



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Gwendolyn Kennedy	Damon Jeter	Norman Jackson, Chair	Jim Manning	Bill Malinowski
District 7	District 3	District 11	District 8	District 1

**JULY 27, 2010
5:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: June 22, 2010 [pages 4-5]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Ensure that any negotiations with the Fire Departments, City and County, make it a priority to keep ISO ratings and is in the best interest of the citizens and Firefighter Safety [page 7]
3. Paving Overlook Drive [pages 9-10]

4. Construction Services for Lake Cary Water Quality Capital Improvements Project [pages 12-16]
5. Construction Services for Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvements [pages 18-23]
6. Through Trucks prohibited on N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive [pages 25-28]
7. Arcadia Lakes Floodplain Management Services Agreement [pages 30-36]
8. Direct Staff to Review the Floodplain Ordinance to Ensure that there are appropriate enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance [pages 38-39]
9. Sease Road [pages 41-55]
10. Farmers Market [pages 57-62]

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

11. Proposal that Richland County Enact a Tree Canopy Ordinance and inventory to preserve and enhance the number of trees in Richland County [page 64]
12. Proposal that Richland County shall have in place a Grease Trap Ordinance that all commercial food preparation customers using Richland County Sewer Systems shall have traps inspected and pumped out every two months or sooner [page 66]

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: June 22, 2010 [pages 4-5]

Reviews

Richland County Council
Development and Services Committee
June 22, 2010
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: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy
Member: Bill Malinowski

Absent: Damon Jeter
Jim Manning

Others Present: Paul Livingston, Joyce Dickerson, L. Gregory, Pearce, Jr., Michielle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Anna Almeida, Amelia Linder, David Hoops, Stephany Snowden, Jennifer Dowden, Jim Wilson, Carl Gosline, Sara Salley, Daniel Driggers, Geo Price, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:02 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 25, 2010 (Regular Session) – Mr. Malinowski requested that the tape be reviewed and the minutes corrected as necessary regarding the following items: International Cultural Exchange Ad Hoc Committee and Retreat: Visionary Legacy of Council.

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Malinowski stated that the minutes did not reflect that the item entitled “Ensure that any negotiations with the Fire Departments, City and County, make it a priority to keep ISO ratings and is in the best interest of the citizens and Firefighter Safety” was to be placed on the agenda as an item for action; therefore, the minutes need to be amended as such.

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2007 Roadway Resurfacing Project Additive #6 – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Adoption of the Complete Streets Goals and Objectives – Ms. Kennedy 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.

Conservation Easement-Clark Family Property – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval and to direct Mr. Wilson to clarify the ordinance's language. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ensure that any negotiations with the Fire Department and County, make it a priority to keep ISO ratings and is in the best interest of the citizens and Firefighter Safety – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to hold this item in committee until after a public forum is held to allow firefighters and all stakeholders to share pertinent information with the committee. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Review all Engineering and Architectural Drawing Requirements to make sure there is no unnecessary charge or expense to citizens – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to defer this item until after staff reviews the ordinance in more detail. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Sease Road – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to defer this item to the July committee meeting. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:58 p.m.

Submitted by,

Norman Jackson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Ensure that any negotiations with the Fire Departments, City and County, make it a priority to keep ISO ratings and is in the best interest of the citizens and Firefighter Safety [page 7]

Reviews

Motion: Ensure that any negotiations with the Fire Departments, City and County, make a priority to keep ISO ratings and is in the best interest of the citizens and fire fighter safety.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Paving Overlook Drive [pages 9-10]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Paving Overlook Drive

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to consider a motion by Council Member Joyce Dickerson for the paving of Overlook Drive in order to accelerate the paving of this road.

B. Background / Discussion

Overlook Drive is located between Longtown Road West and Dunes Point near Blythewood, South Carolina. This road is approximately 8/10 of a mile in length, Council Member Dickerson has requested that the road be paved using funding from the R&D budget in the amount of \$600,000. Many of the houses on this road were constructed no more than 5-7 years ago. There is also undeveloped frontage on this road that is owned by the developer.

C. Financial Impact

Preliminary cost estimates are \$577,077.16 for construction and \$15,000.00 for engineering services. This will bring the total preliminary estimate to \$592,077.16 for design and construction of Overlook Drive.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and are as follows:

1. Approve Council Member Dickerson's motion to pave Overlook Drive.
2. Do not approve Council Member Dickerson's motion to pave Overlook Drive.

E. Recommendation

The Department of Public Works has no recommendation in regard to the paving of Overlook Drive. There is no available funding in the present R&D budget to cover this project.

Recommended by:

Council

Date: 06/30/10

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Item# 3

Attachment number 1
Page 1 of 2

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation. Approval would require the identification of funds and may require a budget amendment.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 7/19/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion; however, there is no funding available for this project in the FY11 budget for Roads and Drainage. Paving Overlook Drive would require either the elimination of other planned projects, reduction of staff, or the use of Roads and Drainage fund balance and a budget amendment.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Construction Services for Lake Cary Water Quality Capital Improvements Project [pages 12-16]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Award of Construction Services for Cary Lake Water Quality Capital Improvements Project to the most responsive bidder from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division Budget

A. Purpose

"County Council is requested to approve the award of construction services for Cary Lake Water Quality Capital Improvements Project to the most responsive bidder from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division FY11 adjusted budget."

B. Background / Discussion

The Cary Lake Water Quality Improvement project is being performed in association with Gills Creek Watershed Association to improve water quality in Gills Creek Watershed in Richland County. The project design is completed through Gills Creek Competitive Grant funded by State Budget Board and matching funds from Richland County Stormwater Management. The project is being undertaken as a pilot project for the implementation of the Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan that was recently completed by Stormwater Management. *It is to be noted that Cary Lake is in JC-04 sub-watershed (catchment area) of the Gills Creek watershed. Per Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan, JC-04 was rated as one of the highly critical water quality areas in the Gills Creek Watershed.*

The project addresses removal of sediment, trash and debris that has built up over several decades in Cary Lake. The project would focus on two (2) main outfall areas into the lake. The first area is the outfall area of Jackson Creek into the lake (past the box culvert at Decker Blvd) and will be known as Section 1. The second area is the outfall from Ashworth Place Pond (at Cary Lane) and will be known as Section 2.

Section 1: Through field observation, historical evidence, and the review of past storm water studies, it is apparent that the sedimentation that has occurred in Section 1 is a result of the development of the Dentsville/Forest Acres/Northeast area over the past several decades. Sedimentation has even changed the shape of the headwaters of the pond and reduced depth to 1' to 2' in some areas of the main body of water. Based on hydrographic survey of the area the proposed sediment removal equates to 30,000 cubic yards approximately. In addition, a trash rack will be installed on the face of the box culvert at Decker. This shall minimize the amount of trash that is transported into the Lake from Jackson Creek.

Section 2: Section 2 has also experienced sedimentation issues, mostly during upstream construction over past several decades. There will be 1' – 5' of excavation over this area, consisting of approximately 4-acres and totaling 7,000 cubic yards.

All work on the project is expected to a complete within 180 consecutive calendar days from the date of Notice to Proceed.

Richland County had obtained construction easements and permissions from East Richland County Public Service District for access to the lake and Cary Lake Home Owner's Association to perform actual work on the lake. All of the necessary requirements applicable to the project such as permits, utilities co-ordination, design and drawings, easements, contract documents, specifications, are satisfactorily addressed. Bids were solicited for the project construction services from the qualified contractors on May 14, 2010 with a due date of June 28, 2010 at 2.00p.m. A pre-bid conference was held for the project on June 07, 2010 at 10:00a.m. The bids received were evaluated and the lowest, most responsive bidder Herve Cody Contractor is being recommended to Council for award of project. The bid cost for the project is \$569,000.00.

C. Financial Impact

The Engineer's total estimated construction cost for the project is \$681,000.00. The lowest bids came \$112,000.00 lower than the engineer's estimate which is approximately 16% lower. The Public Work's Roads & Drainage Division has entire funding available for this project in its FY11 adjusted budget. Council approval is needed in authorizing the award of contract to the most responsive bidder, Herve Cody Contractors.

Item	Cost in Dollars
Bid Amount for Cary Lake Water Quality CIP	\$569,000.00
Contingencies at 10%	\$56,900.00
Total Project Construction Cost	\$625,900.00

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 and is funded wholly in FY11 adjusted budget. This project will help in improving water quality in the region and Gills Creek watershed as a whole. The project is first shovel ready project per Gills Creek Watershed Management Plan since County restored watershed approach of solving water quality problems. The project is highly visible for both Gills Creek and Richland County water quality restoration efforts. The project is well in-line with watershed planned and integrated Stormwater Management's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) program.

2. Do not approve the recommendations, and send it back to the Department of Public Works. **Consequences:** No contract for construction services which either stalls or delays the implementation of capital improvement project. Negative impact on watershed approach taken by County to restore water quality in the region.

E. Recommendation

"It is recommended that Council approve the award of construction services contract for Cary Lake Water Quality Capital Improvement Project to the most responsive bidder, Herve Cody Contractors, from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division FY11 adjusted budget."

