



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Jim Manning	Julie-Ann Dixon	Bill Malinowski (Chair)	Torrey Rush	Seth Rose
District 8	District 9	District 1	District 7	District 5

**JANUARY 22, 2013
5:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: December 18, 2012 [PAGES]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Curfew for Community Safety [PAGES 6-40]
3. Contract Award: Pavement Condition Survey Project [PAGES 41-44]
4. Existing Paved Road Resurfacing Funds Distribution [PAGES 45-50]

5. Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement between Richland County and Forest Acres [**PAGES 51-59**]
6. Waste Management Landfill Leachate Treatment [**PAGES 60-67**]
7. Quit Claim Deed - Vinson [**PAGES 68-77**]
8. To adopt and codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code [**PAGES 78-82**]
9. Caughman Lake Property Study (Pinewood Lake Park) [**PAGES 83-111**]

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: December 18, 2012 **[PAGES]**

Reviews

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012
5:00 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: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy
- Member: Valerie Hutchinson
- Member: Bill Malinowski
- Member: Jim Manning
- Member: Seth Rose

ALSO PRESENT: Kelvin E. Washington, Sr., Norman Jackson, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Amelia Linder, David Hoops, Daniel Driggers, John Hixon, Sara Salley, Justine Jones, Tracy Hegler, Buddy Atkins, Brad Farrar, Stephany Snowden, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 5:16 p.m.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Manning apologized for allowing his meeting prior to the D&S Committee to delay the start of the committee meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 27, 2012 (Regular Session) – Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to approve the agenda as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Road Right of Way and Acceptance Policy: Prescriptive Easements and Unaccepted Paved Roads – Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council a recommendation to defer this item to the Council Retreat. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Contract Award: Pavement Condition Survey Project – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to defer this item in Committee. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Closing Scott Ridge Road – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward to Council a recommendation for approve the request to consent to judicial closing of the subject roadway. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Require Utility Providers to Obtain Permission Before Doing Work in Richland County – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to defer this item in Committee. The vote in favor was unanimous.

International Themed Mural on the Decker Boulevard Staples Building – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to invite at least three local artists, Richland School District Two, Midlands Technical College Art Department and Engenuity to bid to take part in this unique project. A discussion took place.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:31 p.m.

Submitted by,

Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Curfew for Community Safety [**PAGES 6-40**]

Reviews

Notes

July 31, 2012 - This item was forwarded to the September 11, 2012 Council meeting without a recommendation. Staff is to provide Council with a copy of the City of Columbia's curfew ordinance as well as the proposed County curfew's legislative history, the draft County ordinance, and crime statistics provided by the Sheriff's Department.

September 11, 2012 - Council directed the Chair of Council to form an Ad Hoc Task Force comprised of individuals from the Sheriff's Department, restaurant owners, bar and lounge owners, and community groups / residents to formulate recommendations regarding this item. The Ad Hoc Task Force is to report its findings back to Council no later than December 31, 2012.

Richland County Council Request for Action

Subject: Curfew for Community Safety

A. Purpose

This request is, per Mr. Manning's motion, to consider a curfew as a means of bringing citizens and government together in an effort to make our neighborhoods and communities safer.

B. Background / Discussion/Chronological History

The County has the authority to impose a curfew under its general police powers for the purpose of promoting the public welfare, security, health, and safety of its citizens. Additional legal guidance is available in accordance with the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act or as requested under separate attorney-client memorandum.

Chronological History - as provided by Randy Cherry in County Administration

February 2, 2010 Council Meeting: Motion Period: Council consider a curfew as a means of bringing citizens and government together in an effort to make our neighborhoods and community safer [Manning]. This matter was forwarded to D&S.

Feb 23, 2010 D&S Committee: The Committee deferred this item pending further clarification of legal issues raised regarding the proposed curfew. The vote in favor was unanimous.

March 23, 2010 D&S Committee: The Committee voted to defer this item pending Legal receiving additional clarification from councilmember Manning regarding what should be included in the language of the proposed curfew. The vote in favor was unanimous.

April 27, 2010 and May 25, 2010 D&S Committee meetings: The Committee deferred this item pending Legal meeting with Mr. Manning to discuss the specifics of the proposed curfew.

June 2010- March 2012 D&S Committee: In June 2010, Legal recommended that this item be moved to items pending analysis-no action required-in D&S committee. Legal indicated that Mr. Manning will discuss with the Sheriff's Department, as well as the City of Columbia, ways to enhance community safety. In March of 2012 Mr. Manning directed staff to keep this item on the Committee agenda pending a forthcoming draft ordinance from Legal.

April 24, 2012 D&S Committee: The item was held in committee in order for the committee to review the draft ordinance that was presented by the County's Legal department.

May 22, 2012 D&S Committee: The Committee held this item in committee and requested that the Sheriff's Department obtain data indicating how the ordinance will impact the County overall, not just district eight (8). The committee directed staff to provide this information to them by the July committee meeting. The committee also recommended that Council consider other alternatives regarding this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

June 26, 2012 D&S Committee: The item was listed as an item pending analysis-no action required.

