



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Greg Pearce | Torrey Rush | Joyce Dickerson (Chair) | Damon Jeter | Paul Livingston |
| District 6 | District 7 | District 2 | District 3 | District 4 |

**FEBRUARY 25, 2014
6:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street

CALL TO ORDER

ELECTION OF CHAIR

1. Election of Chair

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. Regular Session: December 17, 2013 [PAGES 5-7]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

3. Approval of a Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator for the Solicitor's Office and a Senior Application Support Analyst for the Information Technology Department [**PAGES 8-12**]
4. Coroner's Office: Purchase of Replacement Computer Equipment [**PAGES 13-17**]
5. FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan - Council Approval [**PAGES 18-39**]
6. Richland County Sheriff's Department ASPCA Foundation Grant/No FTE/No Match [**PAGES 40-42**]
7. Out of Cycle Funding Requests: Accommodations Tax and Hospitality Tax [**PAGES 43-46**]
8. 2nd Annual "Relax, It's OK 2 B Single" Valentine's Day Gala Funding Request [**PAGES 47-52**]
9. Policy for Purchase of Property by Elected and Appointed Officials [**PAGES 53-56**]
10. Expanding Richland County's Community Development Staff [**PAGES 57-61**]
11. Reclassification and Promotion Handbook Revisions [**PAGES 62-66**]
12. CASA: Fostering Futures Youth Center [**PAGES 67-70**]
13. Property Acquisition, 0.26 acre parcel [**PAGES 71-75**]
14. EMS Ambulance Purchase [**PAGES 76-79**]
15. Replace Deteriorated Caulk at the Expansion Joints and Windows at the Richland County Administration and Health Department Buildings [**PAGES 80-83**]

ADJOURNMENT



Special Accommodations and Interpreter Services

Citizens may be present during any of the County's meetings. If requested, the agenda and backup materials will be made available in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), as amended and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof.

Any person who requires a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in the public meeting may request such modification, accommodation, aid or service by contacting the Clerk of Council's office either in person at 2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC, by telephone at (803) 576-2061, or TDD at 803-576-2045 no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Election of Chair

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: December 17, 2013 [**PAGES 5-7**]

Reviews

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2013
6:00 P.M.**

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: Joyce Dickerson
- Member: Damon Jeter
- Member: Paul Livingston
- Member: Greg Pearce
- Member: Torrey Rush

ALSO PRESENT: Kelvin Washington, Bill Malinowski, Norman Jackson, Seth Rose, Jim Manning, Tony McDonald, Roxanne Ancheta, Sparty Hammett, Warren Harley, Daniel Driggers, Brad Farrar, John Hixon, Justine Jones, Bill Peters, Dwight Hanna, Buddy Atkins, Geo Price, Monique Walters

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 26, 2013 (Regular Session) – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Rush moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Ending the Hospitality Tax Program – Mr. Rush moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to defer this item until the 2014 Council Retreat. The vote in favor was unanimous.

PPACA (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act) Compliance – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Rush, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the following requests: (1) County Council revise policies relating to part-time and temporary County employees to clearly limit work hours and length of temporary jobs; (2) County Council provide the County Administrator the authority to designate determination periods for the PPACA; and (3) County Council permit staff to develop a second health plan with lower benefits that would be used primarily for part-time employees. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Approval of a Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator for the Solicitor's Office and a Senior Application Support Analyst for the Information Technology Department – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Rush, to defer this item until the January Committee meeting. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Appraisal of Huger Street Properties – Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council without a recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:27 p.m.

Submitted by,

Joyce Dickerson, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Approval of a Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator for the Solicitor's Office and a Senior Application Support Analyst for the Information Technology Department **[PAGES 8-12]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Approval of a Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator for the Solicitor's Office and a Senior Application Support Analyst for the Information Technology Department

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to the Solicitor's Office budget in the amount of \$81,735 for the purpose of hiring a Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator and a budget amendment to the Information Technology Department's budget in the amount of \$79,953 for a Senior Business Application Analyst.

B. Background / Discussion

The first requested position will devote 50% of their time serving as a Family Court Social Worker and 50% of their time as a Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator. The Family Court Social Worker will assist the Juvenile Division of the Solicitor's Office pursuant to the Compulsory School Attendance Act. Specifically, the Family Court Social Worker will work with the Family Court, the schools, parents and children to address the increasing problem of school non-attendance and other status offenses. During calendar year 2012, the Juvenile Division of the Solicitor's Office disposed of one hundred ninety seven (197) non-attendance petitions. Year-To-Date, for calendar year 2013, there has been one hundred ninety eight (198) such dispositions. Currently, five percent (5%) of the contempt hearings, result in the family member (parent) being incarcerated for failure to require the child to attend school. The Family Court Social Worker will intervene to determine the root causes of absences and recommend corrective measures to the Solicitor's Office and the families. This intervention will assist the Juvenile Division by decreasing the number of non-attendance petitions filed in the Family Court. Family Court Petitions are the statements of charges filed against the juvenile (juvenile warrants).

This position will also serve as the Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator who will work with the newly created Juvenile Mental Health Court (JMHC) which is housed in the Richland County Probate Court. According to the 2011 Mental Health National Outcome Measures (NOMS) for South Carolina, 25,488 juveniles, aged 0-17, were served by South Carolina Department of Mental Health-DMH. In addition, ninety two percent (92%) met the Federal definition for a serious emotional disturbance (SED) and three percent (3%) had co-occurring mental health and alcohol and other disorders. A National Survey of U.S. Juvenile Mental Health Courts documented that sixty five to seventy percent (65% to 70%) of the youth in the juvenile justice system experience mental disorders and that their treatment needs are serious and complex. Additionally, the survey found that twenty eight percent (28%) of the youth in their study required significant and immediate mental health treatment: eighty percent (80%) met criteria for two or more disorders, and sixty one percent (61%) had a co-occurring substance use disorder. There are over 500 juvenile probation cases in Richland County and at least fifty percent (50%) of them have a diagnosed mental disorder. Studies show that about fifteen to forty five percent (15% to 45%) of girls and fourteen to forty three percent (15% to 43%) of boys go through a least one trauma. Of these children and teens who have had a trauma, three to fifteen percent (3% to 15%) of girls and one to six percent (1% to 6%) of boys develop Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. The JMHC Coordinator will handle the day to day activities of the Court to include case management, docketing, maintaining a JMHC database, coordinating and collaborating with both Mental Health and Alcohol and Drug Abuse Providers on

Item# 3

treatment plans, communicating with families, community visits as well as disseminating information on the JMHC. The JMHC Coordinator will: 1) Ensure that needed treatment or other services are received and monitor participant's progress, 2) Act as Liaison between treatment community and courts, 3) Attend, coordinate and schedule all court hearings and present evidence or recommendations to the Court, participate in meetings and case conferences with treatment professionals and community service providers, 4) Assist with collection and review of mental health utilization data to determine effectiveness of programs and services, identify trends and make recommendations.

The second requested position is the Senior Application Support Analyst (IT Professional) within the Information Technology Department who will provide comprehensive and wide-ranging support to software and hardware applications used by the Richland County Solicitor's Office and other departments. The Analyst will proactively anticipate and coordinate necessary updates, upgrades, and training for the Solicitor's Office software and hardware applications. Time is of the essence for the employment of this much needed position. Currently, the Solicitor's Office is awaiting critical upgrades to its criminal case management system. The number of criminal arrest warrants is increasing at a rate of one hundred (100) additional warrants per week. Over the remainder of FY 2013-2014, the Office will increase its current caseload in excess of twenty-six hundred (2,600) warrants. The criminal justice system is rapidly moving and requires continuous technological assistance. This employee will ensure that the Solicitor's Office mission critical software applications are running smoothly and without problems. The Analyst will work as the project manager in the planning and implementation of new systems and major system upgrades; will be instrumental in the deployment of new software applications that improve operational efficiency, effectiveness, and excellence and conducts post-implementation reviews with management and end users. The Analyst will also identify and configure the appropriate software application security for each group of software users to prevent unauthorized access to restricted data.

The Solicitor's Office currently has sufficient one time funding for the Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator for the remainder of FY 2013-2014. As a result of an extended medical leave of an employee, the Office can fund this new position through June 30, 2014 with existing resources. Therefore, there would be zero fiscal impact in this area for FY 2013-2014. Beyond FY 2013-2104, Richland County would need to fund this position. In essence, we are requesting only the (FTE) full-time employee position.

C. Legislative/Chronological History

None

D. Financial Impact

This request is for two new positions for the remainder of FY 2013-2014:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <p>Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator 0% Base Salary (\$60,000) and Fringe Benefits</p> | <p>\$0</p> |
| <p>Senior Application Support Analyst 50% Base Salary (\$58,500) and Fringe Benefits</p> | <p>\$39,976</p> |

| | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Total | \$39,976 |
|--------------|-----------------|

This request is for two new positions for FY 2014-2015:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Family Court Social Worker/Juvenile Mental Health Court Coordinator Base Salary (\$60,000) and Fringe Benefits | \$81,735 |
| Senior Application Support Analyst Base Salary (\$58,500) and Fringe Benefits | \$79,953 |
| Total | \$161,688 |

E. Alternatives

1. Approval would provide funds for two new critical positions that will address backlog of juvenile status offense cases, assist juveniles with mental health issues and increase office productivity regarding information technology systems.
2. Non-approval would result in delaying the implementation of the new Juvenile Mental Health Court and a continued backlog of non-attendance and other status offense petitions in the Richland County Family Court. In addition, non-approval of the Senior Application Support Analyst will result in critical technology processes not being addressed in a timely fashion leading to a decrease in office productivity.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that these two budget amendments be approved for the remainder of FY 2013-2014 and for fiscal years thereafter. These two positions are time sensitive and are necessary prior to FY 2014-2015. They are time sensitive due to the increased number of Family Court Petitions, the newly created Juvenile Mental Health Court and the backlog of IT projects within the Solicitor’s Office.

Recommended by: Dan Johnson Department: Solicitor Date: 11-27-13

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 12/6/13
 Recommend Council approval ✓ Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommendation is based on the request being outside of the budget cycle and not the merits of the request. Approval as requested will require a budget amendment and the identification of funding source for the current year of approximately \$40k and will require the annualized amount of \$162k to be absorbed with the FY15 budget. Since the request is for personnel which is recurring cost for the County we would encourage

approval include the identification of recurring revenue of \$162k or similar cost reduction to cover the increase.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Human Resources has neither been involved with development of this request nor has additional information about this request beyond the contents of this ROA.

Legal

Reviewed by: Brad Farrar

Date: 12/10/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision of Council.

Administration

Reviewed by: Warren Harley

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration's recommendation like Finance is based on request being outside of the budget cycle and not the merits of the request. It is also important to note that approval as requested will require a budget amendment and at this point the process to achieve the request would not be completed rather late in the current fiscal year. It would be our recommendation that council consider this request in the normal budget cycle which would give time to identify an available funding source for the \$162k that is needed to fund this request in the FY15 budget.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Coroner's Office: Purchase of Replacement Computer Equipment [**PAGES 13-17**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Coroner's Office: Purchase of Replacement Computer Equipment

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment for the Coroner's Office in the amount of \$24,216.22 for the purpose of purchasing computer equipment to replace and/or upgrade the computer equipment that is currently being used in the Coroner's Office.

B. Background / Discussion

The majority of the current computer equipment that is being used in the Coroner's Office is very old and worn out. The IT Department has repaired, reworked and "limped" this equipment along as much as they can. We requested that the IT Department take an inventory of our equipment and make recommendations as to what our next step should be. They provided the attached chart listing all of our equipment and the current condition of each computer. Our request for funds for upgrading or replacing this equipment is based on the recommendations made by the IT Department. As you will notice, the attached information quotes an estimated total replacement/upgrade cost of \$31,842.30. This amount includes the cost of replacing laptops at an estimated cost of \$1,835.69 each. This department has chosen to replace the laptops with Surface Tablets at an estimated cost of \$1,400.00 each. The difference in our request versus the estimated cost of \$31,842.30 is an estimated savings of \$7,626.08 to the county.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This is the first request for computer replacement funding therefore there is no history.

D. Financial Impact

The cost to the county is based on figures provided to the Coroner's Office by the IT Department and is listed in the chart below:

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Surface Tablets (11@\$1,400.00) | \$15,400.00 |
| Desk Top Towers (3@\$1,010.66) | \$3,031.98 |
| Upgrades (7@\$300.00) | \$2,100.00 |
| Docking Stations for Surface Tablets (7@\$300.00) | \$2,100.00 |
| Tax | <u>\$1,584.24</u> |
| Total | \$24,216.22 |

Upon approval by Council, the requested amount of \$24,216.22 should be placed into line item 529600 Computers and Equipment in the Coroner's Budget (1100240000) for use for the purchase of stated equipment.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the Coroner’s request to provide funding to replace and/or upgrade the existing computer equipment in the Coroner’s Office to provide the Coroner and his employees the updated equipment they need to document and store the information that is collected in the performance of their duties as required by law.
2. Do not approve the Coroner’s request for funding to replace and/or upgrade the existing computer equipment in the Coroner’s Office and within a very short period of time the existing equipment will be totally inoperable and the Coroner and his employees will not have the equipment needed to document and store the information that is collected in the performance of their duties as required by law.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to provide funding to replace the existing computer equipment in the Coroner’s Office to provide the Coroner and his employees the updated equipment they need to document and store the information that is collected in the performance of their duties as required by law.