Recommended by: David Hoops, P.E., DPW Director
Srinivas Valavala, DPW Stormwater Manager

Department: Public Works

Date: 07/02/2010

F. Reviews

(Please ***SIGN*** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers:

Date: 7/12/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 7/13/10

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Cary Lake Water Quality Improvements
 Monday, June 28, 2010 @ 2:00 PM



BID SUMMARY

Company Name	Total Bid
Herve Cody Contractor	\$569,000.00
Richardson Construction Company	\$2,384,000.00
JC Wilkie Construction, Inc.	\$1,347,493.42
L-J, Inc.	\$934,800.00
McClam & Associates	\$617,820.00
Cherokee, Inc.	\$871,415.00

LOW TO HIGH BID SUMMARY

Company Name	Total Bid	Rank
Herve Cody Contractor	\$569,000.00	1
McClam & Associates	\$617,820.00	2
Cherokee, Inc.	\$871,415.00	3
L-J, Inc.	\$934,800.00	4
JC Wilkie Construction, Inc.	\$1,347,493.42	5
Richardson Construction Company	\$2,384,000.00	6

The attached bid tabulations is an accurate summary of the bids received on the subject project. Any discrepancies in unit prices or extended totals have been identified.

Certified By: 
 Signature

Registration Number 24748



July 1, 2010

Mr. Srinivas Valavala
Stormwater Manger
Richland County Department of Public Works
400 Powell Road
Columbia, SC 29203

Re: Cary Lake Water Quality Improvements Recommendation of Award

Dear Mr. Valavala:

Dennis Corporation recommends award of the contract for the Cary Lake Water Quality project, Richland County project number RC-CN-493-0910, to the lowest responsive bidder, Herve Cody Contractor of Robbinsville, North Carolina in the amount of \$569,000.00. Dennis Corporation personnel have verified that all addendums and required paperwork were addressed in the final bid and have checked references. All references had positive responses regarding Herve Cody Contractor.

If you have any questions or concerns in regard to this memo or this project itself, please feel free to contact us at (803) 252-0991.

Sincerely,



James L. Pruitt, III, PE
Civil Infrastructure Manager

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Construction Services for Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvements [pages18-23]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Award of Construction Services for Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvement Project to the most responsive bidder from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division Budget

A. Purpose

"County Council is requested to approve the award of construction services for Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvement Project to the most responsive bidder from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division FY11 adjusted budget."

B. Background / Discussion

The Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvement Project is being performed by the Department of Public Works Stormwater Management in an effort to improve water quality of stormwater runoff discharged from properties off of Farrow Road. This runoff is discharged to Cumbess Creek which is Crane Creek watershed. The project is part of the implementation of the Lake Elizabeth Concept Study that was completed recently and per County's effort to improve water quality in Crane Creek Watershed.

Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvement Project includes retrofitting existing storm drainage system with water quality units at three identified locations. The installed units shall treat stormwater before it is discharged in Cumbess Creek. All work on the project is expected to be complete within 45 consecutive calendar days from the date of Notice to Proceed.

All of the necessary requirements applicable to the project such as permits, easements, utilities co-ordination, design and drawings, contract documents, specifications, are satisfactorily addressed. Bids were solicited for the project construction services from the qualified contractors on May 19, 2010 with a due date of June 18, 2010 at 10.00a.m. A pre-bid conference was held on June 02, 2010 at 11:00a.m. The received bids were to be evaluated, and a recommendation is being presented to the Council to award the project to the most responsive lowest bidder, Richardson Construction Company. Bid cost for the project is \$103,015.00.

C. Financial Impact

The Engineer's total estimated construction cost for the project is \$119,500.00. The lowest bid came approximately 14% less than engineers estimate. The Public Works Roads & Drainage Division has entire funding available for this project in its FY11 adjusted budget. Council approval is needed in authorizing the award of contract to Richardson Construction Company.

Item	Cost in Dollars
Engineer's Estimated Project Construction Cost for Lake Elizabeth Phase I CIP	\$103,015.00
Contingencies @ 10%	\$10,301.50
Total Estimated Project Construction Cost	\$ 113,316.50

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 and is funded wholly in FY11 adjusted budget. This project will help in improving water quality in the region and Crane Creek watershed as a whole. The project is well in-line with planned Stormwater Management's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) program and Department of Public Works goals.
2. Do not approve the recommendations, and send it back to the Department of Public Works.
Consequences: No contract for construction services which either stalls or delays the implementation of capital improvement project.

E. Recommendation

"It is recommended that Council approve the award of construction services contract for Lake Elizabeth Phase III Cumbess Creek Water Quality Capital Improvement Project to the most responsive bidder (pending recommendation) from Richland County Department of Public Works Roads & Drainage Division FY11 adjusted budget. The name of the recommended responsive bidder/firm for the project and project bid cost will be presented to the Council appropriately at that time"

Recommended by: David Hoops, P.E., DPW Director
Srinivas Valavala, DPW Stormwater Manager

Department: Public Works

Date: 06/29/2010

F. Reviews

(Please **SIGN** your name, ✓ the appropriate box, and support your recommendation before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council denial

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council denial

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 7/12/10

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 7/13/10

Recommend Council denial



June 29, 2010

Mr. Srinivas Valavala
Richland County Department of Public Works
400 Powell Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Re: Lake Elizabeth Ph III – Cumbess Creek Water Quality Improvements
Bid Tabulation Certification and Award Recommendation

Dear Mr. Valavala:

Bids for the Lake Elizabeth Phase III – Cumbess Creek Water Quality Improvement project were accepted by Richland County until 10:00 a.m. on June 18, 2010 at which time they were publicly opened and read aloud. The enclosed bid tabulation sheet has been certified by this office.

We have reviewed the bid proposal and the attached documents for conformance with the bidding requirements and located licensure and surety information in proper order. Our review noted that the apparent low bidder (Richardson Construction Co.) did not include executed copies of the requested "Certificate of Familiarity", the "Affidavit", nor the "Drug Free Workplace Act Statement". Our recommendation is that these be considered as informalities and that the County request these documents be delivered by Richardson with the other preconstruction documents required by the contract. Also, please note that Richardson's bid included three mathematical discrepancies. In each case, these discrepancies are corrected or clarified by subsequent calculations on the bid form and, thus, do not appear to represent a problems. In no case does any appear to modify the "Subtotal" of any of the individual sites or Richardson's "Total Bid".

The first is in "Item No. 1" of Site A1 in which the "No. of Items" listed was 520 and Richardson's "Unit Cost" was given as "\$4.00". On the bid, this was extended to an "Item Cost" of "\$480.00" where the correct

math would have extended this value to \$2,080.00. I do not believe that this represents a problem in that the sum of the extended "Item Cost" (\$"29,690.00") correctly includes "Item No. 1" at the correctly extended value of \$2,080.00.

The second is in "Item No. 9" of Site A1 in which the "No. of Items" listed was 1 and Richardson's "Unit Cost" was given as \$"10,000.00". On the bid, this was extended to an "Item Cost" of \$"12000.00" where the correct math would have extended this value to \$10,000.00. Again, I do not believe that this represents a problem in that the sum of the extended "Item Cost" (\$"29,690.00") correctly includes "Item No. 9" at the listed "Item Cost" of \$12,000.

The third is in "Item No. 8" of Site A2 in which the "No. of Items" listed was 1 and Richardson's "Unit Cost" was given as \$"22,000.00". On the bid, this was extended to an "Item Cost" of \$"29,000.00" where the correct math would have extended this value to \$22,000.00. Again, I do not believe that this represents a problem in that the sum of the extended "Item Cost" (\$"32,745.00") correctly includes "Item No. 8" at the listed "Item Cost" of \$29,000.

It is the recommendation of this office to award the contract to the lowest, responsible bidder, Richardson Construction Co. of Columbia, South Carolina Inc., in the amount of \$103,015.00 (one hundred three thousand fifteen dollars and no cents) for this project.

I have hand delivered the original bids to Purchasing this morning. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
GENESIS CONSULTING GROUP, INC.



Dennis A. Leverette, SR., P.E.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Through Trucks prohibited on N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive [pages 25-28]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Through Truck Prohibited on N. Donar Drive & Prima Drive

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve an amendment to Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles and Parking, Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations, Section 17-9, Subsection (a), so as to prohibit through truck traffic on N. Donar Drive and on Prima Drive within Richland County.

B. Background / Discussion

N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive serve as the main roads through the Forest Green community. The roads are bordered on both sides by residential housing.

N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive consist of two lanes. Over the years, the large volume of truck traffic has contributed to the deterioration of the road. In addition, it has turned a quaint community road into a major connector.

There are numerous heavy trucks that use N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive. There are other routes that trucks can use to avoid N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive.

C. Financial Impact

The only financial impacts to Richland County would be the installation of two signs installed on two posts. N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive are maintained by the Richland County Roads and Drainage Division and will remain so.

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives that exist for this project and are as follows:

1. Approve an amendment to Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles and Parking, Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations, Section 17-9, Subsection (a), so as to prohibit through truck traffic on N. Donar Drive and on Prima Drive within Richland County.
2. Do not approve the amendment to Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles and Parking, Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations, Section 17-9, Subsection (a), and allow truck traffic to continue to use N. Donar Drive and Prima Drive through the Forest Green Community.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council approve an amendment to Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles and Parking, Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations, Section 17-9, Subsection (a), so as to prohibit through truck traffic on N. Donar Drive and on Prima Drive within Richland County.