July 31, 2012 D&S Committee: This item was forwarded to the September 11, 2012 Council meeting without a recommendation. Staff is to provide Council with a copy of the City of Columbia's curfew ordinance as well as the proposed County curfew's legislative history, the draft County ordinance, and crime statistics provided by the Sheriff's Department **ACTION: ADMINISTRATION, LEGAL, SHERIFF, CLERK OF COUNCIL**

Additional Comments provided by the County's Legal Department on 8/30/12:

- Under the proposed County Ordinance, commercial establishments located within the unincorporated areas of District 8 of Richland County which allow for the on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine shall be prohibited from operating between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. on Mondays through Saturdays. Any person who violates any provisions of this section shall be subject to the penalty provisions of section 1-8 of the Richland County Code of Ordinances.
- The proposed bar curfew ordinance is not different from the City of Columbia's bar curfew ordinance except that the City of Columbia has established a program; whereby, commercial establishments may apply for an exemption. The City of Columbia's bar curfew ordinance indicates the requirements of the exemption. Below is the language regarding the exemption and a few of the exemptions covered by the City of Columbia ordinance. The entire list of exemptions is contained in the City of Columbia ordinance (see attached).
 - Under a program established by the City Manager, commercial establishments that allow for the on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine may seek exemption to subsection (1) to operate after 2:00a.m. on Mondays through Saturdays, upon application and proof of business policies or practices that comply with the following:
 - The commercial establishment shall not allow any drinking contests or games, or contests involving disrobing, or "wet t-shirt", "Girls Gone Wild" or similar contests will be held or advertised at the commercial establishment unless the commercial establishment is licensed to operate as a sexually oriented business. No agent, employee or independent contractor for the commercial establishment will encourage or permit this prohibited behavior by the patrons, unless the business is licensed to operate as a sexually oriented business.
 - For those commercial establishments required to utilize security agency personnel to primarily exercise security functions, as defined by Section 40-18-20, et. seq, of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended from time to time, under subsection 3 such security agency shall be licensed by the State of South Carolina. The security agency shall also be licensed by the City of Columbia.
 - Upon City request, the commercial establishment will consult with the City of

Columbia Police Department and provide such security as is recommended by that Department that recognizes individual circumstances of the commercial establishment.

- The Legal Department identified Districts 1, 3, 4, 7, and 9 with numbers offenses committed equal or greater than the number of offenses reported in District 8. Of these districts, District 9 has expressed an interest in a curfew. Legal is in the process of researching whether a curfew would be supported in District 9.
- The Richland County Sheriff's Department has reviewed the proposed ordinance. It is Legal's understanding that it is the desire of the Sheriff's Department that the draft ordinance be implemented county-wide.

The following documents are included with this ROA:

- Draft Richland County Ordinance Regarding the consumption of alcoholic beverages in County Council District 8.
- City of Columbia Ordinance 2011-021
- Richland County Sheriff's Department Reported Offenses by County Council District 2009 to 2012 YTD
- Richland County Sheriff's Department Reported Offenses by County Council District 2009 to 2012 YTD between the hours of 2:00am and 7:00 am.

C. Financial Impact

None known.

D. Alternatives

1. Adopt a curfew.
2. Do not adopt a curfew.

E. Recommendation

Council discretion, keeping in mind, however, the legal consideration briefly outlined above.

Recommended by: Tish Garnett

Department: Legal Date: 08/22/12

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 8/30/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Item# 2

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision for Council with no financial impact or funding request.

Sheriff Department

Reviewed by: Steve Birnie

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

1. Regarding other possible alternatives to having a curfew: There are none at this time. The Sheriff wants to ensure equal application of the ordinance across the county so there is no confusion as to where and when this curfew is applied.

2. Regarding potential financial/other impacts to the Sheriff's Department: RCSD will enforce the curfew in the course of our current patrols. We will make adjustments as information is developed and establishments are identified who are uneducated to the requirement. Those who are unwilling to comply will be addressed accordingly. It is recommended the county provide notice to all establishments who dispense alcohol of the ordinance in advance of the effective date.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 9/5/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Left to Council's discretion; legal guidance is available upon further request and will be provided under separate cover.

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 9/5/12

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval based on input from the Sheriff's Department. Further recommend that, if approved, the ordinance be applied County-wide, as suggested by the Sheriff.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-12HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES; CHAPTER 18, OFFENSES; BY THE ADDITION OF SECTION 18-7, "HOURS OF SALE RESTRICTED FOR COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS WHICH ALLOW FOR ON-PREMISES CONSUMPTION OF BEER, ALE, PORTER AND/OR WINE;" SO AS TO PROHIBIT THE OPERATION OF COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS LOCATED WITHIN DISTRICT 8 OF RICHLAND COUNTY WHICH ALLOW FOR THE ON-PREMISES CONSUMPTION OF SAID BEVERAGES AS DEFINED BETWEEN CERTAIN HOURS OF CERTAIN DAYS.

WHEREAS, Richland County Council (the "Council") is empowered to enact regulations that provide for the general health and welfare of its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Council is concerned about the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages in the late night and early morning hours, and the attendant health and safety problems which may arise; and

WHEREAS, the Council has determined that it is in the best interests of the County for the general health and welfare of the community that the on-premises sale and consumption of certain alcoholic beverages be restricted between the hours of 2:00 A.M. and 6:00 A.M. Mondays through Saturdays within District 8;

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

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances; Chapter 18, Offenses; is hereby amended by the addition of Section 18-7, Hours of sale restricted for commercial establishments which allow for on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine to read as follows:

Sec. 18-7. Hours of sale restricted for commercial establishments which allow for on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine within District 8.

(a) Definitions.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this section, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this subsection, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Beer, Ale, Porter and Wine shall be defined for purposes of this section as stated in Section §61-4-10 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended from time to time.

(b) Prohibition.

Commercial establishments located within the unincorporated areas of District 8 of Richland County which allow for the on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine shall be prohibited from operating between the hours of 2:00 A.M. and 6:00 A.M. on Mondays through Saturdays.

(c) Penalty.