Recommended by: Gary Watts

Department: Coroner

Date: 01/02/2014

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/12/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Information Technology

Reviewed by: Janet Claggett

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

The RCIT Department has reviewed and supports the purchase of the equipment specified by the Coroner. As for the timing as a budget amendment or instead for FY15, the RCIT Department defers to Council discretion.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/12/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by Warren Harley:

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration's recommendation is based on the timing of the request being outside of budget cycle and not the validity of the request. RCIT is in agreement that the need is valid. However, absent any urgency to replace equipment that immediately puts the Coroner's work in jeopardy Administration would recommend moving this item to the next fiscal year. At this point in the fiscal year the request would not finish the approval process until March 2014. **As an alternative council could agree to partially fund half or some portion of this request replacing equipment based on the most urgent need and then look to fund the remainder of the request in the normal budget cycle.**

CORONER EQUIPMENT INVENTORY AND RECOMMENDATIONS - 12/30/13
SUBMITTED BY RC IT DEPARTMENT

| User's Computers and Contact Information | | Last updated 12/04/2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----|----|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Users | Phone | Cell | Computer | Description | Windows | RAM | IE | Crystal Reports Updated | Under Maintenance Contract | Upgrade Course of Action | Estimated Replacement/Upgrade Cost | Tech Review | | | | |
| Ann Joe | 576-1797 | 309-6144 | postcomancy | Desktop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Ann Neeley | 576-3364 | 518-8798 | BVNZHH1 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Cathy Rawls | 576-1792 | 600-2978 | 016962531453 | Surface | 8 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | None | \$300.00 | FAX Solution | | | | |
| | | | JSGJJS1 | Desktop | 7 | 4GB | 9 | Yes | No | Upgrade | \$1,835.69 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| | | | 1VNZHH1 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | Yes | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Charles "Chuck" Wesley | 576-3366 | 529-0737 | COR17037331453 | Surface | 8 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | None | \$1,835.69 | FAX Solution | | | | |
| Charlie Benton | 576-1796 | 521-0824 | 7FJMJ2B1 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Christine Benson | 576-1796 | 309-3048 | BVF5W91 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| | | | 8X2N1R1 | Desktop | 7 | 3GB | 9 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| | | | LTH88SPH1 | Desktop | XP | 2GB | 7 | Yes | Yes | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| David Burns | 576-3374 | 513-7985 | 3ZFCXK1 | Netbook | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| David Escalante | 576-3362 | 309-8979 | 9DOVHQ1 | Desktop | XP | 4GB | 9 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| Debbie Phillips | 576-1795 | 600-2974 | 1N86GK1 | Desktop | XP | 2GB | 8 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| Gary Watts | 576-1795 | 600-2974 | TVNZHH1 | Laptop | XP | 2GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| James "Jim" Potash | 576-1794 | 521-0929 | CS028878831253 | Surface | 8 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | None | \$300.00 | FAX Solution | | | | |
| Jane Powell | 576-1794 | 309-5821 | 45PZCP1 | Desktop | XP | 3GB | 7 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| | | | 6PBKVV1 | Desktop | 7 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| | | | 0016822231453 | Surface | 8 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | None | \$300.00 | FAX Solution | | | | |
| | | | 5VNZHH1 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Kimberly Simpson | 576-3365 | 518-6034 | 2ZFCXK1 | Netbook | XP | 2GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Leonard Bradley | | 227-9752 | 23ZXV21 | Desktop | XP | 3GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,010.66 | | | | | |
| | | | GVNZHH1 | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| | | | 017286431453 | Surface | 8 | 4GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | None | \$300.00 | FAX Solution | | | | |
| Nell Mauney | 767-1544 | 518-6032 | 6ZFCXK1-LAP | Netbook | XP | 2GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Robert Dean | 791-5280 | 529-0736 | 5ZFCXK1 | Netbook | XP | 2GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Ted Powell | 576-1790 | 600-2980 | 4ZFCXK1 | Netbook | XP | 2GB | 8 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,835.69 | | | | | |
| Veronica Sullivan | 576-1793 | 600-2985 | 8X2Q1R1 | Desktop | XP | 3GB | 10 | Yes | Yes | Upgrade | \$300.00 | Review/Updater/Cleanup | | | | |
| William "Bill" Stevens | | | 5J6N191 | Desktop | XP | 1GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,010.66 | | | | | |
| - Central Work Area | | | 5M81W61 | Desktop | XP | 1GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,010.66 | | | | | |
| - Dr. Dee Gilledge | | 206-9816 | | Laptop | XP | 1GB | 7 | Yes | No | Replace | \$1,335.69 | | | | | |
| Hardware requirement: RC Standard (4GB-RAM)(WONDOWS7) | | | | | | | | | | | Total Estimated Replacement/Upgrade Cost | \$31,842.30 | | | | |
| We have 18 computers to replace: 4 Desktops, 9 Laptops and 5 Netbooks. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do we want to replace the Desktops with Desktops or Laptops? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Are we replacing the Netbooks with Laptops? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan - Council Approval [**PAGES 18-39**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan - Council Approval

A. Purpose

Council is being requested to approve the HUD–approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan (Appendix A) in its entirety.

B. Background / Discussion

The FY 13-14 Community Development budget (both CDBG and HOME) was approved by Council on July 2, 2013. At that time the Annual Action Plan was not finalized. After Council’s budget approval, the full plan was submitted to HUD for approval on August 15th. HUD has approved the plan and the grant awards have been received by the County. This is the final step in the approval for our files.

Council is being requested to approve the HUD approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan in its entirety. The budget has already received Council approval during a July 2013 meeting. This current ROA action is a formality. HUD has already approved the plan and grant agreements have been received and signed off by Administration as the HUD authorized signature. This requested action will also satisfy Finance requirements of Council approval.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- Council approved FY 13-14 CDBG Budgets on July 2, 2013.
- HUD approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan by October 1, 2013.

D. Financial Impact

The sole financial impact of this request for the County is the HOME Match which has been previously approved within the County general budget. The amount approved was \$101,479 in County general funds. The remaining funds are non-county (federal) sources.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to approve the HUD approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan in its entirety.
2. Do not approve the HUD approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan in its entirety.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the HUD approved FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan in its entirety.

Recommended by: Valeria Jackson Department: Community Development Date: 11/20/13

Item# 5

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Budget is available as stated

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

(Appendix A)

**2013 Annual Action Plan
Program Year 2013 (October 1, 2013 – September 30, 2014)**

Richland County is an expanse of more than 770 square-miles that occupies the center of the State of South Carolina. It is home to the nation's largest Army basic training facility, Fort Jackson and the State's capitol, Columbia. Richland County Government's motto is *Uniquely Urban, Uniquely Rural* and is so appropriately named for its true combination of smaller metropolitan flavor, coupled with major parcels in the outlying areas constituting the rural setting. The County's population growth, while originally centered in the urbanized area of Columbia, has spread along the County-wide Interstates I-26, I-20 and I-77, which is through the northern area of the County. The local economy is a mixture of State and local governments, banking and finance, industry, health care, higher education, significant regional retail centers, and an emerging research and development sector.

Founded in 1786, Columbia most recently proclaimed itself as the "New Southern Hot Spot". The new moniker is based upon various factors such as the City Center Partnership's decade-long downtown revitalization; and the \$200 million investment, 165 acre property to transform the former state mental hospital on Bull Street into a multiuse urban space, making it one of the largest downtown green areas on the East Coast. Columbia houses the largest children's museum, EdVenture, along with Riverbanks Zoo, ranked among the top ten zoos in the United States. The educational community within Richland County has a long working history of shared resources. Beyond the University of South Carolina, institutions include Allen University and 3,100-student Benedict College (both HBCU's), Columbia College as well as Midlands Technical College and a number of for-profit schools such as Virginia College and University of Phoenix.

The area's temperate year-round climate keeps residents and tourists kayaking any of the three intersecting rivers (Congaree, Saluda or Broad River), along with Lake Murray (41 miles long and 14 miles wide at its widest point, the lake covers 78 square miles with 649 miles of shoreline), which is home to state and national fishing tournaments. CNN Money Magazine named Columbia One of the 25 Best Places to Retire in the country.

While Richland County is home to Fort Jackson, the University of South Carolina (USC) and state government are still major employers; insurance services and upcoming technology pioneered by Blue Cross Blue Shield of SC, Aflac, and Colonial Life are blossoming as well. This is making our county and area one of the nation's insurance industry leaders. Top ten area employers include Wells Fargo Bank; Verizon Wireless; Michelin; SCANA/SCE&G along with Palmetto Health Alliance. In addition, non-profits like IT-ology are committed to the collaboration of businesses, academic institutions and organizations for growth of the IT talent pipeline, fostering economic development and advancing the IT profession for all age ranges to include kindergarten to adult professionals.

In 2011, the County emerged as the second most populated county in the State (389,116), behind only Greenville County. In 2000, US Census listed the County's population at 320,781, which reflects a 21% shift in growth. As of 2010, 61% of the county lived in owner-occupied housing units found in Richland County. The median income is \$64,500.00 with 15% of the population living in poverty. (Sources: usairwaysmag.com and census.gov; [HUD](#) User and US Census Quick Facts - 2011).

Population estimates indicate that the County was one of the fastest growing in the State from 2007 to 2008, ranking 11th with a percentage growth of 1.7%. Future projections indicate that the county's population will grow by 5.2% from 2010 to 2015. The annual estimated number of housing units is almost 158,900. (Source: Office of Research and Statistics (SCORS)).

White people moved into the city of Columbia at a much greater pace in the past decade than African-Americans, who took to suburban life at a rate that outpaced Caucasians — reversing the trend of a

Item# 5

generation ago. Between 2000 and 2010, the capital city's white population jumped 17 percent, while its black population inched up by 2 percent, according to 2010 Census data. Altogether, the number of residents in South Carolina's largest city rose by 11.2 percent. At the same time, black residents moved into Richland County at a rate that was 9 percentage points higher than whites — 22 percent growth, compared with 13 percent for whites. And, for the first time in its history, Richland County has a majority of nonwhite residents because of the growth of black, Hispanic and Asian populations. Demographers have been reporting the trend using estimates for several years. Hispanics are now at 4.9% of the County's demographic, according to 2010 census figures. This reflects an increase from the 2000 figure of 2.7%.

Significant demographic trends and issues in Richland County include:

- Seventy-Three (73%) percent of the persons in the County are under the age of 49, with the median age at 32.6.
- The County's unemployment rate fluctuated with an average of 7.2% in 2012, down from 10.3% in 2011. Source: http://www.eascinc.com/unemployment_rate.html.
- More than 42% of households countywide are considered to be low and moderate income (LMI). Incomes for LMI households are below 80% of median family income (MFI).
- Median value of owner-occupied housing units are listing at \$146,300.
- Households with individuals of 65 years and older are at 19.2% and owner-occupied housing units are at 61.3%. Rental units make up the other 38.7%.
- Previous residential growth in the County has been dominated by the construction of low-density, detached single-family housing in the northeast between I-20 and I-77 and within the northwestern I-26 and southeastern Garners Ferry Road corridors.
- In 2009, more than one-third (36.2%) of County residents in rental units and one-fifth (21.4%) of homeowners are cost-burdened – spending more than 30% of the area median family income (MFI) for housing costs.

I. Citizen Participation

Richland County has a Citizen Participation Plan in place that encourages participation of all residents, especially the low and moderate-income population. Formal and informal approaches are used each year in the assessment process, as citizens' needs and concerns are expressed often in the local government arena. The advertisement considers the special needs of the disabled. In addition, when necessary, flyers are posted in local gathering places and mailed to all neighborhood associations and local churches encouraging attendance.

Richland County Community Development Department staff conducted a public hearing for citizen input. The notice was also posted in The State, on our website and in the County Building where daily high volumes of people (from all socioeconomic levels) visit as well as the County Health Department entrance way. The public hearing was held on **Monday, August 5, 2013** and no comments were received at that time. All public comments were accepted through **Friday August 23, 2013**. Any public comments received were put in writing and forwarded to our HUD Regional office.

Richland County relies heavily on the Ombudsman's Office, which is the County One Stop Call Center. Citizens express concerns by telephone, fax, and email to this office and these concerns are kept and tracked on a computer system. Upon request, the Community Development can receive documented concerns that have been expressed over a period of time. The Community Development Department obtains and reviews the documented concerns and response accordingly.

Richland County Community Development Website (www.richlandonline.com) is available and has current information. The website has been a cost saving tool for the County to communicate with the general public, monitor sub-recipients and share information with HUD as well as other Entitlement Communities. This site will provide links to a variety of resources and information, to include Fair Housing, Program

Management and Compliance. The Community Development Office has received a number of favorable comments about the webpage and its information. The office has also joined Twitter and can be found at [@upgrade_u@twitter.com](https://twitter.com/upgrade_u). In addition, Richland County has a Facebook page, www.facebook.com/pages/RichlandCounty/21957014241, in which Community Development's updates and events are posted.

II. Funding Sources

A. Federal Funds

Projects identified in the Action Plan will be implemented through the County's 2013 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships. Richland County anticipates receiving approximately **\$1,270,319** in CDBG funding and **\$451,016** in HOME funding.

Additional funding will be provided through anticipated program income (**\$14,641.00**) generated by the County's HOME and CDBG, program investments. This includes: Income from ; Income from the Homeowner Rehabilitation Program is estimated to be earned through the repayment of three loans that are being serviced by First Citizens Bank (**\$3,000.00**); through loans made to Community Housing Development Corporations (**\$10,141.00**), and through application fees in the RCHAP program (**\$1,500.00**). Additional monies may be generated utilizing the recapture provisions as outlined in the policies and procedures of the housing programs and the CHDO contracts. These provisions ensure compliance with Federal regulations.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program 1 (NSP1) was created as a result of Title III of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) of 2008. This program provides assistance to acquire and redevelop foreclosed properties that might otherwise become sources of abandonment and blight within their communities. During FY 2012-13, all NSP and NSP1 program income (\$299,343.90 generated) was used to build new, demolish unsafe and blighted properties, along with acquire and rehabilitate properties to provide homeownership opportunities to income qualified households up to 120% of the area median income. Richland County Community Development Department received an allocation of \$2,221,859 and by the end of the grant period the full \$2,521,203 was expended. A total of 18 units were rehabilitated and/or constructed along with 34 blighted units demolished to benefit the county and the grant has now come to a close.

In addition Richland County Community Development applied for and received a total of \$1.3 million in NSP-3 funding from the South Carolina State Housing and Finance Authority in 2011. These funds will be used for acquisition and rehabilitation with the end use of rental or homeownership as well as redevelopment. We will continue to work with our funding partners under NSP 1. Activities will take place in census tracts 5, 107.03 and 110 primarily. These census tracts were selected based on need scores calculated by HUD using marketing conditions and other factors. To date, a total of \$1.2 million has been expended and requested for payment from SC Housing to date. A total of 15 properties have been addressed for households up to 120% LMI.

