prepared a needs assessment report of Richland County's Animal Care Department. Ten years ago, the NACA assessment stated the following: p10-6, #5.02, "The agency should allocate enough field positions as to ensure the needs of citizens are met without undue delays. All calls should be answered before the end of each day. Based on the "calls for service" model, the agency should have a minimum of eleven officers on duty, per shift."

Please consider the growth that has occurred in the County since 1998! The Committee believes the Richland County's Animal Care Department is doing remarkable work for our community. They are, however, critically understaffed and experience frequent personnel turnover.

The Animal Care Committee strongly recommends that County Council address the county's need for additional officers and allocate the funding for such staff increases. With adequate staffing and enforcement of existing ordinances, we believe many of the problems associated with irresponsible pet ownership will be addressed in a fair and cost-effective manner.

This committee appreciates your concern for our citizens and their pets.

Sincerely,



Peggy O'N. Wilson, Chair
Citizens' Subcommittee for Animal Control Issues

cc: Richland County Council
Milton Pope

Enclosure



NATIONAL ANIMAL CONTROL ASSOCIATION

Johnnie W. Mays
Executive Director
P.O. Box 480851
Kansas City, MO 64148

February 23, 1998

Debby Elousson
Research Analyst
Richland County
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202

Dear Debby,

Please find attached a copy of our NACA Needs Assessment Report based on a management and staffing study of Richland County Animal Control.

The Study Team appreciates the cooperation and support from members of Richland County Animal Control, County Administration, local humane groups and the community at large.

If you need any further information, or have any comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 913-768-1319.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Johnnie W. Mays', written in a cursive style.

Johnnie W. Mays
National Animal Control Association

4.02 Both Animal Control and the City of Columbia Animal Shelter should provide more detailed financial and statistical data to verify costs and/or support claims.

4.03 Any County employee who fails to follow proper policies/procedures should be subjected to disciplinary action or termination.

4.04 The agency should secure the services of an outside professional to mediate and resolve the internal conflicts which influence its relationship with the City of Columbia Animal Shelter.

4.05 Animal Control should improve the level of communication between itself and the SPCA and City of Columbia Animal Shelter. Weekly or monthly meetings should occur to stimulate discussion.

Field Operations

5.01 Animal Control should reevaluate its call prioritization program to assure timely response to important calls and a reasonable response to non-priority calls. Citizens should be informed of the approximate time for calls that are not critical.

5.02 The agency should allocate enough field positions as to ensure the needs of citizens are met without undue delays. All calls should be answered before the end of each day. Based on the "calls for service" model, the agency should have a minimum of eleven officers on duty, per shift.

5.03 The agency should abolish its procedure of ignoring or pushing back non-priority calls until the next day.

5.04 With an increase in staffing levels, the agency should introduce evening and weekend service. Shift coverage should also begin earlier in the day.

5.05 The agency should reclassify the following positions:

- "Animal Control Officers" to "Field Supervisors."
- "Animal Control Technicians" to "Animal Control Officers."

5.06 Field personnel should be properly trained in emergency euthanasia techniques, public relations, animal behavior, capture and handling, equipment usage, animal first aid, report writing, investigative skills and courtroom procedures. All training should be documented.

Proposed Implementation Plan 10-6

From: Howard Boyd
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2008 4:49 PM
To: TONY MCDONALD
Cc: Teresa Smith; Stacy Culbreath
Subject: Hobart Road estimates

Tony:

The attachment is consist of two estimates. First one is an estimate of costs that R. Pearson supplied to CTC in a letter dated 9/1/04.

The second spreadsheet is my update to those costs. Of note is the \$374,000 figure for the County's portion of improvements to Hobart, west of the RR track and a portion of the work within the RR crossing.

To generate this update, I simply compared what we provided in our budget in 2004 costs of paving One mile (\$500,000) to current numbers supplied for this fiscal year 2009 budget (\$1,000,000).

In reviewing the documents it appears there was an intricate negotiation to establish who paid for what, and given the increase in the costs it may again be subject to negotiation.

The breakdown in responsibility for the work was as follows:
Developer to construct road from RR to the east
County to construct Road from RR to the west
RR crossing- Joint cost share.

HB

Original Estimate – 9/14/2004

<u>Work Item/Entity</u>	<u>Longtown</u>	<u>Brickyard-Longtown</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Totals (by Tasks)</u>
Road Const. (dev.)	\$77,000	\$102,000	\$0	\$179,000
RR crossing	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$65,000	\$165,000
Hobart Rd Modifications	\$0	\$0	\$107,000	\$107,000
Contingencies.	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
Totals	\$117,000	\$162,000	\$187,000	\$466,000

Revised Estimate – 4/15/2008

<u>Work Item/Entity</u>	<u>Longtown</u>	<u>Brickyard-Longtown</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Totals (by Tasks)</u>
Road Const. (dev.)	\$154,000	\$204,000	\$0	\$358,000
RR crossing	\$80,000	\$120,000	\$130,000	\$330,000
Hobart Rd Modifications	\$0	\$0	\$214,000	\$214,000
Contingencies.	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>
Totals	\$234,000	\$324,000	\$374,000	\$932,000

To: Joe Cronin
From: Tony McDonald
Sent: Wed 4/23/2008 10:45 AM
Subject: D & S Agenda: Discussion of Turn Lane Installation at Holly Ridge Lane

The developer of the Holly Ridge Subdivision, located off of Longtown Road in northeast Richland County, has agreed to donate a fifteen (15) foot right-of-way for the construction of a turn lane into Holly Ridge. Under this plan, the turn lane would be constructed on Longtown Road, which is a State Department of Transportation (DOT) road. The intent would be to provide easier access from Longtown onto Holly Ridge Lane, the subdivision's main entrance.

Because Longtown Road is a DOT road, this would be a State project and would have to be approved, engineered and constructed by DOT. This request has been submitted to DOT for consideration.