Any person who violates any provision of this section shall be subject to the penalty provisions of section 1-8 of the Richland County Code of Ordinances.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective from and after _____, 2012.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Kelvin Washington, Chair

ATTEST THIS THE _____ DAY

OF _____, 2012

Michelle Onley
Assistant Clerk of Council

Item# 2

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

ORIGINAL
STAMPED IN RED

ORDINANCE NO.: 2011- 021

Amending the 1998 Code of Ordinances of the City of Columbia, South Carolina, Chapter 14, Article IV, Offenses Against the Public Peace and Order, Sec. 14-106 Hours of sale restricted for commercial establishments which allow for on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Council this 7th day of June, 2011, that the 1998 Code of Ordinances of The City of Columbia, South Carolina, Chapter 14, Article IV, Offenses Against the Public Peace and Order, Sec. 14-106 Hours of sale restricted for commercial establishments which allow for on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine, are amended to read as follows:

Sec. 14-106. Hours of sale restricted for commercial establishments which allow for on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine.

(a) The following definitions apply for the purposes of this section.

Beer, ale, porter and wine are defined as stated in Section 61-4-10 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended from time to time.

Commercial establishment means any individual, firm, partnership, cooperative nonprofit membership, corporation, joint venture, professional association, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate holding company, or other group or combination acting as a unit, in the singular or plural, and the agent or employee having charge or control of a commercial establishment in the absence of the principal.

Incident means credible evidence of any attempted or accomplished violation of any of the listed crimes, ordinances or codes in this section which is either documented or investigated by a law enforcement agency, fire marshal, license inspector or code enforcement officer or a conviction for a violation of the crimes, ordinances or codes in this section.

(1) Commercial establishments that allow for the on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine shall be prohibited from operating, selling or allowing consumption of beer, ale, porter or wine after 2:00 a.m. on Mondays through Saturdays.

(2) Under a program established by the City Manager, commercial establishments that allow for the on-premises consumption of beer, ale, porter and/or wine may seek exemption to subsection (1) to operate after 2:00 a.m. on Mondays through Saturdays, upon application and proof of business policies or practices that comply with the following:

a. The commercial establishment shall not allow any drinking contests or games, or contests involving disrobing, or "wet t-shirt", "Girls Gone Wild"™ or similar contests will be

ORIGINAL
STAMPED IN RED

held or advertised at the commercial establishment unless the commercial establishment is licensed to operate as a sexually oriented business. No agent, employee or independent contractor for the commercial establishment will encourage or permit this prohibited behavior by the patrons, unless the business is licensed to operate as a sexually oriented business.

b. The commercial establishment shall establish a policy that (i) requires all floor managers, bartenders and wait staff to maintain certification in Serve Safe Alcohol, TIPS or Lexington Richland Alcohol & Drug Abuse Council's PREP training on determining when a customer is underage or apparently intoxicated or approved training as specified by the City of Columbia extended hours exemption permit program procedural guide; (ii) prohibits employees from service of alcohol to underage or apparently intoxicated customers; and (iii) requires the commercial establishment, its agents and employees to enforce a policy of refusing further alcohol service to customers at that point.

c. For those commercial establishments required to utilize security agency personnel to primarily exercise security functions, as defined by Section 40-18-20, et. seq, of the Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976, as amended from time to time, under subsection 3 such security agency shall be licensed by the State of South Carolina. The security agency shall also be licensed by the City of Columbia.

d. No alcohol consumption will be permitted in the parking lots under the control of the commercial establishment. No alcohol consumption will be permitted outside of any roofed, decked, café-style areas or encroachment areas authorized by Columbia City Council, nor shall any glass or metal containers of any kind shall be permitted to leave the roofed, decked, café-style areas of the commercial establishment or encroachment areas authorized by Columbia City Council. The commercial establishment will establish policies and security resources to assure compliance.

e. The commercial establishment must have in place and maintain current at all times all licenses and permits required by state or local law.

f. The commercial establishment must have in place and maintain current at all times liquor liability insurance and workers' compensation insurance. The commercial establishment shall provide the City proof of such insurance at the time of application for an exemption or at any other time the City may request.

g. Upon City request, the commercial establishment will consult with the City of Columbia Police Department and provide such security as is recommended by that Department that recognizes individual circumstances of the commercial establishment.

h. All commercial establishments seeking an exemption under this subsection shall complete an application provided by the Business License Division. Extended Operating Hours permits

ORIGINAL
STAMPED IN RED

shall be issued for one calendar year or any portion thereof and shall expire on June 30. Applicants shall pay a nonrefundable application fee of \$50 (to be equally divided between the business license division and the police department) for each exemption or any renewal or reinstatement thereof. Applicants applying for reinstatement of a revoked exemption shall have a fire safety plan approved by the fire department and shall attend and complete the fire department's Nightclub Safety Seminar prior to reinstatement of the exemption, if any of the incidents resulting in the revocation were related to a violation of the fire code. Exempted commercial establishments shall receive an Extended Operating Hours permit which shall be conspicuously displayed at the entry way of the commercial establishment. Extended Operating Hours permits are not transferable. Extended Operating Hours permits shall be immediately removed upon revocation.

i. Any application for an initial, renewal or reinstatement of an exemption shall be denied if the application is incomplete or contains a misrepresentation, false or misleading statement or a material fact. If it is discovered that any application for an initial, renewal or reinstatement of an exemption was incomplete or contained a misrepresentation, false or misleading statement or a material fact after an exemption has been granted then the granted exemption shall be immediately revoked. The commercial establishment shall comply with subsection 1 for a period of twelve (12) months before applying for another exemption and must be incident free during the twelve (12) month period in order to apply.

j. The denial of an application or revocation of an exemption shall be subject to an appeal process developed by the City Manager.

(3) If the commercial establishment is not the victim of the incident, but shall have on the premises under its control, within the permit period and at any time the commercial establishment is open for business, attempted or accomplished robberies or larcenies, breaches of the peace, drug offenses, assaults, public nuisances, violations related to unlawful service of alcohol to minors or to already intoxicated persons or violations of the fire code related to occupancy loads and exits on the premises, hereinafter collectively "incidents", then:

For a second (2nd) incident of the first two (2) incidents within the permit period and at any time the commercial establishment is open for business the commercial establishment shall employ security agency personnel on a ratio of 1 to per 100 occupancy based on the permitted load occupancy rounded up to the next 100 within 30 days of notice. Failure to provide the required security within 30 days of notice shall result in the immediate revocation of the exemption and permit, and the commercial establishment shall comply with subsection 1 for a period of twelve (12) months before applying for another exemption and must be incident free during the twelve (12) month period in order to apply.