B. County Funds

Richland County will provide a local match as required for the HOME program in Program Year 2013. As feasible, the County will also provide in-kind services, funds for operating costs, funds for furnishings and equipment, other available funds, and real property to carry out the activities identified in this Plan. In past program years, County Departments including Public Works, Procurement, IT, Utilities and the Legal Department have provided in-kind professional services to the County's CDBG and HOME programs. In 2013 the County will also continue to seek donations from private and public entities for services such as engineering to help offset project costs when possible.

In addition, since the inception of its Community Development Program, Richland County has sought partnerships that leverage funding for CDBG and HOME endeavors. In past program years, the County has

Item# 5

partnered with the Rural Development Program of the US Department of Agriculture, the SC State Housing Trust Fund, the Greater Columbia Association of Home Builders, the Salkehatchie Summer Service, Home Depot, and World Changers for activities undertaken in the County’s housing rehabilitation and emergency repair programs. The department also created a partnership with Bank of America to maximize NSP3 funds to leverage against their 203K program, thereby allowing even more citizens to benefit. The newly formed Midlands Housing Trust also partnered with Community Development to complete 21 units of affordable housing apartment complex. Other partnerships are being explored in both public and private sectors.

Table 13-1 outlines program funding from both Federal and local funding sources for program year 2013.

Table 13-1. Program Year 2013 Funding Sources and Income

| Program | New or Current Award Amount |
|---|------------------------------------|
| New Federal Funding | |
| CDBG | 1,270,319 |
| HOME | \$451,016 |
| HUD-SHP (HMIS) | 0 |
| Additional Sources: Carryover/PI/Match | |
| HOME Program Income (Estimated) | \$14,641 |
| Local Funding HOME Match – Richland County | \$101,478 |
| Total Funds Available | \$1,837,454 |

III. Program Year 2013 Budget

Richland County’s CDBG and HOME programs provide funding for projects in unincorporated areas of the County. During the 2013 Program Year, the County will focus its CDBG efforts and funding on approved master plan project areas, neighborhood revitalization, emergency housing repairs and energy efficiency, and operational costs for a homeless facility, job development/training and match for the MACH HMIS grant, a medical clinic targeting underinsured and uninsured low income citizens, job development and training for Section 3 residents as well as planning and administration of the County’s Community Development Program. The County will focus efforts and HOME funding on housing development in conjunction with the Neighborhood Revitalization Program, countywide Housing Rehabilitation Program, multi-unit and/or Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) county-wide projects, programmatic funds for CHDOs, and the Richland County Homeownership Assistance Program (RCHAP).

Richland County projects allocations of \$1,270,319 to implement CDBG activities for the 2013 Program Year. The projects proposed for CDBG funding are listed in Table 13-2, including funding allocated per project for Program Year 2013.

Table 13-2. CDBG Proposed Budget, Program Year 2013

| New/Ongoing CDBG Projects for Program Year 2013 | Total 2013 Funds Allocated |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Monticello Rd. Streetscape (Phase 2 of 3) | \$350,000 |
| Sister Care | \$10,746 |
| HMIS Grant Match to United Way (Phase 2 of 3) | \$30,000 |
| Columbia Housing Authority – Section 3 Jobs | \$50,000 |
| Emergency Repair Program (Minor Repair) | \$200,510 |
| SE Columbia Medical Facility – Hopkins (Phase 2) | \$375,000 |
| Administration (not to exceed 20%) | \$254,063 |
| Sources of Funds | |
| CDBG Entitlement Award | \$1,270,319 |

B. HOME Budget

Richland County expects to receive \$451,016 to implement HOME activities for the 2013 Program Year. In addition, we anticipate approximately \$14,641 in program income along with \$101,478 of Richland County HOME Match. The projects proposed for HOME funding are listed in Table 13-3, including funding allocated for each project for Program Year 2013.

Table 13-3. HOME Proposed Budget, Program Year 2013

| HOME Projects for Program Year 2013 | Total 2013 Funds Allocated |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Housing Rehabilitation Program (HR) * - includes project delivery costs | \$85,915 |
| Down payment Assistance Program (RCHAP) * - - includes project delivery costs | \$220,000 |
| CHDO Set Aside Programmatic and Operating Funds | \$100,000 |
| Administration (not to exceed 10%) | \$45,101 |
| TOTAL HOME ENTITLEMENT BUDGET | \$451,016 |
| Sources of Funds | |
| HOME Program Income | \$14,641 |
| Richland County HOME Match – 25% <i>*To be awarded by County</i> | \$101,478 |
| HOME Entitlement Award | \$451,016 |
| Total HOME Funds Available | \$567,135 |
| Additional HOME Programs Using HOME Program Income (Estimated)** | |
| Down payment Assistance Program (RCHAP) | \$14,641 |
| CHDO/Developers/Sub-recipients (CHDO) | \$101,478 |

**Funding of these programs will derive from FY 12-13 HOME Program Income plus local HOME match.

**Program income will be used towards RCHAP activities.

IV. SPECIFIC Annual Objectives

Program Year 2013 will address the following objectives selected from the County’s 5-Year Consolidated Plan.

- Priority Need 1: Improve the quality and availability of decent, safe and affordable housing.
- Priority Need 2: Provide for adequate and safe public facilities and infrastructure.
- Priority Need 3: Revitalize LMI neighborhoods.
- Priority Need 4: Provide for and support programs and services for the homeless.
- Priority Need 5: Provide code enforcement for LMI neighborhoods and CDBG project areas.
- Priority Need 6: Provide planning activities to meet the needs of LMI areas and residents.
- Priority Need 7: Work with community partners to coordinate community development activities.

Table 13-4 summarizes the priority needs and objectives of the 5-year Consolidated Plan that will be addressed by the projects proposed for the 2013 Program Year and lists performance indicators for each proposed project.

Table 13-4. 2013 Projects, Priority Needs, Objectives and Performance Indicators (HUD Table 3C)

| 2013 Annual Action Plan Projects | Consolidated Plan (CP) Priority Need | Performance Indicator |
|---|--|--|
| CDBG Projects | | |
| 1. Hopkins Area Medical Facility to service LMI patients. | #2 Provide for adequate and safe public facilities and infrastructure. | 1 Medical Facility to serve under & uninsured patients |
| 2. Sister Care | #4. Provide for and support programs and services for the homeless. | 250 Persons served. |
| 3. Emergency Repair Program (ER) | #1. Improve the quality & availability of decent, safe & affordable housing. | 10-13 homes repaired |
| 4. HMIS Match | #4. Provide for and support programs and services for the homeless. | 2,650 homeless individuals & 2,500 families provided services. |
| 5. Job Development/Training for Section 3 residents | #7. Work with community partners to coordinate community development activities. | 20 development and/or training opportunities. |
| 6. Monticello Rd. Streetscape (Neighborhood Revitalization Program) | #3 Revitalize LMI neighborhoods. | Revitalize LMI neighborhoods |
| 7. Administration (20%) | #6. Provide planning activities to meet the needs of LMI areas and residents. | n/a |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| HOME Projects | | |
| 8. CHDO Set Aside Programmatic and Operating Funds | #3. Revitalize LMI neighborhoods. | Rehabilitate homes. Seek partnerships for development of vacant infill properties. |
| 9. Housing Rehabilitation Program (HR) | #1. Improve the quality & availability of decent, safe & affordable housing. | 10-12 homes rehabilitated |
| 10. Down Payment Assistance Program (RCHAP) | #1. Improve the quality and availability of decent, safe and affordable housing. | 15-30 New Home Owners (depending on individual assistance amount) |
| 11. Administration (not to exceed 10%) | #6. Provide planning activities to meet the needs of LMI areas and residents. | n/a |

In September 2003, HUD issued *CPD Notice 03-09* regarding performance measurement. In the notice, HUD strongly encouraged each grantee under its Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) formula, which includes Richland County's CDBG and HOME programs, to develop and use a performance measurement system. In addition, it described the need for HUD to begin to show the results of the federal dollars spent on the activities funded by the CDBG program. On March 7, 2006 HUD established its new

Item# 5

standards for performance measurement through the publication of the *Notice of Outcome Performance Measurement System for Community Planning and Development Formula Grant Programs* in the Federal Register. As described in the Federal Register, the outcome performance measurement system will enable HUD to collect information on the outcomes of activities funded with CPD formula grant assistance and to aggregate that information at the national, state, and local level.

In preparation for the new system, Richland County Community Development staff attended a workshop on HUD's proposed performance measurement system. Since that time, CDBG staff has reviewed records and projects, revised all necessary forms, and communicated with community development partners to ensure that adequate information is collected when needed. Each project or activity funded by the Richland County Community Development program falls under one of the following three objectives that relate to the statutory purposes of the program:

1. Creating a Suitable Living Environment. In general, this objective relates to activities that are designed to benefit communities, families or individuals by addressing issues in their living environment. It relates to activities that are intended to address a wide range of issues faced by LMI persons from physical problems with their environment, such as poor quality infrastructure, social issues such as crime prevention, literacy, or health services.
2. Providing Decent Housing. The activities that typically would be found under this objective are designed to cover the wide range of housing possible under CDBG. This objective focuses on housing programs where the purpose of the program is to meet individual family or community needs.
3. Creating Economic Opportunities. This objective applies to types of activities related to economic development, commercial revitalization, or job creation.

For each objective selected for a specific project, one of three outcome categories will be chosen that best reflects what is proposed to be achieved by funding the activity. The three outcome categories are:

1. Improving Availability or Accessibility. This outcome category applies to activities that make services, infrastructure, public services, housing, or shelter available or accessible to low and moderate-income persons, including those with disabilities. In this category, accessibility not only refers to physical barriers, but also to making the affordable basics of daily living available and accessible to low and moderate-income persons. Where a service or facility did not exist, the assistance provided results in new access to that service or facility. Where a service or facility was limited in size or capacity, and the assistance expanded the existing service or facility, the result would be improved access.
2. Improving Affordability. This outcome category applies to activities that provide affordability in a variety of ways in the lives of low and moderate-income people. It can include creating or maintaining affordable housing, basic infrastructure hookups, or services such as transportation or daycare.
3. Improving Sustainability. This outcome applies to projects where the activity or activities are aimed at improving communities or neighborhoods, helping to make them livable or viable by providing benefit to persons of low and moderate-income or by removing or eliminating slums or blighted areas, through multiple activities or services that sustain communities or neighborhoods.

The three overarching objectives are matched with the three outcome categories, resulting in nine (9) groups of **outcome/objective statements** under which to report the activity or project data to document the results of the activities or projects. The **outcome/objective statements** will be reviewed and assigned to each proposed activity, project and program for Program Year 2013 to comply with the requirements of the performance measurement standards (Table 13-5).

Table 13-5. HUD Performance Measurement Outcome Framework

| | Outcome 1: Availability or Accessibility | Outcome 2: Affordability | Outcome 3: Sustainability |
|---|---|--|---|
| Objective 1: Suitable Living Environment | Enhance suitable living environment through improved accessibility SL-1 | Enhance suitable living environment through improved or new affordability SL-2 | Enhance suitable living environment through improved or new sustainability SL-3 |
| Objective 2: Decent Housing | Create decent housing with improved or new availability DH-1 | Create decent housing with improved or new affordability DH-2 | Create decent Housing with improved or new sustainability DH-3 |
| Objective 3: Economic Opportunities | Provide economic opportunity through improved or new accessibility EO-1 | Provide economic opportunity through improved or new affordability EO-2 | Provide economic opportunity through improved or new sustainability EO-3 |

VI. Description of Proposed Projects

Richland County plans to undertake 11 major projects, including planning and administration of the CDBG and HOME programs, during Program Year 2013. HUD Tables 3C for projects ID numbers 2013-1 through 2013-11 describe each major project, including project description, location, funding type and amount, performance indicators, project start and completion dates, as well as all required HUD citations and objectives.

VII. Geographic Distribution

While the FY 13-14 CDBG and HOME funds will benefit over 70% low to moderate income persons, various projects will take place throughout the county. Richland County’s Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP) will continue to address Richland County Master Planned Areas such as Broad River Heights, Candlewood, Crane Creek, Trenholm Acres/New Castle and Woodfield Park by using previous years CDBG and other funding. As a result the community will see a new park in Crane Creek off Fairfield Road and the demolition of a hazardous, blighted mobile home park off Shakespeare Road near Two Notch Road. FY 13-14 funds will benefit those citizens in Districts 10 and 11, which are lower county rural areas with the addition of a medical facility that will service low-income, underinsured and uninsured residents. In addition, the continuation of Phase II of the Monticello Road Streetscape will take place in the mid-portion of the County. Public Services projects such as job development and training for Section 3 residents, assistance to a domestic violence shelter and funds to United Way for HMIS support round out the use for CDBG entitlement dollars.

Richland County’s CDBG and HOME programs continue to target assistance for projects that benefit low and moderate income persons and LMI communities in the unincorporated areas of the County. HOME funds are to address up to 80% of low-income persons and/or areas. RCHAP (down payment assistance-DPA) and HR or Housing Rehabilitation will produce county-wide assistance but historically, the majority of the DPA’s have located in 29223 and 29229 zip codes or the upper northeast quadrant. Lastly, the Richland County Community Development will be working with City of Columbia’s TN Development Corporation to rehabilitate a home in the Meadowlakes subdivision. (See Map 13-1 for proposed project locations).

Master Planned Areas

Community Development is collaborating with Neighborhood Improvement and Planning to assist with the implementation of neighborhood master plans. Richland County Council approved 10 master plans of which

Decker International Corridor/Woodfield Park qualified to receive Federal CDBG funds under slum and blight designation; and based on the U.S Census and the boundaries of Crane Creek, Trenholm Acres/New Castle and Broad River Heights each is determined 51% or higher low to moderate income. Each neighborhood master plan is a detailed study of the specific conditions that prohibit growth and sustainability and focus on residential and commercial planning and development. The goal of the collaboration is to leverage County resources to have greater and immediate impact.

Carry-over activities planned for 2013/2014 are the completion of Crane Creek Park with leveraged general County funding; and demolition of the abandoned Columbia Mall Mobile Home Park and signage improvements. In addition advantage points are given to CHDO's that submit project proposals in target areas. These activities are intended to reduce and prevent blight, contribute to job creation and restore and expand economic vitality.