Recommended by: David Hoops, P.E.

Department: Public Works
Date: 06/07/2010

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 7/13/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-10HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 17, MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC; ARTICLE II, GENERAL TRAFFIC AND PARKING REGULATIONS; SECTION 17-9, THROUGH TRUCK TRAFFIC PROHIBITED; SUBSECTION (A); SO AS TO PROHIBIT THROUGH TRUCK TRAFFIC ON N. DONAR DRIVE AND ON PRIMA DRIVE IN RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution of the State of South Carolina 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 17, Motor Vehicles and Traffic; Article II. General Traffic and Parking Regulations; Section 17-9, Through Truck Traffic Prohibited; Subsection (a); is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 17-9. Through truck traffic prohibited.

(a) All through truck traffic is prohibited on the following roads in Richland County, South Carolina:

- (1) Sparkleberry Lane;
- (2) Congress Road between Leesburg Road and Garners Ferry Road;
- (3) Bynum Road;
- (4) Summit Parkway;
- (5) Valhalla Drive;
- (6) Olympia Avenue between Heyward Street and Bluff Road; ~~and~~
- (7) Bakersfield Road between Dutch Square Boulevard and Morninghill Drive;
- (8) N. Donar Drive; and
- (9) Prima Drive.

SECTION II. Severability. If any section, subsection, or clause of this Ordinance shall be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such finding shall not affect the validity of the remaining sections, subsections, and clauses of this Ordinance.

SECTION III. Conflicting Ordinances Repealed. 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 _____, 2010.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Paul Livingston, Chair

ATTEST this the ____ day of
_____, 2010

Michelle 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

Arcadia Lakes Floodplain Management Services Agreement [pages 30-36]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: To enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Town of Arcadia Lakes to provide Floodplain Management Services including Flood Zone Verifications, Plan Review, and Floodplain Development Permits within their jurisdiction.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to consider an IGA between the Town of Arcadia Lakes and Richland County to partner in the provision of providing Floodplain Management services including Flood Zone Verifications, Plan Review, and Floodplain Development Permits within their jurisdiction.

B. Background / Discussion

The Town of Arcadia Lakes Mayor, Richard W. Thomas has notified the County that they are currently in need of assistance in implementing their Floodplain Management responsibilities.

The Town of Arcadia Lakes has agreed to pay for services rendered, as shown in the memorandum of understanding and agreement, a copy of which is attached for Council's consideration.

C. Financial Impact

Increased revenue for Richland County through services provided by the Town of Arcadia Lakes. Fees are broken down in the proposed IGA. The fees were evaluated to ensure that the rates cover the County cost of providing the service.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the memorandum to assist the Town of Arcadia Lakes.
2. Do not approve the memorandum.

E. Recommendation

This request is at Council's discretion.

Recommended by: David Hoops, Public Works Director Date: 7/8/10

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers
 Recommend Council approval

Date: 7/9/10
 Recommend Council denial

Item# 7

Comments regarding recommendation: This is council discretion. We would recommend that the analysis of the cost of providing the services be provided and reviewed prior to approval in order to ensure appropriate cost recovery is obtained. Additionally we would recommend that language be included to incorporate annual increases to the fee based on increases in service cost.

Planning and Development Services

Reviewed by: Anna Almeida

Date: 7/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Planning/Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 7/16/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 7/21/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 7/21/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

- Plan Review: The County will review Plans for projects that include Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) for compliance with the Municipality and County floodplain management ordinances.
- Floodplain Development Permits (FDP): The County will evaluate FDP applications for compliance with Municipality and County floodplain management ordinances. FDP will be approved or not approved based on their compliance with the aforementioned ordinances.
- Records Keeping: FZV, Plans, and FDP applications and actions will be tracked by the County. The Municipality will provide FZVs, Plans, and FDP applications to the County for review. Once the application process is complete the County will inform the applicant and the Municipality of the application result. When required the Municipality will provide records of previous actions conducted on properties related to floodplain management services, including but not limited to substantial improvements.

Section II – Municipal Responsibilities

A. The Municipality will adopt Richland County Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances and agree to enforce floodplain management decisions rendered by the County and notify the County if activities are conducted that are not in compliance with the Municipalities’ or Counties’ floodplain ordinances.

B. The Municipality will ensure that Municipality code inspectors document floodplain development requirements in accordance with applicable ordinances on all inspections and inform the County when inspections demonstrate non-compliance with those requirements.

C. The Municipality will review initial submittals for Plans and FDPs to determine if a floodplain review is necessary. The Municipality will provide FZVs, Plans, and FDP applications to the County for review, as necessary. Once the application process is complete the County will inform the applicant and the Municipality of the application result. When required the Municipality will provide records of previous actions conducted on properties related to floodplain management services, including but not limited to substantial improvements.

D. The Municipality agrees to funding requirements in Section III.

E. The Municipality, within a reasonable time after the execution of this agreement, shall adopt or amend applicable ordinances as required to make them compatible with existing County ordinances and standards.

F. The Municipality will assist the County in projects for flood hazard mitigation, water quality improvement, or other related projects in the Municipality or County.

Section III - Funding

The Municipality agrees to pay the County as follows:

- 1) \$15.00 per Flood Zone Verification issued.
- 2) \$250.00 per Plan reviewed.
- 3) \$250.00 per Floodplain Development Permit issued.

The County will invoice the Municipality on a biannual basis (June through December).

Section IV – Right-of-Entry

For the term of this Agreement, the Municipality grants to the County the status of a designated representative of the Municipality for the purposes of implementing the items identified in this Agreement.

Section V – Limitations on Liability

The Municipality is liable for compliance with all terms and conditions of the NFIP within its corporate limits, and will be subject to actions resulting from non-compliance, with the exception of those activities identified in this Agreement that are to be performed on behalf of the Municipality by the County. The County assumes responsibility on the commencement date of this agreement for completion of those tasks identified in this Agreement to the extent that the Municipality provides all required documentation, compliance information, or other supporting information, as well as the required payments to the County in a timely manner.

ARTICLE 2 - GENERAL

Section I– Severability

The provisions of this Agreement are to be considered joint and severability such that the invalidity of any one section will not invalidate the entire agreement.

Section II– Successors and Assigns

Whenever in this Agreement the Municipality or the County is named or referred to, it shall be deemed to include its or their successors and assigns and all covenants and agreements in this Agreement contained by or on behalf of the Municipality or the County shall bind and inure to the benefit of its or their successors and assigns whether so expressed or not.

Section III – Extension of Authority

The parties agree that all authorizations, empowerments, and all rights, titles, and interest referred or referenced to in this Agreement are intended to supplement the authority the County has or may have under any provision of law.

Section IV – Termination by the County

The County shall be entitled to terminate this Agreement, and the County shall be released from any obligations under this agreement if: (1) the County is rendered unable to charge or collect the applicable fees; or (2) the County Council acts to terminate this Agreement with the Municipality due to an adverse court decision affecting the intent of this Agreement: or (3) the County provides written notice to the Municipality at least thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of such termination, upon termination of the contract, obligation of the County to conduct the work described herein shall forthwith cease.

Section V– Termination by the Municipality

The Municipality shall be entitled to terminate this Agreement, and the County shall be released from any obligations under this agreement if: (1) the Municipality is rendered unable to pay the applicable fees; or (2) the Town Council acts to terminate this Agreement with the County due to an adverse court decision affecting the intent of this Agreement: or (3) the Municipality provides written notice to the County at least thirty (30) days prior to the effective date of such termination, upon termination of the contract, obligation of the County to conduct the work described herein shall forthwith cease.

In the event the Municipality terminates this agreement, the County shall be entitled to continue to collect all applicable fees within the Municipality that have been performed in advance of the date when the termination occurs.

Section VI– Insurance

For the duration of this Agreement, each party shall maintain a liability program adequate to meet at least the limits of the South Carolina Tort Claims Act.

Section VII– Duration

The duration of this Agreement shall be for a term of five (5) years, and will be automatically renewed for a like term unless one of the parties to the Agreement gives written notice to the other parties of intent to terminate.

Section VIII– Previous Agreements

This agreement supersedes all previous agreements between the County and the Municipality covering provision of these services.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have hereunder caused their names to be affixed as heretofore duly authorized on the date first above written.

WITNESSES:

COUNTY OF RICHLAND

By: _____
Milton Pope
County Administrator

TOWN OF ARCADIA LAKES

By: _____
Richard W. Thomas, Jr.
Mayor

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Direct Staff to Review the Floodplain Ordinance to Ensure that there are appropriate enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance [pages 38-39]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Staff Review of the Floodplain Ordinance to Ensure That There are Appropriate Enforcement Mechanisms to Ensure Compliance

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to consider whether or not to direct staff to review the Floodplain Ordinance to ensure that there are appropriate enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance.

B. Background / Discussion

On June 15, 2010, a motion was made and County Council forwarded the following request to the D&S Committee agenda:

“Direct staff to review the Floodplain Ordinance to ensure that there are appropriate enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance.”

In the meantime, planning staff took the initiative and determined that the Floodplain Ordinance was sufficiently worded and did not need to be amended in order to ensure compliance. But rather, what needed to happen was to appoint appropriate staff as a Code Enforcement Officer to enforce the Ordinance. This occurred at the July 6, 2010 County Council meeting when Quinton Epps was appointed as a Code Enforcement Officer for the purpose of enforcing the floodplain regulations.