For a third (3rd) incident within the permit period and at any time the commercial establishment is open for business, then the granted exemption shall be immediately

ORIGINAL
STAMPED IN RED

revoked and the commercial establishment shall comply with subsection 1 for a period of three (3) months before applying for another exemption. The commercial establishment must be incident free during the revocation period in order to reapply for reinstatement of its exemption. In the event of an incident during the revocation period, the commercial establishment shall comply with subsection 1 for a period of twelve (12) months before applying for another exemption and must be incident free during the twelve (12) month period in order to apply.

For a fourth (4th) incident within the permit period and at any time the commercial establishment is open for business, then the granted exemption shall be immediately revoked and the commercial establishment shall comply with subsection 1 for a period of twelve (12) months before applying for another exemption and must be incident free during the twelve (12) month period in order to apply.

(4) For subsection 3, the issue of business accountability for incident occurrence shall be subject to an appeal process developed by the City Manager.

(5) Police officers, fire marshals, license inspectors and/or code enforcement officers shall have the authority to administer the provisions of this section as to business accountability for incidence occurrence, proof of compliance, permit violations and revocation.


This ordinance shall be effective as of July 1, 2011.

Requested by:

Hospitality Zone Task Force _____


MAYOR

Approved by: 
City Manager

Approved as to form: 
City Attorney

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Introduced: 4/26/2011
Final Reading: 6/7/2011

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses by County Council District

CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD

Please note the following when referencing data in the attached tables:

- Crime numbers are dynamic and are subject to change daily.
- Data in these tables is current through July 10, 2012.
- This data reflects the number of reported offenses by crime type, not the number of incident reports, the number of victims, or the number of calls for service.
- County council districts vary in area and population and comparisons between districts are not feasible.
- Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Crime in municipalities is not included.
- For the tables referencing crime between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM, only offenses with a midpoint time (average of start time and end time) between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM are included.

Crime type specific notes:

- Criminal offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are coded according to SCIBRS (South Carolina Incident Based Reporting System) offense codes.
 - According to SCIBRS:
 - All Other Larceny: All thefts which do not fit any of the definitions of other larceny subcategories.
 - All Other Offenses: All criminal offenses that are not Group A offenses and are not specifically included in any other Group B offense category.
- Non-criminal offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are coded using in-house codes.
 - According to in-house codes:
 - Other, Civil: All non-criminal civil offenses.
 - Other, Domestic: All non-criminal domestic offenses.
 - Other, Insurance: All non-criminal insurance-related offenses.
 - All Other Responses: All other non-criminal offenses.

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD County Council District 1: Bill Malinowski

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	48	45	45	33	171
ALL OTHER LARCENY	91	110	120	64	385
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	41	49	54	29	173
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	32	43	51	30	156
ARSON	2	2	2	2	8
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	16	22	28	12	78
BREACH OF TRUST	3	2	2	1	8
BRIBERY	0	0	1	0	1
BURGLARY	65	71	61	38	235
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	3	1	0	1	5
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	15	14	15	4	48
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	2	3	2	4	11
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	10	17	13	4	44
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	35	43	51	22	151
DRUNKENNESS	1	1	0	1	3
EMBEZZLEMENT	3	1	0	1	5
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	25	27	15	14	81
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	44	39	32	15	130
FORCIBLE FONDLING	8	8	4	3	23
FORCIBLE RAPE	3	5	4	1	13
FORCIBLE SODOMY	3	1	0	1	5
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	7	11	10	3	31
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	13	28	34	15	90
IMPERSONATION	13	7	11	8	39
INCORRIGIBLE	5	9	8	11	33
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	1	0	1
INTIMIDATION	37	33	31	20	121
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	1	3	1	3	8
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	5	4	7	1	17
MISSING PERSON	16	8	7	9	40
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	23	17	18	11	69
MURDER	0	0	1	1	2
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	67	69	62	33	231
OTHER, CIVIL	11	20	22	9	62
OTHER, DOMESTIC	10	8	15	9	42
PEEPING TOM	2	0	0	0	2
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	1	2	0	0	3
RESISTING ARREST	0	1	1	0	2
ROBBERY	4	3	4	3	14
RUNAWAY	27	22	17	16	82
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	0	0	1	1
SHOPLIFTING	8	2	2	3	15
SIMPLE ASSAULT	61	63	75	43	242
STATUTORY RAPE	1	1	1	0	3
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	3	0	1	4
SUICIDE	2	4	2	4	12
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	1	5	2	0	8
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	16	11	8	9	44
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	0	0	1	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	187	123	116	32	458
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	18	21	16	3	58
TRAFFIC	29	14	22	5	70
TRESPASSING	11	12	9	5	37
VANDALISM	132	140	120	56	448
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	3	12	7	1	23
WIRE FRAUD	5	8	3	2	18
TOTAL	1166	1168	1133	598	4065