The Ridgewood Neighborhood Revitalization, another master planned area, will proceed with the construction of the Monticello Road streetscape project. This revitalization community will also include a new in-fill housing development that will continue into year 2013-2014. This will be done using HOME funds by the developer Benedict Allen CDC.

VIII. Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities

Richland County continues to participate in the efforts of local, regional and statewide organizations addressing homelessness and special needs activities. This cooperative and collaborative approach reduces redundancies in service provision and mobilizes resources, enabling more efficient and effective delivery of services and resources. Richland County has a representative on the Midlands Area Consortium for the Homeless (MACH) and maintains a working relationship with the Low Income Housing Coalition. The MACH addresses the concerns of the continuum of care, which involves emergency shelter, transitional housing and programs to assist in the areas of permanent housing and independent living.

Richland County continued to administer the MACH Region's HMIS grants, funded through HUD's Supportive Housing Program (SHP) until July 31st, 2012. HMIS is a computerized database designed to collect client-level information on the characteristics, service needs and gaps of adults and children experiencing homelessness. The HMIS grants provide funding for user licenses, systems support, computers, and internet access, as well as a System Administrator, Program Director, and other required staff. HUD requires a local match of 25% for the Supportive Housing Program grants, which Richland County has provided through CDBG funding.

Starting August 1, 2012, Richland County transferred the administrative role of this grant to the United Way of The Midlands. However, Richland County has agreed to continue to provide the local matching funds at the rate of \$30,000 per year for a three year period. The County also continues to work with the United Way of the Midlands to form a Midlands Housing Trust Fund Program (MHTF) to assist with maintaining the affordability of housing for low to moderate income citizens. Through these efforts, Richland County will assist the Committee to close the gap on affordable housing and other needs to end chronic homelessness in the Midlands. This effort will also provide gap financing and incentives to nonprofits and developers to create affordable housing for low and moderate income populations.

IX. OTHER ACTIONS

A. Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs

The following sections of the 2012-2016 Consolidated Plan and subsequent FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan provide a basis for identifying underserved needs and the obstacles to meeting these needs in Richland County:

- Community Profile
- Housing Market Analysis

- Housing Needs Assessment
- Homeless Needs Assessment
- Non-Housing Community Development

The Strategic Plan and the proposed activities and projects to be undertaken as described in the Annual Action Plan are intended to help overcome these obstacles to the extent possible with available resources.

B. Foster and Maintain Affordable Housing

Richland County will strive to address the needs for affordable housing as identified in the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and subsequent FY 13-14 Annual Action Plan. The strategies and objectives for addressing these needs are identified in the Strategic Plan and addressed in the programs and activities proposed by this 2013 Annual Action Plan. The Community Development Department plans to become a member of the SC Association of Community Development Corporations to foster and strengthen relationships with non-profit housing developers. In addition, the director is a member of the Affordable Housing Coalition of SC.

C. Remove Barriers to Fair and Affordable Housing

A Civil Rights Summit was held April 2013 for County department heads, administration and County Council to review the County’s obligations as an Entitlement Community through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Local HUD representatives were in attendance and provided remarks. The 2012 Richland County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, approved by County Council, was pivotal to the discussion. The overall mission of the summit and efforts moving forward, is to accelerate progress towards the adoption of a Section 504 Plan; Limited English Proficiency Plan and Section 3 Plan.

During the 2013/14 program year attention will be given to create a Richland County Government American with Disability Act Transition Plan. County administration recognizes the need to identify shortcomings as it relates to access to services, information and housing for disabled residents of the County. County Administration appointed an ADA Coordinator who will initiate the formation of a task force to accomplish this mission. The process will be an opportunity to discuss Civil Rights concerns and to verify needs population such as:

- Housing choice alternatives for the disabled and families with children and the need to encourage the construction of affordable homeownership and rental, housing;
- Identify discriminatory practices, trends, or challenges;
- Evaluate language proficiency needs within County Government including determining the degree to which services in other languages are needed, and the number and types of documents and materials needed in languages other than English.

In addition, the strategy for 2013/14 is to take advantage of every opportunity to address the six impediments to fair housing that are identified in the 2012 Analysis of Impediments (AI) document. The AI identifies multiple, often interrelated, conditions, actions and policies that affect housing choice in the County. Many of the findings highlighted in the AI from the 2005 persist as impediments and barriers today.

There will be occasions throughout the year where community development staff will serve on committees and participate in the planning of workshops, conferences and meetings where impediments will be addressed. Scheduled events include but are not limited to the following:

- Neighborhood Planning Conference – October 12, 2013, Fair Housing Game Show
- Financial Empowerment Workshop – October 19, 2013
- Regional Community Development Association Meeting – October 2013
- Fair Housing Month – April 2014
- Ownership, Maintenance & Gardening Conference – June 2014

The mission of Community Development embodies fair and equal access to decent, safe and affordable housing and is ingrained into the consciousness of the depart. The goal to eradicate impediments to fair housing choice is integrated in the day to day business of the Community Development Department.

IMPEDIMENT ONE – DISCRIMINATION IN THE HOUSING MARKET

The review of demographic information, discrimination complaint data, and lending data are not clear in indicating the extent of housing discrimination among persons in the protected classes. Statistical data can assist in identifying problems and topics of concern, however, reporting requirements vary, as does the quality of data provided. Further, much of the available data is at least a year old by the time it is available. More focused, accurate and current data is necessary to understand the needs, and more sources of first-hand information from focus groups and housing advocacy groups are needed to obtain a better understanding of the situation in the marketplace. In the current economy and given the structure of the Richland County housing stock, the incidences of discrimination likely focus on rental housing, and the focus of efforts in the immediate future should be upon aspects of discrimination in the rental market.

To address likely disparities in the availability of affordable housing for female headed households, non-family households, disabled persons and other racial/ethnic groups we plan to implement the following actions:

Action Plan:

- HOME set aside funds for CHDO development will be used for the development of housing that is handicap accessible and energy efficient.
- Continue and, if possible, expand outreach across programs to educate households and housing related organizations by disseminating Fair Housing law literature, conducting Fair Housing law seminars and training, and focusing public awareness campaigns about Fair Housing law in ethnic and minority neighborhoods, and among civic, social, religious, and special interest groups.
- Continue to provide Fair Housing materials and educational programs in Spanish, especially in neighborhoods and communities with high percentages of Spanish-speaking persons.
- Community Development will continue to prepare first-time homebuyers through the Richland County Homeownership Assistance Program for the responsibilities of ownership and home maintenance.

IMPEDIMENT TWO – FAIR HOUSING ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH

Richland County has a strong, visible fair housing program and a coordinated means to address fair housing complaints and queries. However, focus group discussions and survey results in particular note a lack of knowledge about fair housing policies and practice. The need for on-going education, awareness and outreach remains, especially among lower income households and minorities.

Action Plan:

- Continue to work with County agencies, housing advocacy groups, and service organizations and expand efforts to inform renters and homebuyers of their rights and recourse, if they feel they have been discriminated against.
- Update Fair Housing information regularly and adjust strategies and actions accordingly.

IMPEDIMENT THREE – BIAS IN LENDING

The Analysis did not find conclusive evidence of discrimination in lending practices, and the issue does not appear to have generated specific complaints. Additional detailed research is necessary to make any definitive conclusion. However, the County should, when possible, ensure that persons seeking loans for home purchase or improvement are aware of lending practices and procedures.

Action Plan:

- Use neighborhood organizations, churches, and service providers to expand financial literacy and credit counseling programs, especially in minority and lower-income neighborhoods.
- Continue building partnerships such as the one with the Columbia Housing Authority and require homebuyer education, credit counseling and other valuable classes as criteria for funding.

IMPEDIMENT FOUR– LIMITED SUPPLY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

As discussed earlier, affordability is one aspect of housing discrimination and it is difficult to talk about addressing impediments to fair housing, and actions to eliminate discrimination in housing, without simultaneously talking about development of policies, plans, programs, and projects to increase the supply of affordable housing.

Action Plan:

- Continue to meet on a regular basis with representatives from Greater Columbia Community Relations Council Housing Committee and the lending and housing development community to identify difficulties experienced in the development of affordable housing.
- Continue to administer the housing rehabilitation programs to maintain the County’s base of affordable owner occupied units.
- Research other affordable housing programs for additional ideas and practices.
- Work with the Planning Department to create incentives for developers to build a wide range of housing types at a number of price points, considering transportation, employment centers and the availability of services and shopping in their planning (See government policies below).
- Continue to seek partnerships such as Midlands Housing Trust Fund whose primary objective is to maintain the affordability and available housing for low to moderate income persons.

IMPEDIMENT SIX – LOCAL OPPOSITION (NIMBY)

The proposed development or location of affordable housing, group homes, public housing, or Section 8 housing often draws storms of criticism and opposition from neighborhood residents. This “not-in-my-backyard” (NIMBY) phenomenon is wide-spread.

Action Plan:

- Use county resources such as web-site, radio, twitter, Face Book and other vehicles to affect attitude about housing for people in the protected classes.
- Facilitate a panel discussion in October 2013 at the Neighborhood Planning Conference. This discussion will center around the misnomer of what affordable housing and its clientele look like.

D. Lead-Based Paint Hazards

Richland County has established full compliance with all applicable lead-based paint regulations through incorporation of these regulations into its housing policies and procedures manual. Since August 2002, all housing units provided CDBG or HOME assistance by Richland County must comply with *Title X* of the *1992 Housing and Community Development Act (24 CFR Part 35)*. The intent of the Federal regulation is to identify and address lead-based paint hazards before children are exposed. In compliance with the regulation, Richland County requires evaluation for lead-based paint hazards of all housing units constructed before 1978 that are slated for repairs which may disturb any painted surfaces. If lead paint hazards are found during an evaluation, they are addressed through HUD approved interim control or abatement protocol. The County also distributes and maintains documentation of all required information for homes built before 1978, including the EPA *Lead-based Pamphlet, Notification of Lead Hazard Evaluation*, and *Notification of Lead Hazard Reduction*, and distributes lead-based paint information at all County sponsored events.

E. Anti-Poverty Strategy

As the lead agency in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan, Richland County will coordinate efforts among its partner organizations to help meet the goals outlined in this Annual Action Plan. Community partners in this effort include neighborhood associations, residents, faith-based organizations, businesses, health and human services agencies, private developers, lenders and non-profit service providers.

To further address the alleviation of poverty, the County will continue its economic development efforts and its partnership with the Central South Carolina Alliance to recruit new businesses and industries to Richland County, as well as retain existing businesses and industries and encourage their expansion. In addition, the Richland County Economic Development Department will seek to do the same from the County level. Because the creation of economic opportunities is not an isolated solution to alleviating poverty, the County will also work with community partners to identify educational, life skills and training needs and provide opportunities for self-empowerment that will enable LMI residents to become and continue to be self-sufficient and economically independent.

F. Institutional Structure and Coordination of Resources

Richland County works closely with many community partners, federal and state agencies, non-profit organizations, for-profit organizations and neighboring jurisdictions in the formulation and implementation of its Consolidated Plan. These partnerships strengthen the planning process and ensure successful implementation of the Plan. Each partner in the process plays a critical role in the success of the program and brings expertise in a variety of issues and a unique perspective to the table. Communication and collaboration are key aspects of a successful institutional structure and in the successful implementation of the County's housing and community development strategies.

Richland County coordinates with Lexington County, the City of Columbia, the Columbia Housing Authority, United Way, local municipalities and neighboring jurisdictions on matters related to housing and community development. Collaboration is also ongoing with community partners including neighborhood associations, local non-profit organizations, affordable housing developers, service providers, state and federal agencies, the development community and the private sector. These relationships are key to the success of the CDBG program in Richland County and the County intends to continue and strengthen these relationships as well as develop new partnerships to ensure the success of housing and community development efforts both in the County and throughout the Midlands region. In addition, Richland and Lexington Counties along with the City of Columbia continue discussions on collaborations and joint ventures. Richland and the City of Columbia completed a recent collaboration during June's OMG event or Owning, Maintaining, & Gardening for both area residents. The workshop and other related information was well received by the almost 200 participants! The event was co-hosted in observance of National Homeownership Month.

Richland, Lexington and the City of Columbia will also be co-hosts to an eight state Regional Community Development Conference in Oct. 2013. This conference will provide useful training and information regarding the HUD legislative updates, homelessness plan practices, and important training on related HUD programs. The Richland County Community Development Department also meets quarterly with City of Columbia, Lexington County, Columbia Housing Authority, and United Way for roundtable discussions.

X. Program Specific Requirements

A. Other Forms of Investment

As is required by HOME regulations, Richland County will match the HOME grant with County funds in the amount of **\$101,478**. The County will also continue to solicit donations and leveraged funds from our existing partners while continuing to look for areas where we can create new partnerships.

B. Resale/Recapture Provisions

Item# 5

To ensure affordability Richland County will impose either resale or recapture provisions when using HOME funds for assisting homebuyers, homeowners and/or CHDO's with new construction. Richland exercises the option to use both recapture and resale provisions to ensure that all or a portion of the County's HOME investments will be recouped if the household or entity does not adhere to the terms of the HOME agreement for the duration of the period of affordability. The provision of resale versus recapture is dependent upon the activity: ***Recapture for Down Payment Assistance (RCHAP); Resale for CHDO/New Construction; and Recapture for owner-occupied rehabilitation Homeowner Occupied Rehabilitation (HR).***

Resale requirements will ensure if the housing does not continue to be the principal residence of the family for the duration of the period of affordability that the housing is made available for subsequent purchase only to a buyer whose family qualifies as a low-income family and will use the property as its principal residence. The resale requirement must also ensure that the price at resale provides the original HOME-assisted owner a fair return on investment (including the homeowner's investment and any capital improvement) and ensure that the housing will remain affordable to a reasonable range of low-income homebuyers. The period of affordability is based on the total amount of HOME funds invested in the housing.

Recapture provisions will ensure that Richland County recoups all or a portion of the HOME assistance to the homebuyers, if the housing does not continue to be the principal residence of the family for the duration of the period of affordability. While Richland County can structure its recapture provisions based on its program design and market conditions, the period of affordability is based upon the total amount of HOME funds subject to recapture as described in paragraph 24 CFR 92.25 (a)(5)(ii)(A)(5) of the HOME regulations. The HOME investment that is subject to recapture is based on the amount of HOME assistance to enable the homebuyer to buy the unit.