C. Financial Impact

None.

D. Alternatives

This request requires no further action and is being provided as information.

E. Recommendation

No further action is required.

Recommended by: Amelia R. Linder, Esq.

Date: July 13, 2010

F. Approvals

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 7/13/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Planning

Reviewed by: Anna Almeida

Date: 7/15/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Planning/Legal

Reviewed by: Amelia Linder

Date: 7/16/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 7/21/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 7/21/10

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Sease Road [pages 41-55]

Reviews

Richland County Government

County Administration Building
2020 Hampton Street
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202



Phone (803) 576-2050
Fax (803) 576-2137
TDD (803) 748-4999

Office of the County Administrator

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Development and Services Committee
FROM: Sparty Hammett, Assistant County Administrator
SUBJECT: Sease Road Follow-up Questions
DATE: July 20, 2010

The Sease Road improvement project was discussed as an action item at the June 22, 2010 Development and Services Committee meeting. Councilwoman Kennedy had several questions related to this item. The following are the responses to Ms. Kennedy's questions:

1. When was it first decided to build this crossing? The Sease Road project started in 1998.
2. How many people live on this road? Based upon a GIS review, there is one existing home on Sease Road. There are a total of six parcels.
3. Then, how many homes will it serve in unincorporated Richland County? Based upon the GIS review, the one existing home is in unincorporated Richland County.
4. Were the homeowners advised about this new road? The property owners on Sease Road were advised regarding this project through the right-of-way acquisition process. Other homeowners in the area have not been advised regarding Sease Road.
5. Has a public hearing ever been done on this project? Public Works does not have any record that a public hearing was held on this project.
6. Why not? (We do it for other projects, rezoning or road closing, so we should do it for this also.) The County does not normally conduct public hearings for this type of project.
7. Could any of this project be funded if the 1% tax passes in November? The project list could be amended to include Sease Road at the discretion of County Council.



RICHLAND COUNTY

Department of Public Works

C. Laney Talbert Center

400 Powell Road

Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Voice: (803) 576-2400 Facsimile (803) 576-2499

<http://www.richlandonline.com/departments/publicworks/index.asp>



MEMO

To: Assistant Administrator Sparty Hammett
Fr: PW Director David Hoops
Re: Sease Road extension/improvement project update

Date: May 17, 2010

The result of several meetings with the Town of Irmo was the town's proposal to take responsibility for the improvements necessary on Broad River Road (March 3, 2010 letter). This leaves Richland County responsible for the Sease Road improvements including construction of a railroad crossing. To have the most accurate information possible I have requested updated cost estimates from our consultant and from CSX. Attached please find the revised preliminary cost estimate for the roadway construction and force account estimate from CSX

Estimated Project Cost:

Right of way (paid)	\$ 28,289
Engineering (paid)	\$ 25,744
Engineering (to complete)	\$ 18,985
Sease Road Construction	\$ 298,638
CSX Crossing	\$ 318,984
Contingencies (10% of const.)	\$ <u>69,064</u>

Total Estimated Project Cost \$ 759,704

Quantity Estimates

12-Mar-10

RICHLAND COUNTY SEASE ROAD
BASED ON PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION - 3/12/2010

File or Pin Number

Total Contract Amount

Length of project in Miles or km:
0.626

\$298,638.00

Units of Measurement in (English or Metric):
English

This is a Preliminary study to estimate the cost for the Sease Road Project ONLY (does not include US 76/176)

Item Number	Description	FINAL PLAN QUANTITY	Unit	Price	Amount
1031000	MOBILIZATION	1.000	LS	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
1050800	CONSTRUCTION STAKES, LINES & GRADES	1.000	EA	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
1071000	TRAFFIC CONTROL	1.000	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
2012000	CLEARING & GRUBBING WITHIN ROADWAY	1.000	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
2024100	REMOVAL & DISPOSAL OF EXISTING CURB	110.000	LF	\$12.00	\$1,320.00
2031000	UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION	1563.000	CY	\$6.00	\$9,378.00
2033000	BORROW EXCAVATION	4385.000	CY	\$8.00	\$35,080.00
2081001	FINE GRADING	5100.000	SY	\$1.50	\$7,650.00
2103000	FLOWABLE FILL	10.000	CY	\$120.00	\$1,200.00
3050106	GRADED AGGREGATE BASE COURSE (6" UNIFORM)	5550.000	SY	\$7.50	\$41,625.00
3069900	MAINTENANCE STONE	50.000	TON	\$35.00	\$1,750.00
4011004	LIQUID ASPHALT BINDER PG64-22	20.000	TON	\$475.00	\$9,500.00
4013990	MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (VARIABLE)	20.000	SY	\$3.00	\$60.00
4020320	HOT MIX ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE COURSE TYPE B	520.000	TON	\$55.00	\$28,600.00
4030320	HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE TYPE B	400.000	TON	\$54.00	\$21,600.00
6041200	BARRICADE - TYPE 3	36.000	LF	\$35.00	\$1,260.00
6051120	PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)	392.000	SF	\$7.50	\$2,940.00
6250005	4" WHITE BROKEN LINES (GAPS EXCLUDED)-FAST DRY PAINT	120.000	LF	\$0.35	\$42.00
6250025	24" WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAGONAL LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT	70.000	LF	\$6.00	\$420.00
6250030	WHITE SINGLE ARROW (LEFT, STRAIGHT, RIGHT)-FAST DRY PAINT	6.000	EA	\$60.00	\$360.00
6250045	RAILROAD CROSSING SYMBOLS - FAST DRY PAINT	2.000	EA	\$100.00	\$200.00
6260105	4" YELLOW BROKEN LINES(GAPS EXC) - FAST DRY PAINT	100.000	LF	\$0.35	\$35.00
6260110	4"YELLOW SOLID LINE(PVT EDGE&NO PASSING ZONE)-FAST DRY PAINT	3140.000	LF	\$0.30	\$942.00
6271005	4" WHITE BROKEN LINES(GAPS EXCL.)THERMOPLASTIC- 90 MIL	120.000	LF	\$0.35	\$42.00
6271025	24" WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES)-THERMO-125 MIL	70.000	LF	\$3.90	\$273.00
6271030	WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) THERMO-125 MIL	6.000	EA	\$75.00	\$450.00
6271045	RAILROAD CROSSING SYMBOLS - THERMOPLASTIC - 125 MIL	2.000	EA	\$150.00	\$300.00
6271064	4" YELLOW BROKEN LINES(GAPS EXC)THERMOPLASTIC - 90 MIL	100.000	LF	\$0.35	\$35.00
6271074	4" YELLOW SOLID LINES(PVT EDGE LINES) THERMO-90 MIL	3140.000	LF	\$0.35	\$1,099.00
6300005	PERMANENT CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS- MONO-DIR.- 4"X4"	6.000	EA	\$4.50	\$27.00
6301005	PERMANENT YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS MONO-DIR.- 4"X4"	10.000	EA	\$4.50	\$45.00
6301100	PERMANENT YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR.- 4"X4"	60.000	EA	\$4.50	\$270.00
6510105	FLAT SHEET, TYPE III, FIXED SZ. & MSG. SIGN	36.500	SF	\$25.00	\$912.50
6531210	U-SECTION POST FOR SIGN SUPPORTS - 3P	74.000	LF	\$10.00	\$740.00
7141113	18" RC PIPE CUL-CLASS III	484.000	LF	\$30.00	\$14,520.00
7141116	36" RC PIPE CUL-CLASS III	98.000	LF	\$70.00	\$6,720.00
7203130	CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER(1'-6" OGEE)	2300.000	LF	\$13.00	\$29,900.00
8041020	RIP-RAP (CLASS B)	23.000	TON	\$65.00	\$1,495.00
8048210	GEOTEXTILE FOR EROSION CONTROL UNDER RIPRAP(CLASS 2)TYPE C	70.000	SY	\$3.50	\$245.00
8051100	STEEL BEAM GUARDRAIL	300.000	LF	\$20.00	\$6,000.00
8052300	END TERMINAL - TYPE T	4.000	EA	\$2,200.00	\$8,800.00
8071000	RESET FENCE	24.000	LF	\$6.00	\$144.00
8072000	RESET CHAIN-LINK FENCE	300.000	LF	\$8.00	\$2,400.00
8100100	PERMANENT COVER	0.650	ACRE	\$1,100.00	\$715.00
8100200	TEMPORARY COVER	0.325	ACRE	\$800.00	\$260.00
8101110	STRAW OR HAY MULCH WITH TACKIFIER	0.350	ACRE	\$950.00	\$332.50
8101120	STABILIZED MULCH MATRIX (SMM)	0.300	ACRE	\$1,100.00	\$330.00
8104005	FERTILIZER (NITROGEN)	33.000	LB	\$2.00	\$66.00
8104010	FERTILIZER (PHOSPHORIC ACID)	33.000	LB	\$1.50	\$49.50
8104015	FERTILIZER (POTASH)	33.000	LB	\$1.50	\$49.50
8105005	AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME	650.000	LB	\$0.45	\$292.50
8109050	WATERING	54300.000	GAL	\$0.07	\$3,801.00
8109901	MOWING	0.650	ACRE	\$250.00	\$162.50
8151111	TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL BLANKET (CLASS A)	0.100	MSY	\$1,400.00	\$140.00
8152007	SEDIMENT TUBE	50.000	LF	\$10.00	\$500.00
8153000	SILT FENCE	750.000	LF	\$2.50	\$1,875.00
8153090	REPLACE/REPAIR SILT FENCE	200.000	LF	\$2.00	\$400.00