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD

County Council District 2: Joyce Dickerson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	211	220	208	105	744
ALL OTHER LARCENY	332	353	337	186	1208
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	106	169	169	76	520
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	123	111	141	81	456
ARSON	4	7	4	2	17
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	152	170	144	53	519
ASSISTING/PROMOTING PROSTITUTION	0	0	1	0	1
BREACH OF TRUST	7	10	7	7	31
BURGLARY	373	418	365	199	1355
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	1	1	1	2	5
CURFEW/LOITERING/AGRANCY VIOLATIONS	2	1	3	2	8
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	77	66	84	37	264
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	12	18	7	0	37
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	60	47	62	33	202
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	353	315	322	164	1154
DRUNKENESS	2	5	2	2	11
EMBEZZLEMENT	10	15	14	1	40
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	2	2	1	0	5
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	114	96	94	45	349
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	86	69	66	25	246
FORCIBLE FONDLING	13	15	19	15	62
FORCIBLE RAPE	13	13	15	12	53
FORCIBLE SODOMY	3	8	3	1	15
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	48	51	44	18	161
FRAUD CHECK	2	2	2	1	7
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	33	68	70	39	210
GAMBLING EQUIPMENT VIOLATION	0	1	0	0	1
IMPERSONATION	42	28	33	17	120
INCORRIGIBLE	19	19	15	20	73
INDECENT EXPOSURE	4	1	5	3	13
INTIMIDATION	106	112	97	44	359
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	11	6	8	8	33
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	22	29	15	9	75
MISSING PERSON	45	27	28	16	116
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	161	128	168	86	543
MURDER	2	1	2	0	5
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	156	179	211	71	617
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	0	0	1	0	1
OTHER, CIVIL	43	48	52	22	165
OTHER, DOMESTIC	20	16	34	17	87
OTHER, INSURANCE	5	7	9	1	22
PEEPING TOM	2	0	1	0	3
POCKET PICKING	1	0	1	0	2
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	3	0	1	0	4
PROSTITUTION	3	0	0	0	3
PROWLER	0	1	1	0	2
PURSE SNATCHING	1	1	0	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	7	6	6	4	23
ROBBERY	50	47	55	33	185
RUNAWAY	51	57	59	34	201
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	2	1	0	3
SHOPLIFTING	80	59	87	33	259
SIMPLE ASSAULT	332	270	276	129	1007
STATUTORY RAPE	3	1	2	2	8
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	20	34	12	7	73
SUICIDE	4	2	5	3	14
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	5	5	6	8	24
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	22	25	18	12	77
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	3	4	2	0	9
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	243	159	166	84	652
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	94	90	104	42	330
TRAFFIC	259	257	143	65	724
TRESPASSING	36	33	51	17	137
TRUANCY	0	0	1	0	1
VANDALISM	484	425	400	216	1525
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	33	56	50	22	161
WIRE FRAUD	5	6	1	2	14
TOTAL	4516	4392	4312	2133	15353

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
County Council District 3: Damon Jeter

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	193	212	176	96	677
ALL OTHER LARCENY	238	258	338	158	992
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	145	172	166	49	532
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	156	157	173	97	583
ARSON	4	8	2	1	15
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	175	192	152	80	599
ASSISTING/PROMOTING PROSTITUTION	1	0	0	1	2
BETTING/WAGERING	1	0	1	0	2
BREACH OF TRUST	7	11	9	5	32
BURGLARY	192	273	256	125	846
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	1	1	0	0	2
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	30	22	10	6	68
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	78	63	63	35	239
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	12	9	11	7	39
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	67	49	44	19	179
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	408	362	269	122	1161
DRUNKENNESS	21	9	7	4	41
EMBEZZLEMENT	28	15	16	4	63
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	130	140	109	45	424
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	57	53	46	28	184
FORCIBLE FONDLING	16	10	10	4	40
FORCIBLE RAPE	9	13	10	8	40
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	2	0	1	4
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	49	51	70	25	195
FRAUD CHECK	6	11	6	4	27
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	42	68	86	53	249
GAMBLING EQUIPMENT VIOLATION	1	1	4	0	6
IMPERSONATION	27	31	23	14	95
INCORRIGIBLE	23	21	21	14	79
INDECENT EXPOSURE	4	3	5	1	13
INTIMIDATION	84	86	64	33	267
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	6	4	6	5	21
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	26	41	27	6	100
MISSING PERSON	22	27	20	19	88
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	124	135	142	82	483
MURDER	3	0	0	1	4
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	106	102	112	49	369
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	1	1	1	0	3
OTHER, CIVIL	23	38	43	17	121
OTHER, DOMESTIC	5	7	16	18	46
OTHER, INSURANCE	2	3	2	2	9
POCKET PICKING	0	1	0	0	1
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	2	1	2	0	5
PROSTITUTION	5	0	4	4	13
PROWLER	0	1	0	0	1
PURSE SNATCHING	1	2	1	0	4
RESISTING ARREST	12	10	12	6	40
ROBBERY	60	56	79	29	224
RUNAWAY	33	32	32	16	113
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	3	1	0	0	4
SHOPLIFTING	341	301	230	160	1032
SIMPLE ASSAULT	231	197	218	97	743
STATUTORY RAPE	2	0	0	1	3
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	26	23	19	14	82
SUICIDE	1	1	5	1	8
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	3	10	9	0	22
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	24	15	18	8	65
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	3	3	1	2	9
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	239	210	264	82	795
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	87	93	80	44	304
TRAFFIC	270	277	195	91	833
TRESPASSING	43	50	42	30	165
TRUANCY	0	0	1	0	1
VANDALISM	283	294	307	152	1036
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	50	37	28	23	138
WELFARE FRAUD	0	0	5	0	5
WIRE FRAUD	4	3	2	0	9
TOTAL	4248	4279	4070	1998	14595

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
 County Council District 4: Paul Livingston