Down Payment Assistance (RCHAP)

Since the Richland County Homeownership Assistance Program (RCHAP) may provide up to \$14,999 in down payment and closing cost assistance a five (5) year Deferred Forgivable Loan agreement is used as the mechanism for a recapture provision. With this agreement the HOME assistance is forgiven over a five year period as long as the homeowner continues to own and live in the assisted unit as their primary place of residence for the 5 year period of affordability. If the homeowner does not live within this unit and sells the property anywhere within this five year period, the funds are recaptured at a rate of 20% diminishing sliding scale per year. For example, if the housing units sells at year 3 of this five year period, the homebuyer would owe back 60% of the subsidy (see chart below).

The housing unit must continue to be the principle residence of the homebuyer. If the Borrower does not maintain principal residency in the property for at least five years from the date of closing, Richland County will recapture all or a portion of the HOME assistance to the homebuyer. Failure to maintain the original terms of the mortgage will result in recapture of the grant. In the case of sale; RCHAP will require repayment of funds to be distributed from the net proceeds of the sale of the property as the holder of the lien in second position. A change in the mortgage is triggered by refinancing, selling, or renting the home within the period of affordability. The recaptured amount of the grant is on a pro-rata basis determined by the amount of time the homeowner has owned and occupied the house and will be measured by the affordability period outlined below.

| <u>HOME OCCUPANCY TIME LIMIT</u> | <u>REPAYMENT AMOUNT OF LOAN</u> |
|---|--|
| 1 Year or less | 100% |
| 2 Years (up to) | 80% |
| 3 Years (up to) | 60% |
| 4 Years (up to) | 40% |
| 5 Years (up to) | 20% |
| 5 Years and over | 0% (Satisfaction of Lien) |

Only the direct subsidy allotted to the homebuyer is subject to recapture.

Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation (HR Program)

For the Homeowner Rehabilitation Program, HUD regulations do not require a period of affordability; however, the County self-imposes a ten to fifteen year affordability period and a Deferred Forgivable Loan agreement as the mechanism for a recapture provision. The HOME assistance is forgiven on a prorated basis over a ten to fifteen year period as long as the homeowner continues to own and live in the assisted unit as their primary place of residence for the county's self-imposed ten to fifteen year period of affordability.

All Richland County loans for homeowner housing rehabilitation will be made based on the applicant's household income verification and their ability to repay the loan and outlined below.

- Low Interest Bearing Loans – Non-elderly and non-disabled households with incomes from 60 percent to 80 percent of the area median income may qualify for a 2 percent loan with a ten to fifteen year payback period.
- Zero Interest Loans – Non-elderly and non-disabled households with incomes less than 60 percent of the area median income may qualify for a zero percent loan with a ten to fifteen year payback period.
- Deferred Forgivable Loans – Households with an elderly head of household (62 years) or households with a disabled member may qualify for a 10 year zero interest deferred forgivable loan. This type loan would be forgiven on a pro-rata basis over the term of the loan provided that the person receiving the loan continues to own and occupy the home as their principle place of residence.
- Grants – Pre-1978 houses will require evaluation for Lead-based Paint (LBP) hazards. If any are found, LBP hazard reduction must take place. The cost for this LBP hazard evaluation and reduction will be provided to the owner in the form of a grant with no deferment period or payback required.
- Subordination of HR Mortgages – It is Richland County's policy *not* to subordinate to subsequent mortgage loans except when the CD staff determines that it is in the best interest of the homeowner and/or county to do so **and** it is approved by the CD Director.
- In Case of Death – if homeowner who received assistance under the homeowner rehabilitation program dies before the term of the loan expires, a family member may assume the loan if that family member assume legal ownership of the property and moves into or continues to reside in the property as their primary place of residence. If the estate is sold, then the remaining balance of the loan will become due to Richland County. The amount to be recaptured is limited to the net proceeds available from the sale of the house.

Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)/New Construction

Richland County Community Development will provide HOME-subsidy to non-profit community housing development organizations for the purpose of developing affordable housing. The assistance given for this purpose is subject to the provisions of HOME Investment Partnership Program authorized under Title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Housing Act.

All affordable housing units developed by CHDO's are subject to sales restrictions, occupancy requirements and resale provisions. These provisions apply to all homeownership and rental units where HOME subsidy is regardless of the amount. The provisions apply to activities to include acquisition, construction, rehabilitation and direct assistance. For all homeownership units housing must have an initial purchase price not to exceed 95% of the median purchase price for the area, be the principle residence of an income qualifying family at the time of purchase and is subject to resale to a income eligible family.

The period of time where these provisions apply is referred to as the Period of Affordability. The Period of Affordability for resale requirements is determined by the amount of subsidy invested in a housing unit (HOME rule 24 CFR 92.254(a)(5)(i)) For a specific period of time (see table below) a unit if sold must be sold to another family that qualifies as low-income who will use the property as their primary residence. The

original homebuyer must receive a fair return on the initial investment; and the property must be sold at a price that is affordable.

| Affordability Period for Rental Projects | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ACTIVITY | AVERAGE PER-UNIT HOME | MINIMUM AFFORDABILITY PERIOD |
| Rehabilitation or Acquisition of Existing Housing | <\$15,000 | 5 years |
| | \$15,000 - \$40,000 | 10 years |
| | >\$40,000 | 15 years |
| Refinance of Rehabilitation Project | Any dollar amount | 15 years |
| New Construction or Acquisition of New Housing | Any dollar amount | 20 years |

The CHDO is required to safeguard the requirements of HOME and must execute an agreement that outlines these requirements prior to closing. The agreement must include income requirements, period of affordability and resale requirements. Acceptable instruments that a CHDO can use to impose the resale requirement are recorded deed restrictions, covenants running with the land or a second mortgage. Failure to put these provisions in place is a violation of the HOME rule and the County may be asked to repay the total investment where these provisions are not enforced. This expense can be passed down to the CHDO and could result in penalties.

Richland County must limit the amount subject to recapture to the net proceeds available from the sale. This limitation applies to all units regardless of the type of recapture provisions used or the nature of the sale.

All CHDO’s projects to include new construction and single story rehabilitation will be required to comply with ADA accessibility codes. Priority will be given to projects located in a targeted local area. HOME funding will be awarded through a RFP process for acquisition, rehabilitation and new construction only.

Two CHDO’s awarded contracts the later part of 2012/13 will complete a total of 3 units of affordable housing - 1 single family for homeownership and 1 duplex rental unit.

Fair Return on Investment

Richland County’s definition of fair return on investment is defined as what a homebuyer can expect back on their return if they sell their unit during the period of required affordability as referenced within their agreement. The fair return is calculated upon the objective standard for Richland County as the percentage of change in median sales prices for housing units within the median statistical area over or during the period of ownership. This calculation basis includes the original investment by the homebuyer with the addition of specific types of upgrades or additions that will add value to the property. These types of upgrades include tangible, structural improvements to the interior or exterior of the home that would remain with the home during and after a sale. These additional homebuyer-financed improvements are not financed by Richland County. A reasonable range of low-income buyers during the point of resale would be low income buyers as defined 50%-79% current area median income. During depressed or declining market seasons (such as a time of “seller’s market”), a loss of investment does constitute a fair return.

XI. Public Housing

The Columbia Housing Authority is an autonomous, non-profit public housing agency serving the residents of the City of Columbia and Richland County. The CHA owns and maintains more than 2,170 units of conventional public housing, which are available to families of low and moderate incomes. The Housing

Authority also administers the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program for residents of Richland County, providing rental assistance to persons with low income who want to live in homes in the private rental market, but cannot afford market rental rates. The CHA also provides several programs aimed at helping families become financially independent and become homeowners. Since becoming an Entitlement Community, Richland County has worked with the Columbia Housing Authority to strengthen their relationship, to better utilize programs and resources by avoiding duplication, and appropriately target housing to County residents in need. In addition we partner with the Columbia Housing Authority by using their Homeownership Program to ensure that families receiving our RCHAP funds are fully aware of the responsibilities of home ownership. This program includes three (3) classes which include Home Buying, Budget and Credit, and Home and Yard Maintenance. We also conduct outreach to residents of public housing by providing information to the CHA and by participating in housing clinics with the Greater Columbia Community Relations Council and other neighborhood and housing agency providers. Finally Richland County has used CDBG funds to assist CHA (section 3 residents) by providing job development and other economic development programs to individuals residing in public housing, receiving Section 8 assistance, and for Housing First (chronically homeless) and Permanent Supportive Housing (disabled homeless HUD funded program) participants. There are 3,500 Housing Choice Vouchers in the CHA Section 8 program, including 25 vouchers for the homeless, 100 vouchers for the Mainstream (disabled) Program, and 34 Homeownership vouchers. In addition, the CHA also has 29 SRO vouchers, 99 Moderate Rehab Certificates, 90 HOPWA vouchers, and 255 Veterans Affairs Supportive Vouchers. Also the CHA runs the Housing First Program which includes 45 units of Permanent Support Housing from HUD and 10 more Emergency HOPWA Homeless Vouchers from the City of Columbia (these are not included in the 90 HOPWA above). Also in June the CHA purchased Bethel Bishop Apartments (HUD Multi-Family) which contains 188 units and CHAD has bought 202 units of Bayberry Mews and Capital Heights.

XII. Monitoring and Compliance

Monitoring and Compliance Plan

Richland County recognizes the importance of maintaining appropriate performance measurements of its CDBG and HOME projects and programs. Richland County provides monitoring, oversight and compliance standards for its sub-recipients to include CHDO's and other funding partners. The components of this type of oversight include but are not limited to:

- Preparation of detailed budgets to include sources and uses of funding as well as anticipated and planned project costs.
- Completion of written agreements to include Memorandum of Agreement or Understanding (MOA or MOU) or more comprehensive sub recipient written and signed agreements, as deemed appropriate.
- Evaluation of impacts to the area and community such as Environmental Assessment seeking appropriate HUD clearances when required.
- Request and review monthly to quarterly written progress reports and other correspondences and communications to monitor compliance and timeliness. Monthly emails are distributed to CDBG sub-recipients to provide a CDBG timeliness test update. Richland County's Annual CDBG timeliness is August 2nd.
- Project site visits before, during and after programs and/or construction take place documented with photos taken by Richland County Staff.
- The department's HAC or Housing Advisory Committee meets on a periodic basis to review and approve owner-occupied (both HR and ER) housing applicants as well as advise in policy and procedure updates. The HAC's committee is comprised of an attorney, building official, realtors and other members who are knowledgeable about the housing community.
- On-site monitoring is completed with HOME CHDO's and Developers annually or as needed and desk monitoring is also conducted as needed per contractual recipient.

- After the monitoring is completed, the sub-recipient will receive a monitoring response letter within 30 days detailing any deficiencies that might exist. If there are no major findings or concerns, the sub-recipient is notified and the monitoring review is deemed officially closed. However, if there is concern or finding, the sub-recipient will be given a specific amount of time to remedy the issue.
- The Department of Labor's Davis-Bacon Provisions are determined if required (construction at or exceeding \$2,000). Staff provides oversight and management of prevailing wage rate info, payroll reviews, employee interviews and other facets of the requirement.
- Richland County ensures that all housing projects meet the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and other local housing codes by Richland County staff and paid consultants and inspections. Richland County Community Development staff will begin completing an annual written assessment of all paid personnel associated with rehab work to include general contractors, inspectors, and construction management.
- Desk monitoring and quarterly reporting are mechanisms used to keep sub-recipients on track with expending funds and expending funds correctly. Using the HUD monitoring checklist as a guide, Richland County will periodically evaluate financial performance and program performance against the current Consolidated/Annual Action Plan.
- Richland County has financial and programmatic processes in place to ensure that CHDO, contractors and sub-recipients are in compliance, and that activities and procedures can be tracked accordingly. These include contract provisions that ensure affirmatively marking for fair housing and procurement procedures to ensure minority participation.

The County will ensure compliance with program requirements, including the timely expenditure of federal funds. A higher emphasis will be placed on producing a healthy mix of smaller and quicker expenditures along with larger, more impactful projects.

XIII. Anti-Displacement Plan

It is the policy of Richland County to make all reasonable efforts to ensure that activities undertaken with CDBG and HOME Program funds will not cause unnecessary displacement. The County will continue to administer the CDBG and HOME Programs in such a manner that careful consideration is given during the planning phase to avoid displacement. Displacement of any nature shall be reserved as a last resort action necessitated only when no other alternative is available and when the activity is determined necessary in order to carry out a specific goal or objective that is of benefit to the public.

If a displacement is precipitated by activities that require the acquisition (either in whole or in part) or rehabilitation of real property directly by Richland County or its agent, all appropriate benefits as required by the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies' Act* of 1970 and amendments – the "Uniform Act" or the Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan under Section 104 (d) – shall be provided to the displaced person or persons. Information about these programs is provided to all persons who may potentially be displaced in the form of informational brochures and explained in detail by the County's Community Development staff.

Richland County will replace all low and moderate-income dwelling units that are occupied or vacant ***but suitable for occupancy*** and that are demolished or converted to a use other than as low and moderate-income housing in connection with an activity assisted with funds provided under the *Housing and Community Development Act of 1974*, as amended, as described in *24 CFR 570.606(c)(1)*. All replacement housing will be provided within four years after the commencement of the demolition or conversion. Before entering into a contract committing the County to provide funds for an activity that will directly result in demolition or conversion, the County will make a public notice in a local newspaper and submit to HUD the following information in writing:

- A description of the proposed assisted activity.
- The location on a map and number of dwelling units by size (number of bedrooms) that will be demolished or converted to a use other than as low or moderate-income dwelling units as a direct result of the assisted activities.
- A time schedule for the commencement and completion of the demolition of conversion.
- To the extent known, the location on a map and the number of dwelling units by size that will be provided as replacement dwelling units.
- The source of funding and a time schedule for the provision of the replacement dwelling units.
- The basis for concluding that each replacement dwelling unit will remain a low or moderate-income dwelling unit for at least 10 years from the date of initial occupancy.
- Information demonstrating that any proposed replacement of dwelling units with smaller dwelling units (for example, a two-bedroom unit with two one-bedroom units), is consistent with the housing needs of lower-income households in the County.