Quantity Estimates

12-Mar-10

RICHLAND COUNTY SEASE ROAD
 BASED ON PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION - 3/12/2010

File or Pin Number

Total Contract Amount

\$298,638.00

Length of project in Miles or km:

0.626

Units of Measurement in (English or Metric):

English

This is a Preliminary study to estimate the cost for the Sease Road Project ONLY (does not include US 76/176)

Items Number	Description	FINAL PLAN QUANTITY	Unit	Price	Amount
8154000	SILT BASINS	10.000	CY	\$9.50	\$95.00
8154010	CLEANING SILT BASINS	20.000	CY	\$4.50	\$90.00
8154050	REMOVAL OF SILT RETAINED BY SILT FENCE	200.000	LF	\$2.00	\$400.00
8156405	AGGREGATE NO.5 FOR EROSION CONTROL (6" UNIFORM)	20.000	SY	\$20.00	\$400.00
8156490	STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE	20.000	SY	\$15.00	\$300.00
9800000	TYPE "A" CATCH BASIN	10.000	EA	\$1,900.00	\$19,000.00

Total = **\$298,638.00**

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST DOES NOT INCLUDE CONTINGENCIES, R/W ACQUISITION, AND UTILITY RELOCATION.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS
SUMMARY

PROJECT INCLUDES: <u>RICHLAND COUNTY</u>		
<u>Sease Rd. Paving Project</u>		
NOTE: THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR F&H TO FINISH THE SEASE ROAD PLANS ONLY (DOES NOT INCLUDE THE WIDENING OF US 76/176)		
PHASE I	Surveys & Utility Updates	
	Sease Road Paving Project	\$2,519.05
	TOTAL	\$2,519.05
PHASE II	Erosion Control Design and Plan Development	
	Sease Road Paving Project	\$4,696.50
	TOTAL	\$4,696.50
PHASE III	Plan Revisions (Typicals, quantities, plan revisions, standard drawing updates)	
	Sease Road Paving Project	\$6,779.66
	TOTAL	\$6,779.66
PHASE III	Permit Application and Construction Inspection	
	Sease Road Paving Project	\$4,990.08
	TOTAL	\$4,990.08
	PROJECT TOTAL	\$18,985.29

FLORENCE & HUTCHESON, INC.

**CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.
FORCE ACCOUNT ESTIMATE**

ACCT. CODE : 709 - SC0043

ESTIMATE SUBJECT TO REVISION AFTER: 10/25/2010 DOT NO.: TBD
 CITY: Irmo COUNTY: Richland STATE: SC
 DESCRIPTION: New grade crossing with automatic traffic control devices for extension of Sease Road at CSXT.

DIVISION: Florence SUB-DIV: C N and L MILE POST: C 12.40
 AGENCY PROJECT NUMBER: 8.T690401 (R-2559C)

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING:

200 Labor (Non Contract)		\$	2,700
200 Additive	31.34%	\$	846
230 Expenses		\$	470
212 Contracted & Administrative Engineering Services		\$	33,123
Subtotal		\$	37,139

CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION:

200 Labor (Non Contract)		\$	540
200 Additive	31.34%	\$	169
230 Expenses		\$	94
212 Contracted & Administrative Engineering Services		\$	4,870
Subtotal		\$	5,673

FLAGGING SERVICE: (Contract Labor)

070 Labor (Conductor-Flagman)		\$	-
050 Labor (Foreman/Inspector)		\$	5,040
070 Additive	131.93% (Transportation Department)	\$	-
050 Additive	153.46% (Engineering Department)	\$	7,734
230 Per Diem	(Engineering Department)	\$	1,125
230 Expenses		\$	-
Subtotal		\$	13,899

SIGNAL & COMMUNICATIONS WORK: (Details Attached) \$ 157,452

TRACK WORK: (Details Attached) \$ 66,464

ACCOUNTING & BILLING:

040 Labor		\$	3,600
040 Additive	159.92%	\$	5,757
Subtotal		\$	9,357

PROJECT SUBTOTAL

900 <u>CONTINGENCIES:</u>	10.00%	\$	289,985
		\$	28,999

GRAND TOTAL *** \$ 318,984**

DIVISION OF COST:

Agency	<u>100.00%</u>	\$	318,984
Railroad		\$	-
TOTAL *****		\$	318,984

NOTE: Estimate is based on FULL CROSSING CLOSURE during work by Railroad Forces.

This estimate has been prepared based on site conditions, anticipated work duration periods, material prices, labor rates, manpower and resource availability, and other factors known as of the date prepared. The actual cost for CSXT work may differ based upon the agency's requirements, their contractor's work procedures, and/or other conditions that become apparent once construction commences or during the progress of the work.

Office of Assistant Chief Engineer Public Projects--Jacksonville, Florida

Estimated prepared by: J. Schofield, ARCADIS Approved by: CSXT Public Project Group
 DATE: 4/28/2010 REVISED: DATE:

Form Revised 03-02-2010-LLS

Project Summary Sheet

**CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.
FORCE ACCOUNT ESTIMATE**

Page 1 of 3

ACCT. CODE : 709 - SC0043
Pub EB - SC EB3 (SC)

ESTIMATE SUBJECT TO REVISION AFTER:	10/25/2010	DOT NO.: TBD
CITY: Irmo	COUNTY: Richland	STATE: SC
DESCRIPTION: New grade crossing with automatic traffic control devices for extension of Sease Road at CSXT.		
DIVISION: Florence	SUB-DIV: C N and L	MILEPOST: C 12.40
DRAWING NO.: _____	DRAWING DATE: _____	
AGENCY PROJECT NUMBER: 8.T690401 (R-2559C)		

<u>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING:</u>						
200	Labor (Non Contract)		10 Days @	\$ 270.00	\$	2,700
200	Additive	31.34%			\$	846
230	Expenses				\$	470
212	Contracted & Administrative Engineering Services				\$	33,123
	Subtotal				\$	37,139
<u>CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING/INSPECTION:</u>						
200	Labor (Non Contract)		2 Days @	\$ 270.00	\$	540
200	Additive	31.34%			\$	169
230	Expenses				\$	94
212	Contracted & Administrative Engineering Services				\$	4,870
	Subtotal				\$	5,673
<u>FLAGGING SERVICE: (Contract Labor)</u>						
70	Labor (Conductor-Flagman)		0 Days @	\$ 350.00	\$	-
50	Labor (Foreman/Inspector)		15 Days @	\$ 336.00	\$	5,040
70	Additive	131.93% (Transportation Department)			\$	-
50	Additive	153.46% (Engineering Department)			\$	7,734
230	Expenses	(Engineering Department)	15 Days @	\$ 75.00	\$	1,125
230	Expenses	(Transportation Department)	0 Days @	\$ 45.00	\$	-
	Subtotal				\$	13,899
<u>COMMUNICATIONS WORK:</u>						
	Temporary (Details Attached)				\$	-
	Permanent (Details Attached)				\$	-
	Subtotal				\$	-
<u>TRACK: LABOR</u>						
50	Traffic Control		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Remove Existing Crossing		56 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,344
50	Renew Cross Ties		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Renew Rail		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Install OTM		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Install Field Welds		32 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	768
50	Install Geo-Textile Fabric		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Install Sub-Drains		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Install Ballast		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Line and Surface		64 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,536
50	Install Crossing Materials		70 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,680
50	Install Bituminous Pavement		0 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	-
50	Material Delivery		48 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,152
50	Build Track Panel		112 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	2,688
50	Install Panel		70 MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,680

Force Account Worksheet

Item# 9

Attachment number 2
Page 6 of 14

**CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.
FORCE ACCOUNT ESTIMATE**

Page 2 of 3

ACCT. CODE : 709 - SC0043
Pub EB - SC EB3 (SC)