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	93	109	129	60	391
ALL OTHER LARCENY	144	142	150	90	526
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	60	76	87	31	254
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	63	59	69	46	237
ARSON	3	3	4	0	10
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	99	134	108	49	390
BETTING/WAGERING	0	0	2	0	2
BREACH OF TRUST	12	5	5	3	25
BURGLARY	170	171	154	78	573
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	1	0	0	0	1
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	2	4	3	0	9
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	33	30	35	20	118
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	2	12	6	2	22
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	25	26	36	18	105
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	218	265	191	86	760
DRUNKENESS	4	4	0	1	9
EMBEZZLEMENT	5	1	3	0	9
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	31	42	37	14	124
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	36	17	13	5	71
FORCIBLE FONDLING	4	3	3	5	15
FORCIBLE RAPE	4	4	4	2	14
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	2	2	1	6
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	29	25	20	8	82
FRAUD CHECK	0	0	2	0	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	13	16	28	16	73
IMPERSONATION	21	12	9	7	49
INCORRIGIBLE	10	12	6	3	31
INDECENT EXPOSURE	6	3	0	2	11
INTIMIDATION	35	47	49	24	155
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	5	5	6	3	19
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	10	11	13	2	36
MISSING PERSON	24	13	13	2	52
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	62	94	95	62	313
MURDER	1	1	0	0	2
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	65	83	76	35	259
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	0	0	3	0	3
OTHER, CIVIL	9	14	11	11	45
OTHER, DOMESTIC	4	8	8	3	23
OTHER, INSURANCE	2	2	2	0	6
POCKET PICKING	0	0	0	1	1
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	0	1	0	0	1
PURSE SNATCHING	0	2	0	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	5	5	8	2	20
ROBBERY	27	22	23	22	94
RUNAWAY	27	25	17	10	79
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	0	1	0	1
SHOPLIFTING	42	26	16	15	99
SIMPLE ASSAULT	124	143	126	45	438
STATUTORY RAPE	1	1	2	0	4
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	21	16	11	12	60
SUICIDE	1	0	0	0	1
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	4	1	4	3	12
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	4	5	4	2	15
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	1	1	0	0	2
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	67	74	112	41	294
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	40	45	60	19	164
TRAFFIC	135	149	105	63	452
TRESPASSING	27	23	25	6	81
TRUANCY	0	1	0	0	1
VANDALISM	180	155	174	84	593
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	22	27	19	11	79
WELFARE FRAUD	0	0	2	0	2
WIRE FRAUD	2	1	0	0	3
TOTAL	2036	2178	2091	1025	7330

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
County Council District 5: Seth Rose

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	35	53	54	17	159
ALL OTHER LARCENY	80	76	73	34	263
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	31	57	46	16	150
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	35	39	38	13	125
ARSON	1	0	1	0	2
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	92	125	103	50	370
ASSISTING/PROMOTING PROSTITUTION	0	2	1	0	3
BREACH OF TRUST	3	0	5	0	8
BURGLARY	53	82	71	20	226
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	16	9	10	0	35
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	41	49	37	15	142
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	6	25	6	8	45
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	30	29	49	24	132
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	195	264	206	116	781
DRUNKENESS	2	2	3	0	7
EMBEZZLEMENT	1	2	2	1	6
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	39	23	29	7	98
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	9	7	20	3	39
FORCIBLE FONDLING	4	2	0	1	7
FORCIBLE RAPE	5	5	1	1	12
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	16	12	10	12	50
FRAUD CHECK	2	4	0	0	6
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	11	27	18	15	71
IMPERSONATION	8	6	11	5	30
INCORRIGIBLE	1	0	3	0	4
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	1	1	2
INTIMIDATION	16	14	13	11	54
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	2	1	2	1	6
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	24	27	10	5	66
MISSING PERSON	8	6	4	1	19
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	28	21	29	18	96
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	25	26	28	20	99
OTHER, CIVIL	10	13	9	7	39
OTHER, DOMESTIC	4	2	6	1	13
OTHER, INSURANCE	3	1	2	1	7
POCKET PICKING	1	0	1	0	2
PROSTITUTION	4	2	0	1	7
PURSE SNATCHING	0	0	0	1	1
RESISTING ARREST	8	7	5	0	20
ROBBERY	11	11	16	11	49
RUNAWAY	4	7	5	1	17
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	0	0	1	1
SHOPLIFTING	26	12	26	8	72
SIMPLE ASSAULT	64	56	51	22	193
STATUTORY RAPE	0	0	1	1	2
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	6	9	6	6	27
SUICIDE	0	1	1	0	2
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	2	2	0	0	4
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	4	7	1	4	16
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	0	0	1	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	50	27	35	15	127
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	7	15	15	6	43
TRAFFIC	206	228	72	29	535
TRESPASSING	13	6	11	3	33
VANDALISM	71	80	59	57	267
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	20	28	7	11	66
TOTAL	1333	1509	1213	602	4657

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
County Council District 6: Greg Pearce

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	39	34	34	35	142
ALL OTHER LARCENY	34	45	48	22	149
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	15	23	13	11	62
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	28	30	20	13	91
ARSON	0	1	0	0	1
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	21	23	17	9	70
ASSISTING/PROMOTING PROSTITUTION	1	0	0	0	1
BETTING/WAGERING	1	0	0	0	1
BREACH OF TRUST	3	2	0	0	5
BURGLARY	53	59	63	50	225
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	1	4	4	0	9
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	12	13	6	7	38
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	0	1	0	2	3
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	9	14	10	3	36
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	55	52	44	21	172
DRUNKENESS	1	1	0	1	3
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	1	1	0	2
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	11	12	10	3	36
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	11	5	6	3	25
FORCIBLE FONDLING	2	3	0	1	6
FORCIBLE RAPE	1	2	3	3	9
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	0	1	0	2
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	2	3	3	1	9
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	0	1	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	9	8	14	5	36
IMPERSONATION	8	4	3	1	16
INCORRIGIBLE	9	4	4	0	17
INDECENT EXPOSURE	1	1	1	0	3
INTIMIDATION	17	18	8	5	48
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	2	0	2	0	4
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	5	4	4	0	13
MISSING PERSON	31	7	3	2	43
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	10	19	15	15	59
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	26	25	22	10	83
OTHER, CIVIL	5	6	5	5	21
OTHER, DOMESTIC	4	9	7	2	22
OTHER, INSURANCE	2	1	3	1	7
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	1	1	0	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	1	3	0	2	6
ROBBERY	15	7	8	3	33
RUNAWAY	22	8	4	2	36
SHOPLIFTING	3	3	4	5	15
SIMPLE ASSAULT	47	39	42	27	155
STATUTORY RAPE	1	0	0	0	1
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	2	1	1	0	4
SUICIDE	0	0	0	1	1
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	1	0	1	0	2
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	0	0	0	3	3
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	28	29	17	22	96
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	6	8	7	5	26
TRAFFIC	11	24	18	4	57
TRESPASSING	6	3	2	3	14
VANDALISM	59	61	58	23	201
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	3	3	2	6	14
WIRE FRAUD	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	638	624	538	338	2138