If such data are not available for last four items at the time of the general submission, the County will identify the general location on an area map and the approximate number of dwelling units by size and provide information identifying the specific location and number of dwelling units by size as soon as it is available.

The Richland County Community Development Department is responsible for tracking the replacement of housing and ensuring that it is provided within the required period. The Department is also responsible for ensuring that relocation assistance, as described in 570.606(c)(2), is provided to any lower-income person displaced by the demolition of any dwelling unit or the conversion of a low or moderate-income dwelling unit to another use in connection with an assisted activity.

Consistent with the goals and objectives of activities assisted under the Act, the County will take the following steps to minimize the displacement of persons from their homes:

- Coordinate code enforcement with rehabilitation and housing assistance programs.
- Evaluate housing codes and rehabilitation standards in reinvestment areas to prevent their placing undue financial burden on long-established owners.
- Assist as needed homeowners to locate temporary housing to house persons who must be temporarily relocated during rehabilitation.
- Adopt public policies to identify and mitigate displacement resulting from intensive public investment in neighborhoods.

XIV. Definition of Income

The County had adopted the IRS definition of adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility to participate in all CDBG and/or HOME programs (except for the HOME funded RCHAP), as well as determining area-wide benefit under the CDBG program. The Richland County Housing Assistance Program (RCHAP) uses the Part 5 definition of annual Income. Beginning with the new fiscal year all programs will convert to Part 5 definition of income to ensure departmental consistency. The County has developed policies and procedures to ensure that these definitions are implemented consistently and accurately.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Richland County Sheriff's Department ASPCA Foundation Grant/No FTE/No Match **[PAGES 40-42]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Richland County Sheriff's Department ASPCA Foundation Grant/No FTE/No Match

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a grant application that was not included in the Grant Budget Request for FY 2014.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Sheriff's Department has applied for a grant to provide funding for equipment to implement an Animal Cruelty Response Unit. The application is for funding through the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Foundation. The equipment requested will allow for RCSD investigators to more efficiently and effectively respond to cases of suspected animal abuse and mistreatment. Any costs to maintain the equipment will be absorbed by the Richland County Sheriff's Department budget.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

None

D. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact as this grant does not require matching funds.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Animal Cruelty Investigative Equipment (Grantor 100%) | \$50,240 |
|--|-----------------|

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request for funding to provide the Animal Cruelty investigative equipment for RCSD.
2. Do not approve, forfeit funds, and decrease likelihood for future funding.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request for the Animal Cruelty Investigative equipment.

Recommended by: Stephen Birnie, Deputy Chief Department: Sheriff Date: 12/13/13

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/12/14

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommendation based the grant having no financial impact to County or recurring cost associated with the grant.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date:1/13/14

X Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/13/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion.

There are no grant documents attached, so Legal cannot comment on the actual grant or its requirements.

Administration

Reviewed by Warren Harley:

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommendation based the grant having no financial impact.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Out of Cycle Funding Requests: Accommodations Tax and Hospitality Tax [**PAGES 43-46**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Out of Cycle Funding Requests: Accommodations Tax and Hospitality Tax

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to create a policy where all out-of-cycle Accommodations and Hospitality Tax requests be referred to the appropriate staff so that they may provide the requesting organizations with the request procedures and timeline.

B. Background / Discussion

At the December 3, 2013 Council meeting, Councilman Malinowski made the following motion:

All requests for Hospitality and/or Accommodations taxes after the budget process will be referred to the staff person who handles such requests. That staff person will provide a response to the requesting person/entity the Richland County process to request such funds and when the submission period is. The purpose of this motion is to eliminate the constant out of cycle requests for funds that have already been obligated.

Mr. Malinowski brought forward this motion as a result of an increase in funding requests being made by organizations outside of the grant and budget process.

The application period for Accommodations and Hospitality Tax grants is January – February of each year for funding that would be in place the following fiscal year (July 1 – June 30). The committees for each program present funding recommendations to Council during the budget process and awards for the fiscal year are announced each June.

Currently out-of-cycle funding requests are mostly received by County Council members who make motions during the Motion Period to full Council for funding. These motions are then forwarded to the Committee process (usually A&F) and on to full Council for a vote. Required paperwork for the processing of a funding award is handled by staff once the funding request is approved by full Council.

By routing the out-of-cycle request to the Grants Manager, staff can reach out to the requesting organization and educate them on the grant and budget procedures and timelines in hopes to reduce future out-of-cycle requests.

Please note: If this motion is approved, out-of-cycle budget requests will be stopped at this point (ie, staff reaching out to the requestor and educating them on the procedures and timelines); meaning, the out-of-cycle funding request will *not* be forwarded to a Committee (usually A&F) and on to Council for review and a vote because it is outside of the normal budget process.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This motion was presented at the December 3, 2013 Council meeting.

Item# 7

D. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact for implementing this process, though the result may yield a reduction in the amount of Accommodations and Hospitality Tax budget amendments outside the budget process.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion to route all out-of-cycle Accommodations and Hospitality Tax funding requests to the appropriate staff so they can provide procedures and timeline information to the requesting entity. These out-of-cycle funding requests will *not* be forwarded to a Committee (usually A&F) and on to Council for review and a vote because it is outside of the normal budget process.
2. Do not approve the motion to route all out-of-cycle Accommodations and Hospitality Tax funding requests to the appropriate staff so they can provide procedures and timeline information to the requesting entity. Come up with a different solution.
3. Do nothing. This means that the current process (funding request [primarily] received by a Council Member; Council Member makes a motion; motion goes to Committee; Committee recommendation goes to Council for a vote) will stay in place, and that out-of-cycle funding requests will continue to be considered by Council.

F. Recommendation

This recommendation was made by Mr. Malinowski. This is a policy decision for Council.

Recommended by: Bill Malinowski Department: County Council Date: 12/3/13

G. Reviews

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

Finance

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers | Date: 1/13/14 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |
| Comments regarding recommendation: | |

Grants

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: Sara Salley | Date: 1/14/14 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |
| Comments regarding recommendation: | |

Legal

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean | Date: 1/14/14 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |
| Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion. | |

Administration

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta | Date: |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |

Comments regarding recommendation: While this is a policy decision of Council, it is recommended that Council approve the motion to route all out-of-cycle Accommodations and Hospitality Tax funding requests to the appropriate staff so they can provide procedures and timeline information to the requesting entity. These out-of-cycle funding requests will **not** be forwarded to a Committee (usually A&F) and on to Council for review and a vote because it is outside of the normal budget process.

In doing so, this allows the grants application / review / award process to be more fair and equitable, as the majority of all other organizations comply with this process. Those organizations that apply timely must complete a grants application (which Council has approved), and then have those applications vetted by the respective ATax and HTax Committees. The Committee recommendations then go on to Council for a vote during the budget process.

Out-of-cycle HTax and ATax requests do not go through these same steps, thereby circumventing the application and vetting portion of the process.

Furthermore, Council may wish to consider applying this new process to not only ATax and HTax out-of-cycle requests, but also all other out-of-cycle requests (ie, table purchases).

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

2nd Annual "Relax, It's OK 2 B Single" Valentine's Day Gala Funding Request [**PAGES 47-52**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala Funding Request

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to fund the 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala in the amount of \$50,000.

B. Background / Discussion

On December 17, 2013, Council member Washington brought forth the following motion:

**I move that Richland County fund the “Relax It’s OK 2 B Single”
Valentine’s Day Gala at \$50,000.**

This is an annual event aimed at promoting personal and professional growth for attendees to enhance their lives and communities. The event will include panel discussions during the day, and a social event in the evening.

The inaugural event in 2013 attracted over 300 people, and the 2014 event will be promoted in the Columbia, Charleston and Greenville areas of the state, as well as Jacksonville, Florida. This event partners with other events such as the Black Pages’ Black Expo and the Auntie Karen Foundation.

This organization is requesting \$50,000, and did not apply for County funding in FY14.

Please find attached information regarding the funding request.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- Tre’ Taylor gave a presentation at the December 10, 2013 Council Meeting regarding this item.

- Motion by Kelvin Washington on December 17, 2013.

D. Financial Impact

Allocating \$50,000 to this organization will cause a financial impact, and will require a budget amendment. A source of funding will need to be identified.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion to fund the 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala in the amount of \$50,000.
2. Do not approve the motion to fund the 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala in the amount of \$50,000.
3. Approve a funding amount other than \$50,000 for the 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala.

F. Recommendation

The motion is to fund the 2nd Annual “Relax, It’s OK 2 B Single” Valentine’s Day Gala in the amount of \$50,000.

Recommended by: Kelvin Washington Department: County Council Date: 12/17/13

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/12/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommendation is based on the background section that the organization did not apply for County funding for FY14 and the current request is being made outside of the budget cycle. If approved, an appropriate funding source for the event will need to be identified and will require a budget amendment. Based on timing of the request it is unlikely final approval can be accomplished prior to the event date.

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 1/13/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommendation for denial is due to the timing of the request. They did not apply for funds in the FY14 grant cycle. This is an out of cycle request. The organization has been notified of the FY15 grant procedure timeline.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 1/13/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta Date: January 13, 2014
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend denial of this request as it is an out-of-cycle funding request. Hospitality Tax and Accommodations Tax FY 14 grant applications were not submitted for this event via the normal grants process. The organization has been notified of the FY15 grant procedure timeline.

To: Richland County Council
From: Tre' Tailor, Relax, its ok 2b Single

Thank you for the opportunity to make a presentation for the 2nd Annual Relax, its ok 2b Single Valentine's Day Gala. The event is February 14-16, in Columbia SC at a location yet to be confirmed.

Last year the inaugural event held at the Brookland Banquet and Conference Center, featured food, live music, a panel discussion on "Are you ok being single" and attracted some 300 single men and women between the ages of 21-89! Next year, the plans are to expand the event to focus on the panel discussion. Two simultaneous and separate male/ female panels anchored by a notable author/speaker/public figure will be held. The panels would convene separately then come together for a joint session after lunch. The weekend would also feature a social event that evening (Feb 15), with live music, food and a battle of the sexes game and since Valentine's Day is Friday Feb 14, a drop in is also being planned that evening.

Relax, its ok 2b Single is completing its 2nd year of existence and partners with other area groups to promote and facilitate events, including Black Expo, The Auntie Karen Foundation and last year's Parenting Solo Conference, where the Relax session was the most attended. During the 4 city 2 state Black Expo, Relax hosts popular seminars focusing on the Healing, Connection, Communication theme of the organization, and also collects data from attendees at this massive event. Relax has comprised a mailing list of some 2500 In Columbia, Charleston and Upstate, SC and Jacksonville Florida, and regularly corresponds with these singles via eblast . We plan to utilize this list, the over 6000 social media connections and traditional media to promote the event.

The Relax, its ok 2b Single Valentine's Day Weekend will be an annual event aimed at promoting personal and professional growth for attendees to enhance their lives and communities. Relax will also expand the efforts done during the May Black Expo weekend by bringing in a speaker for the seminar, hosting an evening event and implementing additional media promotion.

This is the first time I am requesting funding from the County and/or City or any entity other than personal friends, as I wanted to make certain this was a viable venture. In two short years Relax has garnered tremendous support and created a sizable buzz in the region as an incredible venture that creates positive results. While I 've been informed this is out of cycle, I would appreciate Council seriously considering funding this effort that will positively affect the lives of singles of all ages, races, genders and religions! I am requesting \$50,000 for the bi annual events which will be held in Feb/May 2014 and also propose receiving the funding over a one year period especially since the two events are 3-4 months apart. I appreciate your time and consideration and look forward to working with you to assist our Singles Heal, Connect and Communicate!

S. Tre' Tailor

Item# 8



Relax its ok 2B Single Valentine's Day Gala 2014 Budget

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Guest Hotel Accommodations: | \$1000 |
| Celebrity Guests (including transportation): | \$25,000 |
| Ground Transportation: | \$500 |
| Food: | \$5000 |
| Entertainment: | \$2000 |
| Venue: | \$3000 |
| Advertising: | |
| Radio: | 5,000 (includes out of market) |
| Print: | 500.00 |
| Promotional Materials: | 500.00 |
| Social Media/Internet: | 500.00 |
| Total: _____ | \$50,000 |

- Food and Venue costs based on 500 people



Relax, It's Ok 2b Single!

Introduction

Everyone can relate to being single, regardless of his or her current relationship status, because everyone has been single at one time or another. There are millions of single adult men and women searching for a compatible mate, as proven by the popularity of hundreds of online dating sites. There are sites for Christian singles, young singles, seasoned singles, never married singles, divorced singles, and more. Despite monthly subscription rates ranging from \$10 to \$100, these dating websites are among the most popular ways to meet potential mates. However, the number of meaningful connections is small compared to the number of subscribers using the sites. The missing link is communication-- deep, solid, meaningful communication.

Singles are not talking to each other about the issues and problems they face on a daily basis. Singles are not talking about the inherent differences between the sexes when it comes to dating and building solid relationships. Without meaningful adult communication, no boundaries will be broken and no unions will be forged. *Relax, It's Ok 2b Single* will change that!

Overview

Popular media personality Tre' Taylor has launched *Relax, It's Ok 2b Single* as an innovative effort focused on three important things: Healing, Communication, and Connection.

Healing—Too often, singles seek companionship without first becoming viable companions, themselves. Unresolved and, sometimes, unacknowledged issues from childhood or past relationships can prevent people from coming together in healthy unions. Instead of taking time to get over their issues, people look to potential mates to fill an empty void.

Communication—Singles must promote open, honest, respectful communication between each other, regardless of age or race. *Relax, It's Ok 2b Single* will foster an environment of meaningful communication through several avenues including social media, blogging, podcasting, radio, television and more!

Connection—*Relax, It's Ok 2b Single* will host live events to encourage singles to network, socialize and share ideas. The ultimate goal is providing single men and women with a variety of tools they can use to make meaningful connections in hopes of building wholesome, lasting, fulfilling relationships.

Summary

Relax, It's Ok 2b Single will bring together a diverse cross-section of singles to heal wounds of the past, facilitate meaningful communication, and make solid connections to build relationships and impact the community.

Relax, It's Ok 2b Join Us!