50	Clean-Up		48	MAN-HRS	\$ 24.00	\$	1,152
50	Additive	153.46%				\$	18,415
230	Per Diem		50	MAN-DAY	\$ 90.00	\$	4,500
	Subtotal					\$	34,915
	<u>TRACK: MATERIAL</u>						
220	Cross Ties, Main Line		54	EA	\$ 39.00	\$	2,106
220	Cross tie - pre-plated		0	EA	\$ 83.50	\$	-
220	Cross-tie - Borate		0	EA	\$ 56.00	\$	-
220	Crossties, 10' Length		0	EA	\$ 46.00	\$	-
220	Tie plates		108	EA	\$ 10.51	\$	1,135
220	Rail, 136RE, New		160	LF	\$ 21.00	\$	3,360
220	Misc. OTM		1	LOT	\$ -	\$	-
210	Geo-Textile Fabric		0.5	RL	\$ 930.00	\$	465
210	Sub-Drains		160	LF	\$ 6.00	\$	960
220	Ballast - Car load		0	NT	\$ 12.00	\$	-
220	Ballast - Trucked in		50	NT	\$ 45.00	\$	2,250
220	Field Welds		4	EA	\$ 100.00	\$	400
			0		\$ -	\$	-
			0		\$ -	\$	-
210	Concrete Full Width		0	TF	\$ 250.00	\$	-
210	Concrete/Rubber Xing (CSX)		0	TF	\$ 200.00	\$	-
210	Rubber Crossing, Full Depth		0	TF	\$ 325.00	\$	-
210	Timber/Asphalt Crossing (CSX Standard)		105	TF	\$ 42.00	\$	4,410
210	Bituminous Material		0	NT		\$	-
210	Sales Tax on Material	7.00%				\$	1,056
210	Material Handling	5.00%				\$	754
	Subtotal					\$	16,896
	<u>CONTRACT:</u>						
215	Asphalt Paving (In Place)		18	NT	\$ 160.00	\$	2,880
241	Disposal of Waste Materials		0	TF	\$ 15.00	\$	-
215	Maintenance of Traffic		0	DAY	\$ 350.00	\$	-
	Subtotal					\$	2,880
241	<u>EQUIPMENT RENTAL:</u>						
	Subtotal					\$	12,000
50	<u>WORK TRAIN:</u>						
	Subtotal		0	DAY	\$ 2,100.00	\$	-
	<u>SALVAGE:</u>						
228	Rail		3.5	NT	\$ 65.00	\$	(228)
228	OTM		0	NT	\$ 75.00	\$	-
	Subtotal					\$	(228)
	<u>SIGNAL WORK:</u>						
210	Material - Field & Consumables					\$	-
210	Material - Sales Tax					\$	-
220	Material - Shop					\$	-
60	Construction Labor					\$	-
65	Shop Labor					\$	-
230	Per Diem					\$	-
200	RR Engineering,Preliminary					\$	-

Force Account Worksheet

Item# 9

Attachment number 2
Page 7 of 14

**CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.
FORCE ACCOUNT ESTIMATE**

ACCT. CODE : 709 - SC0043
Pub EB - SC EB3 (SC)

200	RR Engineering,Construction		\$	-
60	Additives to Construction Labor		\$	-
65	Additives to Shop Labor		\$	-
200	Additives to Engineering		\$	-
241	Equipment Expense		\$	-
241	Waste Management		\$	-
212	Contract Engineering		\$	-
211	Freight		\$	-
216	AC Power Service		\$	-
228	Salvage		\$	-
900	Other		\$	157,452
	Subtotal		\$	157,452

ACCOUNTING & BILLING:

40	Labor		18 Days @ \$ 200.00	\$	3,600
40	Additive	159.92%		\$	5,757
	Subtotal			\$	9,357

PROJECT SUBTOTAL:

				\$	289,985
900	<u>CONTINGENCIES:</u>	10.00%		\$	28,999

GRAND TOTAL ***** \$ 318,984

DIVISION OF COST:

Agency	<u>100.00%</u>	\$	318,984
Railroad	<u>0.00%</u>	\$	-
TOTAL *****		\$	318,984

NOTE: Estimate is based on FULL CROSSING CLOSURE during work by Railroad Forces.

This estimate has been prepared based on site conditions, anticipated work duration periods, material prices, labor rates, manpower and resource availability, and other factors known as of the date prepared. The actual cost for CSXT work may differ based upon the agency's requirements, their contractor's work procedures, and/or other conditions that become apparent once construction commences or during the progress of the work.

Office of Assistant Chief Engineer Public Projects—Jacksonville, Florida

Estimated prepared by: J. Schofield, ARCADIS

Approved by:

CSXT Public Project Group

DATE: 4/28/2010

REVISED:

DATE:

Form Revised 03-02-2010-LLS

Estimate No. 116927
CSX Transportation

Sease Rd. - Installation of automatic warning devices (FLS&Gs) to accommodate the proposed extension of Sease Road across the track (reference SC2000012 for p

Irmo, SC

DOT: 927705E

OP: SC0043

CSX Project: SC2008045

Summary

Material	\$ 53,061
Sales Tax	\$ 3,184
Labor:	
Construction Labor (74 man-days).....	\$ 19,756
Shop Labor (5 man-days).....	\$ 800
Subsistence (74 man-days).....	\$ 7,770
Railroad Engineering, Preliminary	\$ 3,971
Railroad Engineering, Construction	\$ 2,963
Additives to Construction Labor	\$ 21,726
Additives to Shop Labor	\$ 997
Additives to Engineering	\$ 2,822
Equipment Expenses (19 work days).....	\$ 12,350
Waste Management (16 work days).....	\$ 192
Contract Engineering	\$ 11,799
Freight	\$ 3,600
Poleline Removal	\$ 0
AC Power Service	\$ 2,500
Salvage	\$ -1
Previous Engineering	\$ 9,963
(survey , design, and design review)	
TOTAL ESTIMATE COST	\$ 157,452

Date: 04/21/2010
 Estimated By: Scott Elliott

NOTE: This estimate should be considered void one year from date of estimate.

**Shop Material List for CSX Project: SC2008045 (Effective: 04/21/2010)
Installation of Automatically Controlled Flashing Lights & Gates
Irmo, SC - C 12.51**

Catalog Num	Cond	Unit Price	Qty	Cost	Description
020-0003401	1	8480.00	1	8480.00	HOUSE 8X8L ALUM INCLUDES 7 SHELFS, FARADAY CLOSET, 240V
020-0017120	1	11.33	8	90.64	BLOCK TERMINAL 12 POST SINGLE STRIP AAR 14.1.6 WITH 1 AAR
020-0017209	1	264.32	1	264.32	TRANSFORMER 010520-20X LIGHT 300 VA MOD SLT-20 SAFETRAN
020-0017311	1	23.52	4	94.08	RESISTOR ADJUSTABLE 0.035 TO 1.50 OHMS SLIDE TYPE AAR
020-0021965	1	8.96	1	8.96	EXTRACTOR DWG 59688-4 TERMINAL GRS CAT P3-308 REF
020-0022651	1	49.01	5	245.05	PLUGBOARD KIT TYPE B1 OR ST1 RELAY ASSEMBLY WITH 12 EACH
020-0022701	1	68.00	24	1632.00	ARRESTER LPC 15012-1 0-30V DC OR 0-24V AC RATED AT 15 AMP
020-0025595	1	20.72	1	20.72	WRENCH DWG 55393-3 GR1 "E" TERMINAL POST NUT GRS CAT
020-0053360	1	406.56	3	1219.68	CHARGER BATTERY ELC 12/20 S 20 AMP 10-19.9 VDC ROTARY SW
020-0660075	1	442.18	1	442.18	ARRESTER GE 9L10KAA212 FOR APPLICATION ON 120 VOLT
020-0750090	1	0.08	3	0.24	NUT INSULATED USE ON AAR BINDING POST TERMINAL FOR
020-0770060	1	13.44	4	53.76	ARRESTER US&S N451552-0201 TRACK SERIES RED LABEL USGA
020-1940055	1	14.22	1	14.22	CONTAINER CIRCUIT PRINT 24" SCHEDULE 20 4" PVC PIPE WITH
020-2552460	1	7539.03	1	7539.03	DETECTOR HARMON 300608-200 PMD-3R SYSTEM W/8KHZ RSI AND
020-3430110	1	311.00	1	311.00	RELAY SAFETRAN 400004 500 OHMS CONTACTS 4FB-2F-1B CSX
020-3430115	1	318.53	1	318.53	RELAY SAFETRAN 400005 500 OHMS CONTACTS 4FB HEAVY DUTY
020-3430135	1	362.64	1	362.64	RELAY SAFETRAN 400213 460 OHMS CONTACTS 2FB CSX
020-3430170	1	318.53	1	318.53	RELAY SAFETRAN 400800-CSX 100/100 OHMS CONTACTS 6FB
020-3430185	1	313.63	1	313.63	RELAY SAFETRAN 400700-X 60 OHMS CONTACTS 4FB CSX
020-4200100	1	6.04	3	18.12	CONNECTOR BUS 1" CENTERS 1/2" X 36" 18 GAGE PUNCHED 1/4" X
020-4200340	1	1.65	4	6.60	LINK TEST ASSEMBLY 1" CENTERS COMPLETE WITH INSULATED
020-4200360	1	4.48	9	40.32	LINK TEST ASSEMBLY 2-3/8" CENTERS COMPLETE WITH CENTER
020-8000067	1	14.61	2	29.22	LOCK AMERICAN H10SIGRA CSX SIGNAL PADLOCK WITH BLACK
020-8100034	1	2503.80	1	2503.80	RECORDER EVENT HARMON HAWK ASSEMBLY COMPLETE WITH
Total Cost: \$				24,327.27	

**Field Material List for CSX Project: SC2008045 (Effective: 04/21/2010)
Installation of Automatically Controlled Flashing Lights & Gates
Irmo, SC - C 12.51**