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD

County Council District 7: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	247	271	254	121	893
ALL OTHER LARCENY	302	356	406	200	1264
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	84	128	140	68	420
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	119	119	123	83	444
ARSON	4	8	5	1	18
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	108	108	101	49	366
BREACH OF TRUST	15	22	13	8	58
BURGLARY	290	422	477	221	1410
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	3	3	0	1	7
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	2	4	4	1	11
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	48	59	45	17	169
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	11	14	7	6	38
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	36	22	32	13	103
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	204	167	160	86	617
DRUNKENNESS	5	3	2	1	11
EMBEZZLEMENT	11	11	13	1	36
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	67	73	88	32	260
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	73	67	75	38	253
FORCIBLE FONDLING	20	17	15	7	59
FORCIBLE RAPE	25	11	10	7	53
FORCIBLE SODOMY	2	1	5	1	9
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	37	29	42	9	117
FRAUD CHECK	3	2	12	1	18
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	29	49	82	31	191
IMPERSONATION	42	31	41	18	132
INCORRIGIBLE	36	37	37	17	127
INDECENT EXPOSURE	5	1	2	2	10
INTIMIDATION	126	135	110	69	440
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	7	10	4	3	24
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	21	22	10	10	63
MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE	0	2	0	1	3
MISSING PERSON	52	41	36	15	144
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	152	147	151	107	557
MURDER	1	1	3	0	5
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	134	140	182	71	527
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	1	1	1	0	3
OTHER, CIVIL	22	41	55	26	144
OTHER, DOMESTIC	14	24	38	22	98
OTHER, INSURANCE	5	1	5	6	17
PEEPING TOM	2	1	0	0	3
POCKET PICKING	0	1	0	0	1
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	1	5	2	0	8
PROSTITUTION	0	0	1	1	2
PROWLER	0	0	2	0	2
PURSE SNATCHING	0	0	3	0	3
RESISTING ARREST	4	9	8	4	25
ROBBERY	41	32	56	17	146
RUNAWAY	91	74	50	26	241
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	2	2	2	0	6
SHOPLIFTING	82	72	152	129	435
SIMPLE ASSAULT	312	294	278	144	1028
STATUTORY RAPE	3	2	2	1	8
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	19	18	15	8	60
SUICIDE	3	2	4	0	9
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	17	13	13	5	48
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	15	16	13	10	54
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	2	1	1	4
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	270	259	244	107	880
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	118	106	107	56	387
TRAFFIC	155	167	139	65	526
TRESPASSING	28	36	34	15	113
TRUANCY	1	0	1	0	2
VANDALISM	431	461	479	201	1572
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	33	23	28	14	98
WIRE FRAUD	5	10	2	3	20
TOTAL	3997	4205	4422	2177	14801

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD

County Council District 8: Jim Manning

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	153	154	138	77	522
ALL OTHER LARCENY	223	234	176	119	752
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	58	95	121	40	314
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	111	99	115	55	380
ARSON	1	5	3	1	10
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	36	43	37	32	148
BETTING/WAGERING	0	1	0	0	1
BREACH OF TRUST	11	10	8	7	36
BURGLARY	177	212	311	140	840
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	0	0	1	0	1
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	2	0	1	0	3
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	65	52	51	17	185
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	9	16	17	11	53
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	24	19	30	10	83
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	144	143	104	61	452
DRUNKENNESS	5	3	2	1	11
EMBEZZLEMENT	10	4	1	3	18
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	2	0	1	0	3
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	83	57	73	35	248
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	60	56	79	22	217
FORCIBLE FONDLING	11	11	12	12	46
FORCIBLE RAPE	7	9	10	6	32
FORCIBLE SODOMY	3	1	5	2	11
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	39	25	33	12	109
FRAUD CHECK	0	1	1	0	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	34	39	76	31	180
GAMBLING EQUIPMENT VIOLATION	1	1	1	0	3
IMPERSONATION	29	28	28	14	99
INCEST	0	0	1	0	1
INCORRIGIBLE	21	23	30	18	92
INDECENT EXPOSURE	1	0	2	2	5
INTIMIDATION	94	100	82	55	331
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	4	6	3	3	16
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	14	13	14	7	48
MISSING PERSON	38	30	35	14	117
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	65	75	76	34	250
MURDER	2	1	1	0	4
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	115	129	146	54	444
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	0	1	0	0	1
OTHER, CIVIL	26	42	38	17	123
OTHER, DOMESTIC	18	21	23	19	81
OTHER, INSURANCE	5	1	4	2	12
PEEPING TOM	0	0	0	1	1
POCKET PICKING	0	1	1	0	2
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	0	0	0	1	1
PURSE SNATCHING	0	0	1	1	2
RESISTING ARREST	3	3	3	2	11
ROBBERY	41	34	37	14	126
RUNAWAY	43	42	54	33	172
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	1	2	2	5
SHOPLIFTING	45	48	56	27	176
SIMPLE ASSAULT	218	214	218	133	783
STATUTORY RAPE	0	3	1	1	5
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	4	5	4	3	16
SUICIDE	3	1	2	0	6
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	6	7	5	2	20
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	19	21	15	9	64
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	3	2	0	0	5
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	188	148	191	81	608
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	65	75	50	32	222
TRAFFIC	96	105	84	45	330
TRESPASSING	31	22	25	12	90
TRUANCY	0	0	1	0	1
VANDALISM	320	288	283	153	1044
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	15	21	18	9	63
WIRE FRAUD	7	6	2	1	16
TOTAL	2808	2807	2943	1495	10053