Phone: 803-386-7114

Facebook: [Facebook.com/RelaxItsOk](https://www.facebook.com/RelaxItsOk)

Twitter: @RelaxItsOk

© Relax, It's Ok 2b Single
All Rights Reserved

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Policy for Purchase of Property by Elected and Appointed Officials **[PAGES 53-56]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Policy for Purchase of Property by Elected and Appointed Officials

A. Purpose

Council is requested to approve the proposed policy regarding property acquisition by elected and appointed officials.

B. Background / Discussion

At the October 1, 2013 Council Meeting, Councilman Bill Malinowski made the following motion:

No elected official is allowed to make outside inquiries about the purchase of property but must submit their request to staff. It will be placed on the appropriate committee agenda for review and action (possibly as an Executive Session item). Elected officials seeking property without the assistance of staff can tend to pay more once it is learned the “government” is seeking to purchase the property. Many of the properties are also in need of repair/remodeling to fit the needs of the particular official and such outside actions can tend to elevate the prices by not going through the approved bid process.

The item was forwarded to the November 26, 2013 A&F Committee Meeting. The Committee unanimously recommended that staff create this policy, and that the title be amended as follows: “Policy for Purchase of Property by Elected and Appointed Officials.” This recommendation was unanimously approved by Council at the December 3, 2013 Council Meeting.

At this time, staff submits the following policy language for review and approval:

To protect the County’s negotiation position and to minimize the possibility of creating false expectations or incomplete understanding among potential sellers, in cases where any Richland County official or personnel is interested in potential property acquisition, such interest should be directed confidentially to the County Administrator or his/her designee (which may include Facilities or other acquisition personnel or agents acting on behalf of the County), with notice to the full Council for its information and consideration.

This policy is adopted by County Council and shall be enforced thereby.

It is at this time that staff requests Council’s approval of the proposed policy.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- October 1, 2013 Motion by Councilman Bill Malinowski

- November 26, 2013 A&F Committee
- December 3, 2013 Council Meeting

D. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with the adoption of this policy.

Adoption of this policy may lead to cost savings on future property purchases.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the policy as proposed.
2. Approve an amended version of the policy.
3. Do not approve a policy on this matter.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the policy as proposed.

Recommended by: Councilman Bill Malinowski Date: October 1, 2013

G. Reviews

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

Please be specific in your recommendation. While “Council Discretion” may be appropriate at times, it is recommended that Staff provide Council with a professional recommendation of approval or denial, and justification for that recommendation, as often as possible.

Finance

Reviewed by Daniel Driggers: Date: 1/12/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Support Services

Reviewed by John Hixon: Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: If this policy is approved it would allow preliminary assessment of property and structures, noting any major positive or negative aspects of the property, prior to initiating the formal purchase process.

Capital Projects

Reviewed by Chad Fosnight: Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: This policy would protect the County’s best interest prior to committing to a property purchase. Staff would have the ability to determine potential environmental impacts as well as ensure the site is compatible with the need for the property.

Legal

Reviewed by Elizabeth McLean:

Date: 1/14/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by Roxanne Ancheta:

Date: January 14, 2014

X Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: While this is a policy decision of Council, it is recommended that Council approve the proposed language regarding property acquisition.

As previously stated by prior reviewers, this policy language will protect the County's interest prior to committing to a property purchase. Preliminary property assessments could also be undertaken to determine if the property is feasible for the proposed / intended use. Further, purchase costs may be lowered if staff is allowed to work through a process to maintain the buyer's confidentiality, etc.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Expanding Richland County's Community Development Staff [**PAGES 57-61**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Expanding Richland County's Community Development Staff

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve one additional FTE staff position for Community Development beginning FY 13-14. The purpose is to expand and upgrade the current Richland County Community Development Department staff a staff of 6 to be in keeping with other Community Development offices around the state. Adding one additional FTE will create more positive change and increased implementation of various projects and programs throughout Richland County.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made by Councilman Norman Jackson at the December 3, 2013 Council meeting:

Establishing and Increasing Richland County Community Development's staff size to be more in keeping with other South Carolina Community Development Departments. No other action has been taken by Council to date.

Currently, Richland County Community Development has 5 FTE positions to cover the implementation of the CDBG and HOME grants (\$1.72 million dollars). These funds are leveraged with other partner's funding resources and program income, which for FY 12-13 totaled an additional \$1.2 million. Of this \$2.9 million, 91% of these funds were placed back into the community for programmatic need and only \$284,663 or 9% went to staff/administrative costs (per the CAPER report submitted to HUD on 12/30/13).

The Community Development Department was created in 2002 when the primary activities were infrastructure projects that utilized the bulk of the CDBG funds and the HOME funds were used for required 15% set-aside to non-profits and some direct assistance to owner-occupied units and down payment assistance. Since 2008, the department has grown programmatically and now has a more geographical project distribution to include the above and newer projects such as Hopkins Medical Facility Construction, Sloan Place Affordable Apartments Up fitting, Decker Blvd. Facade Improvements, Crane Creek Park (Acquisition and Design), Monticello Road Streetscape, Job Training with Columbia Housing Authority and homeless needs such as Transitions and Sistercare. In 2014, the drafted annual action plan will include projects like these in addition to a mobile home park demolition and a public infrastructure project.

The combined factors of current staff reduction from 7 to 5 members; HUD demands growing and not diminishing; workload levels remaining the same regardless of funding; and increased federal compliance since 2009 has created the need for one additional staff person, at a minimum. The overall workload for both CDBG and HOME required by HUD is the same, regardless of staff size and this administrative work includes more compliance, more regulations overview and more accountability as HUD begins to add major broad sweeping changes.

While the workload and federal HUD mandates have grown, the department size has witnessed changes since 2002. The department actually decreased by two, when an employee retired in 2010 and one left through voluntary termination in 2012. Other SC Community Development Departments have larger staff to implement its programs.

Community Development Staff Operations and Funding of other counties in FY 12-13:

| County Name | Staff Size | HUD CDBG/HOME Awards |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Richland County | 5 FT members | \$1.27 mil/\$451K |
| Lexington County | 6 FT members | \$1.43 mil/\$480K |
| Spartanburg County | 7 FT members | \$1.31 mil/379K |
| Charleston County | 9 FT members | \$1.66 mil/\$547K |
| Greenville County | 14 FT/2 PT members | \$2.47 mil/\$837K |

The average staff size using the above counties numbers would be 9 positions. Richland County is the 2nd largest County in South Carolina and houses the state's capital.

HUD funds are not awarded competitively to these counties; they are based upon a federal formula. Also, please note overall, both CDBG and HOME funds have been cut over the past 5 years; with HOME being reduced by 58% nationwide on average in FY 2012. Comparing statewide numbers above, the largest reduction was Charleston County by 17% in CDBG and 37% in HOME. Richland was cut by 7.2% in CDBG and 19% in HOME funds.

With the exception of Richland County, all of the above Community Development Departments are partially funded administratively with general county funding. Many of these counties cover the director's salary and possibly 1-2 others given CDBG and HOME programs have 20% and 10% admin cost caps. This allows the funding of the departments at the staff levels seen above.

Programs such as Richland County's Down Payment Assistance (RCHAP) and Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation have been in frozen status and can be linked to the low number of staff members as well, when coupled with reductions in federal funding and increased response to need. The new position's responsibilities would include administration and compliance for existing and new CDBG projects along with intake and processing of direct assistance housing applications, and monitoring and compliance of contractual partners. Funding of \$50,000 from General Funds will allow the department to hire an additional staff member who will assist the entire department to provide the enhanced compliance and oversight of the growing number of programs that benefit the County on a whole.

The current staff is paid with federal funds from CDBG and HOME at 100%, but due to administrative costs caps the department can no longer add any additional positions from this federal funding source. The HOME program requires a 25% match, and while those funds do come from the County, they cannot be and are not used towards administrative costs.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This item comes from a motion made by Councilman Norman Jackson at the December 13, 2013 Council Meeting.

D. Financial Impact

The financial impact associated with this request is \$50,000 of general funds to obtain an entry level compliance position to provide the wage compensation of salary, fringe and benefits. This position funds would come from the General County Fund beginning in FY 13-14.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to increase the department by one additional FTE staff member and fund the position at the level of \$50,000 which will cover the full compensation package. The programs and projects will operate much better and more effectively and have a higher level of compliance.
2. Do not approve the request to increase the department by one additional FTE staff member and fund the position at the level of \$50,000 which will cover the full compensation package. The programs and projects will operate the same or less effectively and have a lowered level of compliance.

F. Recommendation

This recommendation was made by Councilman Jackson. This is a policy decision for Council.

Recommended by: Norman Jackson Department: County Council Date: 1/4/14

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/13/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Recommend Council approval
 Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council on the level of funding from the County to be invested in the program. If approved mid-year it would require a budget amendment and identification of a funding source therefore Council may consider approving with an effective date of 7/1/14 which would allow it to be incorporated into the FY15 budget process.

Community Development

Reviewed by: Valeria Jackson Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council. I would recommend approval for it to be incorporated into the FY15 Budget Process with effective date of 7/1/14. If granted approval, the position would be used and beneficial to the department and the community.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy and budget decision for Council.

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley Date: 1/21/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council. From the grant standpoint, and additional staffing would need to be covered through the general fund as the County is using the maximum amount allowed by HUD for program administration.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/12/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/24/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

The decision is left to Council's discretion.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Reclassification and Promotion Handbook Revisions [**PAGES 62-66**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Reclassification and Promotion Handbook Revisions

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request is to revise the policies on reclassification and promotion.

B. Background / Discussion

The County's current reclassification policy does not authorize a pay increase for an incumbent in a job approved for reclassification unless the employee's pay rate is below the minimum of the new pay range, despite the fact that an employee is taking on additional duties and responsibilities, which sometimes cause the job to be reclassified 5 or more pay grades higher. Revisions to the reclassification policy will authorize pay increases for incumbents based on percentage increases per grade change.

Please note that a proposed job description for a reclassification is reviewed and assigned a pay grade by our outside Human Resources consultant, Buck. Buck reviews the increased / decreased responsibilities, per the proposed job description, and assigns it a pay grade based on the increased / decreased responsibilities.

Revisions are being requested to the promotion policy to mirror that of the reclassification policy.

Reclassifications

Current Policy:

Reclassification – The reassignment of an existing position from one classification to another based on job content such as duty, kind of work, level of difficulty, required skill and education, and accountability for work being performed. Reclassification may result in an increased (if the employee is below the minimum of the new pay grade), decreased or maintained pay rate.

Proposed Policy:

Reclassification - The major objective of the reclassification process is to place jobs in an appropriate grade/salary range that reflect both the job's market value and a proper internal relationship to other jobs at Richland County. This process includes determining the most appropriate pay grade, as well as reviewing essential compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act as it pertains to exempt or non-exempt status and the Americans with Disabilities Act relating to identification of and documentation of essential functions.

Richland County Government supports equal opportunity for all employees. Therefore, whenever possible, promotion opportunities should be published to all employees. Reclassification of a position to a higher pay grade and/or increase in the pay rate of an incumbent employee in a reclassified position is considered a non-competitive promotion. Planned promotion of an employee within an established career path is also considered a non-competitive promotion; however, such promotions should consider equity and consistency with peer employees. Reclassification pay increases can range from 10% to 20% depending on several factors. Reclassifications are documented, significant, and permanent change in the duties and responsibilities of the position that include a change in duties/responsibilities, skills, knowledge, and abilities as a result of reorganization, program changes, new technologies, and/or other events that impact the nature of work to be performed. Reclassification can result in the pay grade of a job increasing, decreasing or remaining the same.

| Increase in Pay Grade | Percentage Increase |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1-2 | 10% |
| 3-4 | 15% |
| 5 or more | 20% |

As previously stated, a proposed job description for a reclassification is reviewed and assigned a pay grade by our outside Human Resources consultant, Buck. Buck reviews the increased / decreased responsibilities, per the proposed job description, and assigns it a pay grade based on the increased / decreased responsibilities.

Promotions

Current policy:

Promotion – The movement of an employee from one position to a different position with increased duties and responsibilities and/or a higher pay grade. Promotions generally result in an increase in an employee’s pay. Promotion increases can range from 5% to 15% depending on several factors.

Proposed Policy:

Promotion – The movement of an employee from one position to a different position with increased duties and responsibilities and/or a higher pay grade. Promotions generally result in an increase in an employee’s pay. Promotion increases can range from 10% to 20% depending on several factors.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This is a staff-initiated request.

D. Financial Impact

It is undetermined if departments will request additional reclassifications / promotions due to this change. Again, however, departments / HR cannot make unilateral decisions for reclassifications / assigning new pay grades to positions. Reclassifications are reviewed and recommendations are made by the outside consultant, Buck.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the handbook changes as proposed.
2. Modify and approve the handbook changes.
3. Do not approve the handbook changes.

F. Recommendation

Staff recommends Council approve the handbook changes as proposed.

Recommended by: T. Dwight Hanna Dept: Human Resources Date: January 10, 2014.

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/21/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

While the recommended policy would be employee-centric, it is also important that the County evaluate the fiscal sustainability of the policy over time. I would recommend that the County require some level of regressive analysis to the policy change to determine the potential financial impact prior to approving and establish internal controls to be utilized prospectively. Therefore the recommendation is based on the financial impact of the decision being undetermined and not the merits of the proposal.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/22/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: February 20, 2014

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It is recommended that Council approve the concepts as presented, and allow staff to evaluate the fiscal sustainability of this policy over time, as recommended by the Finance Director. The results of this study will be presented to Council at an upcoming Council meeting for review and action.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

CASA: Fostering Futures Youth Center **[PAGES 67-70]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: CASA: Fostering Futures Youth Center”

A. Purpose

County Council is asked to approve the concept of creating the Fostering Futures Youth Center. If County Council approves the concept it would also direct county staff to explore and evaluate the feasibility and cost of the Fostering Futures Youth Center. Staff would also develop a plan and identify possible funding to be considered by County Council as part of its normal budget process.

B. Background / Discussion

In Richland County, SC, youth exiting foster care as adults are ill prepared for independence. These youth have traditionally been denied preparation for adulthood; denied assistance on improving their life skills; many are failing scholastically and/or quit school; most have not developed positive study and/or work skills and have limited social skills. Creating the Fostering Futures Youth Center will allow Richland County to expand existing services currently provided by RCCASA. The Center will be specifically designed for Richland County youth in foster care. The Fostering Futures Youth Center will improve the life skills of our most vulnerable youth to better prepare them for independence upon exiting state care; enhance visitation between youth in foster care and their families; and to create a training academy for RCCASA volunteers, youth, and their families.