Catalog Num	Cond	Unit Price	Qty	Cost	Description
020-0013686	1	40.43	1	40.43	BOOTLEG KIT CSX RAIL CONN W/15 FT 3/16 IN BDSTRAND 6/64
020-0013908	1	6.41	350	2243.50	CABLE UG COMPOSITE 19 CONDUCTOR INCLUDES 13
020-0025145	1	320.49	2	640.98	SHUNT ENCLOSURE INTERRAIL P/N IRS-SE8A WAYSIDE MOUNT
020-0052475	1	11.20	4	44.80	ARM EXTENSION 10-1/2" ALUM WITH 3/8" DIAMETER MOUNTING
020-0053245	1	1.43	150	214.50	CABLE UG 3 COND NO 9 AWG SOLID C CSX SPEC SS796 SHOW
020-0054075	1	988.90	2	1977.80	GATE GARD NORMAL MOVEMENT COMPLETE WITH SHEAR PIN AND
020-0055421	1	18.61	6	111.66	BRACKET SIGN 4" OR 5" MAST W/1/2" U-BOLT FOR ALL SIGNS
020-0056678	1	5039.31	2	10078.62	SIGNAL 0221-L GCWD GATE ASSY DWG SS222 INCLS ADJ 19 TO 28
020-0057275	1	0.96	350	336.00	WIRE UG TRACK TWISTED PAIR NO. 6 AWG SOLID CONDUCTOR
020-1040322	1	162.40	20	3248.00	BATTERY SAFT SPL165, 165 AH POCKET PLATE NICKEL CADMIUM
020-1040324	1	229.88	9	2068.92	BATTERY SAFT SPL250, 250 AH POCKET PLATE NICKEL CADMIUM
020-1040540	1	31.36	1	31.36	TRAY BATTERY FIBER CO 82687-1-P 12" WIDTH 24" LONG
020-1040550	1	45.92	2	91.84	TRAY BATTERY FIBER CO 82687-3-P 12" WIDTH 38"
020-1360014	1	763.02	1	763.02	PACKAGE FOREMANS CARE FOR ALUMINUM TYPICAL BOM FOR USE
020-1360016	1	21.18	1	21.18	PACKAGE SAFETY & SECURMENT WITH 1 EA CAUTION TAG 1 EA
020-1360103	1	1376.43	1	1376.43	LAYOUT METER SERVICE WITH 25' POLE CSX DWG SS351 SH 2 ITEMS
020-1710045	1	1.88	200	376.00	CONDUIT SDR 13.5 4" POLYETHYLENE TRENCHLESS
020-2060072	1	750.00	2	1500.00	FOUNDATION HELICAL SCREW-IN ASSEMBLY 7" X 10", USED FOR
020-2531285	1	265.93	2	531.86	SHUNT HARMON 250250-326 NBS-1-10 326HZ 10 FT LEADS
020-3901895	1	92.68	2	185.36	TIP FLEX HWY CROSSING GATE 24 IN LONG RED & WHITE STRIPES
020-3920200	1	154.79	1	154.79	BELL GCWD ELECTRONIC 4" OR 5" MAST 8 TO 13 VOLTS DC GSI PN
020-3930010	1	3.70	2	7.40	KIT GATE ARM WARNING STICKER KIT INCLUDES 1-EA 5"X3"
020-4200340	1	1.65	26	42.90	LINK TEST ASSEMBLY 1" CENTERS COMPLETE WITH INSULATED
020-4200900	1	0.27	6	1.62	CONNECTOR SHEATHING AMP 329860 FOR NO. 14 WIRE
020-9999991	1	100.00	1	100.00	BLOCKING AND BRACING FOR PROJECTS BURCO DIST

Field Material List for CSX Project: SC2008045 (Effective: 04/21/2010)
Installation of Automatically Controlled Flashing Lights & Gates
Irmo, SC - C 12.51

Catalog Num	Cond	Unit Price	Qty	Cost Description
360-0006100	1	35.07	1	35.07 STOOL STEP WOOD 14"X 20" SIGNAL MAINTAINERS CSXT
360-0800145	1	4.55	1	4.55 BROOM WAREHOUSE CORN HVY DUTY ID300
Total Cost: \$				26,228.59

**Consumables List for CSX Project: SC2008045 (Effective: 04/21/2010)
Installation of Automatically Controlled Flashing Lights & Gates
Irmo, SC - C 12.51**

Catalog Num	Cond	Unit Price	Qty	Cost Description
N/A		50.00	20	1000.00 FILL MATERIAL, 1 CUBIC YARD
N/A		800.00	1	800.00 WALKWAY ROCK, 10 CUBIC YARDS
020-0017605	1	0.26	350	91.00 WIRE CASE 10 AWG FLEX CSX SPEC SS796 OKONITE
020-0017607	1	0.58	500	290.00 WIRE CASE TW PR NO 10 AWG FLEX CSX SPEC SS796 TWIST 2
020-0017625	1	0.38	150	57.00 WIRE CASE TW PR NO 14 AWG FLEX CSX SPEC SS796 TWIST 2
020-0017630	1	0.12	200	24.00 WIRE CASE NO 16 AWG FLEX CSX SPEC SS796 FURN 1000 FT SPOOL
020-0017635	1	0.80	130	104.00 WIRE SIGNAL DEL 018 NO 6 COPPER STRANDED SINGLE
020-0028610	1	0.22	100	22.00 TERMINAL RING AMP 35628 YELLOW PLASTI-BOND HVY DUTY
020-3261970	1	9.41	2	18.82 DECAL ASSY 2" BLACK PRESSURE SENSITIVE VINYL PRE-MASKED
020-4200880	1	0.53	2	1.06 CONNECTOR TERMINAL 2-3/8" CENTERS AAR 14.1.15-4 NICKEL
020-4200892	1	0.44	27	11.88 CONNECTOR TERMINAL 1" CENTERS AAR 14.1.15-3 NICKEL PLATED
020-4251190	1	0.13	120	15.60 TERMINAL RING AMP 35627 BLACK PLASTI-BOND WIRE SIZE 10-12
020-4251290	1	0.49	30	14.70 TERMINAL WIRE AMP 322051 BLUE WIRE SIZE NO 6 AWG 1/4" STUD
020-4251295	1	0.49	6	2.94 TERMINAL WIRE AMP 322007 BLUE WIRE SIZE NO 6 AWG 3/8" STUD
020-9999992	1	50.00	1	50.00 HOUSE, SIGNAL HANDLING CHARGE, BURCO DISTRIBUTION
450-0019212	1	0.02	100	2.00 SCREW 10 X 1" SHT METAL PAN HD TYPE A COARSE THREAD
Total Cost: \$			2,505	

ESTIMATE FOR CONSTRUCTION SERVICES



Date: **April 26, 2010**
 Location: **Irmo, SC**
 Milepost: **C 12.40**
 DOT Number: **TBD**
 Description: **Sease Rd. Extension at CSXT - new signals and surface**
 GEC Number: **NCCSXP08.0057**
 OP Number: **SC0043**

CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION:

<u>LABOR</u>	Hours	Rate	TOTAL
Program Administrator (<i>Project Administration</i>)	8	\$157.00	\$1,256.00
Senior Engineer II (<i>contractor document review</i>)	8	\$136.00	\$1,088.00
Senior Engineer I (<i>1 inspection and close out</i>)	16	\$119.00	\$1,904.00
Clerical / Administrative	4	\$68.00	\$272.00
SUBTOTAL LABOR	36		\$4,520.00

SUMMARY OF EXPENSES (NON-LABOR DIRECT COSTS)

<u>ITEM</u>	Quant.	Unit Price	TOTAL
Phone / Cell Phone / FAX			\$0.00
Postage / Shipping			\$10.00
Air Fare			\$0.00
Transportation Expenses, excluding mileage			\$0.00
Mileage @ 0.500 / mile [from Charleston, round trip] = 250.0 mi.]	500.0 mi.	0.500	\$250.00
Lodging	0.0 days		\$0.00
Per Diem - meals	2.0 days	\$15.00	\$30.00
Field Services			\$0.00
Reproduction			\$0.00
Photos and Maps			\$10.00
Permits / Licenses			\$0.00
Equipment Rental			\$0.00
Field Expenses			\$0.00
Other Expenses			\$50.00
SUBTOTAL EXPENSES			\$350.00
TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT FEE -----			\$4,870.00

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Farmers Market [pages 57-62]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Farmers' Market Items

A. Purpose

Council is requested to consider the two farmers' market items currently before the D&S Committee, and provide direction to staff with regards to these items.

B. Background / Discussion

At the February 23, 2010 D&S Committee meeting, the Committee voted to defer and combine two farmers' market items pending legislative approval of the proposed Joint Resolution.

The Joint Resolution received passage on June 16, 2010. The Joint Resolution clarifies that Richland County can continue to use the County's existing stream of hospitality tax revenues to pay off the bonds issued by the County to acquire the tract of land that was intended for use as the new State Farmers' Market. This legislation also clarifies that the tract can be used for economic development purposes. The Joint Resolution is attached below for your convenience.

Because the Joint Resolution was approved, it is at this time that the following two farmers' market items are back before the D&S Committee for consideration and direction.

Item 1:

The following occurred at the November 24, 2009 D&S Committee Meeting:

Pineview Property Follow up – The committee recommended that this item be moved to the December Committee meeting as an action item. Staff is to gather information on regional markets legislation / appropriations. Mr. Jackson stated that he has information, including sketches, that he will provide to staff.

The following information was obtained from the South Carolina Association of Counties regarding the regional markets legislation / appropriations.