Richland County Fostering Futures Youth Center will be a unique, unmatched facility that will serve as a model for youth advocacy organizations throughout the country. In addition to the above noted heightened services for children, families, and guardian’s ad litem, the Fostering Futures Youth Center will serve as an inclusive facility that offers expansion possibilities for sharing facility space with RC Sheriff’s Department, RC Department of Social Services, and school resource personnel.

Once established, the Fostering Futures Youth Center will draw potential resource possibilities. Supervised visitation is an entitled service to children in foster care and is a reimbursable service through Federal IV-E funds. This opportunity reflects the same components that current exists between RCCASA and SCDSS on our existing Training Grant. The RCCASA Foundation Board of Directors is very committed to the success of the Fostering Futures Youth Center will support the center as they currently do the CASA organization. At present, the RCCASA Foundation supports the RCCASA with an augmented budget of approximately \$200,000 annually. Through the Foundation, the Fostering Futures Youth Center has great possibilities of further resource cultivation through grants and other partner foundations such as the Wal-Mart Foundation. National CASA wholeheartedly embraces Fostering Futures and RCCASA, Inc. is one of 11 in the nation to receive a \$40,000 grant in FY 2013 for this initiative. It is anticipated that National CASA will continue to lend their support and resources for successful programs implementing Fostering Futures for at-risk youth.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- o 1983 ~ Richland County CASA established as the sole Guardian ad Litem program to provide advocacy services to children in Richland County whose interests were before the court for abuse & neglect actions.

- o July 1, 2010 ~ S0980 Bill statutorily requires Richland County CASA to provide a volunteer Guardian ad Litem for every child (100%) whose interests are before the Richland County Family Court for abuse and neglect actions.

D. Financial Impact

There would be no financial impact for Richland County staff to explore the concept of creating the Fostering Futures Youth Center.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the concept of the Fostering Futures Youth Center and direct Richland County staff to explore the feasibility of this concept and identify possible funding sources and bring back to Richland County Council for consideration.
2. Do not approve concept of Fostering Futures Youth Center.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the concept of the Fostering Futures Youth Center and direct Richland County Staff to explore a plan and identify possible funding sources and bring back to Richland County Council for consideration.

Recommended by: Paige Green Department: CASA Date: 02/18/14

G. Reviews

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

Please be specific in your recommendation. While “Council Discretion” may be appropriate at times, it is recommended that Staff provide Council with a professional recommendation of approval or denial, and justification for that recommendation, as often as possible.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 2/18/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Recommend Council discretion
 Comments regarding recommendation:

The ROA request is for Council to approve the concept of a Youth Center and explore funding options therefore approval is at Council’s discretion.

If the cost is considered to be a major influence of the project decision, it may be beneficial to have the initial one-time cost investment and any recurring costs along with funding options provided in conjunction with the approval.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 2/19/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Warren Harley

Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date:

Recommend Council denial

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Property Acquisition, 0.26 acre parcel **[PAGES 71-75]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Property Acquisition, 0.26 acre parcel

A. Purpose

To recommend to the Richland County Council to acquire a 0.26 acre parcel immediately adjacent to the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport (CUB).

B. Background / Discussion

An airport capital improvement project (CIP) to extend Taxiway ‘A’ at the Jim Hamilton – LB Owens Airport is currently under design. This project will provide a significant safety enhancement to the intersection of Taxiway ‘A’ and Runway 13 – 31. An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been completed and approved by the staff of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Contracts for the professional services for preparation of the EA, the design of the project, as well as the land acquisition services were previously approved by the Richland County Council.

This small parcel will be subdivided from the larger parcel (R13705-16-02) where the Columbia Gardens Apartments are located. It is necessary to obtain this 0.26 acre parcel in order to positively control the Taxiway Safety Area (TSA) which is required by FAA regulations. A survey of the parcel to be acquired is included as Attachment ‘A’ to this ROA.

Ninety-five percent (95%) of the purchase price will be funded through a previously-awarded Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grant from the FAA. The remaining 5% will be funded through local matching funds which were previously approved by the Richland County Council. The appraised / fair market value of the parcel is \$3,000 and the owner is a willing seller. Finally, the Richland County Airport Commission recommends the purchase of this parcel.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

Richland County Council has previously approved other activities which have led up to the purchase of this parcel:

- Acceptance of the AIP Grant for the purchase of this property (AIP 3-45-0017-017-2011) – September 9, 2011
- Approval of the professional services contract for the acquisition of this parcel (LPA Inc, Work Authorization 29) – December 6, 2011
- Approval of the professional services contract for the design on this project (WK Dickson, Work Authorization 1) – December 18, 2012

D. Financial Impact

The \$3,000 parcel purchase cost will be paid for as shown:

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---------|-----|
| FAA | AIP 3-045-0017-017-2011 | \$2,850 | 95% |
| RC | Local match (already appropriated) | \$ 150 | 5% |

The South Carolina Aeronautics Commission does not participate in land purchase costs.

E. Alternatives

The alternatives available to County Council follow:

1. Approve the 0.26 acre land purchase.
2. Do not approve the 0.26 acre land purchase.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to purchase the 0.26 acre parcel.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Recommended by: | Department: | Date: |
| Christopher S. Eversmann, PE, AAE | Airport | February 6, 2014 |

G. Reviews

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

Finance

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: <u>Daniel Driggers</u> | Date: 2/11/14 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |
| Comments regarding recommendation: | |

Procurement

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: <u>Rodolfo Callwood</u> | Date: 2/11/14 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Recommend Council approval <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recommend Council denial | |
| Comments regarding recommendation: | |

Grants

| | |
|--|---|
| Reviewed by: <u>Sara Salley</u> | Date: 2/11/14 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council approval | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Council denial |
| Comments regarding recommendation: | |

Legal

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Reviewed by: <u>Elizabeth McLean</u> | Date: 2/11/14 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|

Attachment A

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion. As there is only a plat provided, I cannot give a complete analysis of the purchase, but I would recommend Council avail itself of a title search, environmental study, etc., as it deems necessary in this instance.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 2-11-14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

DRAFT

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

EMS Ambulance Purchase [**PAGES 76-79**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: EMS Ambulance Purchase *ESD02042014*

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to award a purchase order to remount nineteen (19) ambulances. This is a sole-source procurement. Funding is available in the EMS (bond) budget. No other funds are needed.

B. Background / Discussion

EMS has ambulances that have exceeded the end of their life cycle. Over fourteen years ago EMS began to replace ambulances using the same manufacturer to establish continuity and standardization in the fleet. Standardization provides benefits in parts acquisition, maintenance, service, training and familiarization of equipment locations for Paramedics. The ambulances we have are “modular” which means the large patient compartment can be removed from the chassis, refurbished and remounted on a new chassis. That saves about \$30,000 per ambulance. The EMS ambulance fleet is manufactured by Taylor Made Ambulances. Sending the old ambulances back to the Taylor Made Factory for remounting will insure the vehicles are returned to “new” condition with a new warranty. The following ambulances will be remounted:

| Unit | Year | Vin |
|------|------|-------|
| 201 | 2010 | 09140 |
| 204 | 2008 | 24630 |
| 206 | 2008 | 00781 |
| 207 | 2008 | 00785 |
| 212 | 2008 | 00784 |
| 213 | 2010 | 09141 |
| 214 | 2010 | 09142 |
| 216 | 2011 | 12445 |
| 217 | 2008 | 24627 |
| 219 | 2009 | 31985 |
| 220 | 2009 | 31986 |
| 226 | 2008 | 31612 |
| 227 | 2008 | 85401 |
| 228 | 2008 | 85402 |
| 229 | 2008 | 85403 |
| 230 | 2011 | 12446 |
| 233 | 2011 | 86637 |
| 235 | 2011 | 91777 |
| 238 | 2008 | 85400 |

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This is a staff-initiated request. Therefore, there is no legislative history.

D. Financial Impact

There is a significant cost savings for remounting an existing modular patient compartment on a new chassis. Also, there is a significant expense to continue to repair vehicles that are old and “out of contract.” “Out of contract” means that because of the age of the vehicle, it is no longer supported under the First Vehicles regular contract. Costs associated with repairs must be paid out of regular budget funds as the repairs are made. Removing nineteen vehicles that are “out of contract” will reduce repair costs.

The remount cost per vehicle is as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| New Chassis and Remount/Refurbish | \$ 78,694 |
| Sales Tax | 300 |
| ----- | |
| Cost Per Vehicle | \$ 78,994 |
| Cost for 19 Vehicles | \$1,500,886 |

The ambulance remount expenditure is budgeted and is available in the EMS Bond account: 1307995000 / 10700000 in the amount of \$1,500,886

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the purchase to remount 19 ambulance vehicles from Taylor Made Ambulance Company for a cost of \$1,500,886 with the funds coming from the EMS Bond account.

Recommended by: Michael A. Byrd Department: Emergency Services Date 02-04-14

F. Reviews

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

Please be specific in your recommendation. While “Council Discretion” may be appropriate at times, it is recommended that Staff provide Council with a professional recommendation of approval or denial, and justification for that recommendation, as often as possible.

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 2/11/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood
 Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 2/11/14
 Recommend Council denial

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean
 Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Date: 2/18/14
 Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: Warren Harley
 Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 2/19/14
 Recommend Council denial

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Replace Deteriorated Caulk at the Expansion Joints and Windows at the Richland County Administration and Health Department Buildings [**PAGES 80-83**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Replace Deteriorated Caulk at the Expansion Joints and Windows at the Richland County Administration and Health Department Buildings

A. Purpose

Council is requested to authorize the expenditure of approved budgeted funds for the Department of Support Services to replace the deteriorating caulk at the expansion joints and surrounding storefront windows throughout the Richland County Administration and Health Department Buildings located at 2020 and 2000 Hampton St., respectively.

B. Background / Discussion

The Richland County Administration and Health Department buildings have existing, urethane caulk that was installed during the facilities' initial construction in 1992. The installed caulking material has reached its end of life cycle, which is typically 10 to 15 years for urethane caulk, and has begun to fail at the joints between the brick and windows, and at the expansion joints within the brick fields.

The deterioration of the caulk is leading to water infiltration points which have become cost prohibitive to repair and maintain. Water infiltration can lead to the development of mold infestation, thus creating a health hazard, although the facilities maintenance division has been able to prevent this, to date, by quick reactive maintenance to dry all intrusion points before adverse environmental concerns were created.

Richland County Government requested properly licensed contractors specializing in caulking and waterproofing work to provide best value bids that would remove the existing caulk joints and backer rods, clean the joints and replace them with a silicone based caulk and new backer rods. The life expectancy for the replacement material is 20 years.

The Department of Support Services is requesting the expenditure of approved budgeted funds to have the old caulking removed and replaced, thus preventing water intrusion.

Five contractors submitted Best Value Bids consisting of Roofco Inc., NEO Corp., Exterior Diagnostics, Strickland Waterproofing Inc., I&E Specialties. The contractor recommended for approval is Strickland Waterproofing Company, Inc. as they submitted the most responsive, responsible, and advantageous bid to the County. This was determined through the normal Best Value Bid evaluation process.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This item is a staff-initiated request. Therefore, there is no legislative history for this project except for the funding for this project being approved in the current FY 13-14 yearly budget process.

D. Financial Impact

The total cost for this project is a contract amount of \$109,000.00 plus a 25% contingency. The contingency is requested to address any Window Extrusion Gasket deterioration that cannot be identified until accessing equipment (a swing stage or boom lift) is in place to access areas that

Item# 15

cannot be seen from the ground. Including contingency, a total of \$136,250.00 is being requested for approval from Council. Council has already approved the project concept by approving funding during the FY 14 budget process. There are no additional funds requested for this project, and as per our standard operating procedure (SOP), any expenditure of contingency funds requires a formal request that will be vetted by the project management staff before approval or denial of the work. Current funding is identified in the department's budget GL – 1100317002.532900 that is sufficient to support the entire requested amount.

E. Alternatives

1. Authorize Procurement Department Director to enter into and award a contract with Strickland Waterproofing Company, Inc., who has been determined to be the most responsive responder complying materially with the specifications as advertised.
2. Do not approve the expenditure of the funds and leave the facility in its current condition with the existing caulking throughout the facility. However this option will foster increased maintenance costs due to caulking failures that could affect the wellbeing and operational condition of the facility.
3. Award the contract to one of the other responders.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council authorize alternative 1.

Recommended by: John Hixon Department: Support Services Date: 2/11/14

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 2/12/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Recommend approval based on ROA alternative one to award to complete the project for \$136k.

The FY 14 Support Services budget includes \$277k for this project. Because the actual project cost is \$136k, it is recommended that the \$141k balance be “frozen” in the department's budget. If these funds are needed for unforeseen projects (ie, inclement weather event activities, emergency purchases, etc.), the department must request the use of these funds. Otherwise, the \$141k will not be available for rollover, and will revert to the County's General Fund Fund Balance at the end of the fiscal year. Further, this process will be replicated countywide moving forward, with this being the first step towards achieving Council's directives at Retreat to rely less heavily on fund balance, while also beginning the process of restoring the fund balance.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 2/12/14
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend alternative one.

The solicitation does not account for any structural issues that may have been precipitated by the constant train movement for over twenty-five years to include several earthquakes. Structural damages may only be known once work as started on windows.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 2/18/14

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Policy decision left to Council's discretion.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: February 19, 2014

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council authorize the Procurement Director to enter into and award a contract with Strickland Waterproofing Company, Inc., which has been determined to be the most responsive responder complying materially with the specifications as advertised.

Further, Administration has consulted with the Finance Director regarding the proposal in his recommendation (ie, freezing the balance of the funds appropriated in the department's budget for this specific project), and supports this initiative for this particular project, as well as other projects moving forward.

As for Procurement's comment, structural issues were not requested to be taken into consideration in the solicitation, as none of the components are structural components. This is strictly a water proofing necessity project that is a high priority at this time. Further, we have no reason to believe there are any structural issues, since during the initial parking garage improvement project several years ago, the structural integrity of that facility was evaluated by a structural engineer with no issues found.