From: Josh Rhodes [mailto:Josh@scac.state.sc.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2009 2:31 PM
To: Randy Cherry
Subject: Regional Farmers' Market

Mr. Cherry,

Yesterday you called asking whether the state has made appropriations to regional farmer's markets, more specifically Richland County's. **The state has not made any such appropriation to the regional farmer's markets directly or through the Department of Agriculture.** In fiscal year 2006, the state appropriated funds,

including \$15 million in Capital Reserve Funds, for the relocation of the state farmers' market. The relocation was originally going to be within Richland County but in 2008, the legislature passed a resolution authorizing the relocation to be in Lexington County. In that resolution, which is attached, the state allowed the Department of Agriculture to use the \$15 million for the relocation to Lexington County. The Department, through a public-private agreement, had enough capital to cover the cost of the relocation so they proposed to the legislature that the \$15 million be used to aid regional farmers' markets. In that same year the state saw severe revenue reductions so they recommitted the \$15 million to the state general fund and did not move forward with the Department's proposal. This was the only proposal to make state appropriations to regional farmers' markets, including Richland County's, and no such appropriations have been made. I hope this helps and please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess117_2007-2008/bills/1066.htm

Thanks,
Joshua C. Rhodes
Staff Attorney
SC Association of Counties

At the **December 22, 2009 D&S Committee Meeting**, the D&S Committee recommended that staff obtain cost figures and sketches regarding a Farmer's Market on the Pineview Property.

At the **January 5, 2010 Council Meeting**, Council deferred the item to the January 19, 2010 Council Meeting.

At the **January 19, 2010 Council Meeting**, Council rescinded the following action that was approved at the November 3, 2009 Council meeting: "Council voted to suspend consideration of using public funds to invest in a Richland County farmers' market, and to work with current local markets in promotional activities." This item was then forwarded to the February Development and Services Committee.

At the **February 23, 2010 D&S Committee Meeting**, the committee voted to defer and combine this item with item #2 (below) pending legislative approval of a Joint Resolution which will allow the County to continue paying for the bonds used to purchase the property with hospitality tax money.

Item 2:

The following motion was made at the February 2, 2010 Council Meeting by Councilman Jackson:

Explore utilizing the Shop Road/Pine View Road property (Farmers Market Land) with Public/Private partnership. After spending so much of the people's money, we should not let this property sit, grow weeds and become an eyesore.

This is a perfect opportunity to invite potential businesses and entrepreneurs to come up with ideas and financing mechanism to fund and develop viable projects. We cannot afford to sit and wait and do nothing.

This item was forwarded to the February Development and Services Committee.

At the **February 23, 2010 D&S Committee Meeting**, the committee voted to defer and combine this item with item #1 (above) pending legislative approval of a Joint Resolution which will allow the County to continue paying for the bonds used to purchase the property with hospitality tax money.

As previously stated, the Joint Resolution received passage on June 16, 2010. Therefore, it is at this time that the aforementioned two farmers' market items are back before the D&S Committee for consideration and direction.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request at this time, as further information and direction from Council will need to be obtained before a financial impact can be determined.

D. Alternatives

1. Provide direction to staff regarding the farmers' market items.
2. Do not provide direction to staff regarding the farmers' market items at this time.

E. Recommendation

Council discretion.

F. Reviews

(Please replace the appropriate box with a ✓ and then support your recommendation in the Comments section before routing. Thank you!)

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 7/12/10

Recommend Approval Recommend Denial No Recommendation

Comments:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date: 7/13/10

Recommend Approval Recommend Denial No Recommendation

Comments: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 7/13/10

Recommend Approval Recommend Denial No Recommendation

Comments: Council discretion

S*1190 (Rat #0227) **Joint Resolution, By Leatherman**

Similar(H 4506)

A JOINT RESOLUTION TO MAKE CERTAIN FINDINGS BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN REGARD TO THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION INVOLVING A SITE ACQUIRED BY THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN RICHLAND COUNTY FOR THE PROPOSED STATE FARMERS' MARKET, AND TO CONFIRM AND VALIDATE THE USE OF SPECIFIC TRACTS OF LAND RECEIVED BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA RESEARCH AUTHORITY, AND RICHLAND COUNTY AS PART OF THE SETTLEMENT, AND THE USE OF CERTAIN REVENUES TO MEET OBLIGATIONS CONTINUING UNDER THE SETTLEMENT. - ratified title

02/17/10 Senate Introduced and read first time SJ-8
02/17/10 Senate Referred to Committee on Finance SJ-8
03/03/10 Senate Committee report: Favorable with amendment
Finance SJ-14
03/04/10 Scrivener's error corrected
04/13/10 Senate Committee Amendment Adopted SJ-22
04/13/10 Senate Read second time SJ-22
04/14/10 Scrivener's error corrected
04/14/10 Senate Read third time and sent to House SJ-72
04/15/10 House Introduced and read first time HJ-31
04/15/10 House Referred to Committee on Judiciary HJ-31
05/12/10 House Committee report: Favorable Judiciary HJ-8
05/19/10 House Debate adjourned until Thursday, May 20, 2010 HJ-26
05/20/10 House Read second time HJ-16
05/20/10 House Unanimous consent for third reading on next
legislative day HJ-17
05/21/10 House Read third time and enrolled HJ-1
05/25/10 Ratified R 227
05/28/10 Vetoed by Governor
06/02/10 Senate Veto overridden by originating body Yeas-26
Nays-13 SJ-183
06/03/10 House Debate adjourned on Governor's veto HJ-49
06/15/10 House Veto sustained Yeas-50 Nays-51 HJ-69
06/15/10 House Motion noted- Rep. Jennings noted a motion to
reconsider the vote whereby the Veto was sustained
06/16/10 House Reconsidered HJ-8
06/16/10 House Veto overridden Yeas-85 Nays-19 HJ-10

VERSIONS OF THIS BILL

[2/17/2010](#)
[3/3/2010](#)
[3/4/2010](#)
[4/13/2010](#)
[4/14/2010](#)
[5/12/2010](#)

A JOINT RESOLUTION TO MAKE CERTAIN FINDINGS BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN REGARD TO THE SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION INVOLVING A SITE ACQUIRED BY THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN RICHLAND COUNTY FOR THE PROPOSED STATE FARMERS' MARKET, AND TO CONFIRM AND VALIDATE THE USE OF SPECIFIC TRACTS OF LAND RECEIVED BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA RESEARCH AUTHORITY, AND RICHLAND COUNTY AS PART OF THE SETTLEMENT, AND THE USE OF CERTAIN REVENUES TO MEET OBLIGATIONS CONTINUING UNDER THE SETTLEMENT.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

Findings

SECTION 1. The General Assembly finds that:

(1) The Commissioner of Agriculture (commissioner) settled the case captioned as Richland County v. State of South Carolina and South Carolina Department of Agriculture, 2008-CP-40-5723, involving a dispute concerning ownership of approximately one hundred forty-six acres of land (tract) and formerly acquired for the proposed State Farmers' Market.

(2) In connection with the settlement, the commissioner entered into and executed a mutual consent order and other appropriate documents dismissing with prejudice the referenced case and any related claims that the State of South Carolina may have in connection therewith.

(3) In connection with the settlement, the commissioner transferred on behalf of the State approximately one hundred nine acres of the tract to the South Carolina Research Authority (SCRA) and approximately thirty-seven acres of the tract to Richland County.

(4) In connection with the settlement, the commissioner and Richland County agreed that clarification should be sought with respect to the use of the tract by the SCRA and the county.

Use of property

SECTION 2. The approximately one hundred nine acres of the tract transferred to the South Carolina Research Authority shall be used in accordance with the powers granted to the authority pursuant to its

enabling act, as contained in Chapter 17, Title 13 of the 1976 Code, including, but not limited to, Section 13-17-70(5), and the approximately thirty-seven acres of the tract transferred to Richland County shall be used in accordance with the powers granted to Richland County pursuant to Section 4-9-30 of the 1976 Code, including, but not limited to, Section 4-9-30(2). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the original acquisition of and continuing repayment of any outstanding obligations related to the tract constitute an authorized use of those revenues specified in Article 7, Chapter 1, Title 6 of the 1976 Code; however, once the original acquisition and all outstanding original obligations related to the tract are paid in full, revenues collected pursuant to Article 7, Chapter 1, Title 6 of the 1976 Code must be used only for the purposes set forth in Article 7, Chapter 1, Title 6 of the 1976 Code.

Time effective

SECTION 3. This joint resolution takes effect upon approval by the Governor.

Ratified the 25th day of May, 2010.

Vetoed by the Governor -- 5/28/2010.

Veto overridden by Senate -- 6/2/2010.

Veto overridden by House -- 6/16/2010. -- T.

----XX----

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Proposal that Richland County Enact a Tree Canopy Ordinance and inventory to preserve and enhance the number of trees in Richland County [page 64]

Reviews

That Richland County enact a Tree Canopy Ordinance and inventory to preserve and enhance the number of trees in Richland County [Council Member Malinowski]

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Proposal that Richland County shall have in place a Grease Trap Ordinance that all commercial food preparation customers using Richland County Sewer Systems shall have traps inspected and pumped out every two months or sooner [page 66]

Reviews

That Richland County shall have in place a Grease Trap Ordinance that all commercial food preparation customers using Richland County Sewer Systems shall have traps inspected and pumped out every two months or sooner [Council Member Malinowski]