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
 County Council District 9: Val Hutchinson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	132	112	103	42	389
ALL OTHER LARCENY	209	207	254	110	780
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	57	76	89	43	265
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	93	89	87	63	332
ARSON	2	2	1	0	5
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	44	35	45	25	149
BREACH OF TRUST	7	11	9	5	32
BURGLARY	141	122	145	60	468
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	2	0	4	1	7
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	4	2	1	0	7
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	39	48	46	22	155
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	8	5	11	4	28
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	19	9	20	11	59
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	84	61	102	50	297
DRUNKENNESS	0	5	5	1	11
EMBEZZLEMENT	29	20	13	5	67
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	1	1	2	0	4
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	74	60	67	41	242
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	60	59	54	24	197
FORCIBLE FONDLING	7	11	11	3	32
FORCIBLE RAPE	7	4	5	2	18
FORCIBLE SODOMY	2	1	4	1	8
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	44	28	46	16	134
FRAUD CHECK	4	5	4	2	15
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	23	49	98	50	220
GAMBLING EQUIPMENT VIOLATION	1	0	1	0	2
IMPERSONATION	27	30	30	25	112
INCORRIGIBLE	11	17	22	10	60
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	4	2	1	7
INTIMIDATION	83	76	71	38	268
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	4	0	2	1	7
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	11	11	8	3	33
MISSING PERSON	36	20	29	10	95
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	61	35	44	17	157
MURDER	1	0	2	0	3
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	97	99	106	39	341
OTHER, CIVIL	28	21	25	13	87
OTHER, DOMESTIC	13	15	19	9	56
OTHER, INSURANCE	4	3	3	1	11
PEEPING TOM	0	0	1	0	1
POCKET PICKING	0	1	1	1	3
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	3	0	2	1	6
PROWLER	0	1	0	0	1
PURSE SNATCHING	0	0	2	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	4	9	3	0	16
ROBBERY	27	16	23	9	75
RUNAWAY	49	30	49	18	146
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	1	0	1	0	2
SHOPLIFTING	340	241	298	130	1009
SIMPLE ASSAULT	205	173	180	79	637
STATUTORY RAPE	2	1	3	0	6
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	3	3	2	8
SUICIDE	2	1	3	1	7
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	6	2	7	0	15
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	24	16	17	9	66
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	1	1	2	1	5
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	200	176	210	91	677
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	30	39	47	23	139
TRAFFIC	54	56	73	26	209
TRESPASSING	39	26	20	8	93
VANDALISM	300	264	237	120	921
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	8	10	8	7	33
WIRE FRAUD	10	4	4	5	23
TOTAL	2774	2423	2784	1279	9260

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD

County Council District 10: Kelvin Washington

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	252	271	280	135	938
ALL OTHER LARCENY	346	516	394	201	1457
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	98	105	129	48	380
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	155	167	123	76	521
ARSON	5	3	1	4	13
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	336	254	231	93	914
BETTING/WAGERING	1	1	0	0	2
BREACH OF TRUST	13	16	13	3	45
BURGLARY	369	420	326	159	1274
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	3	1	5	1	10
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	3	2	4	1	10
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	80	76	83	39	278
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	14	21	27	15	77
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	39	36	33	16	124
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	236	208	187	78	709
DRUNKENNESS	2	7	4	0	13
EMBEZZLEMENT	8	2	2	1	13
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	79	72	46	19	216
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	54	59	37	24	174
FORCIBLE FONDLING	16	13	11	5	45
FORCIBLE RAPE	17	11	9	10	47
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	3	3	3	10
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	28	21	21	8	78
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	3	1	5
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	22	51	51	25	149
GAMBLING EQUIPMENT VIOLATION	0	1	2	0	3
IMPERSONATION	26	15	27	17	85
INCEST	0	0	1	0	1
INCORRIGIBLE	16	31	33	14	94
INDECENT EXPOSURE	2	4	2	3	11
INTIMIDATION	123	114	99	57	393
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	11	6	6	2	25
LIGUOR LAW VIOLATION	17	20	26	19	82
MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE	0	2	0	0	2
MISSING PERSON	28	26	24	8	86
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	153	184	181	82	600
MURDER	3	4	4	1	12
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	105	129	136	47	417
OPERATING/PROMOTING/ASSISTING GAMBLING	2	2	1	0	5
OTHER, CIVIL	33	49	61	18	161
OTHER, DOMESTIC	55	37	36	22	150
OTHER, INSURANCE	6	7	2	3	18
PEEPING TOM	4	1	1	1	7
POCKET PICKING	0	1	3	0	4
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	1	1	0	0	2
PROWLER	0	1	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	6	7	9	3	25
ROBBERY	41	28	45	18	132
RUNAWAY	53	70	58	23	204
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	2	2	1	0	5
SHOPLIFTING	34	31	15	17	97
SIMPLE ASSAULT	330	308	269	151	1058
STATUTORY RAPE	2	3	3	1	9
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	17	20	10	3	50
SUICIDE	2	4	2	3	11
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	20	21	25	14	80
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	13	9	5	6	33
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	7	0	1	8
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	197	199	133	106	635
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	113	98	93	34	338
TRAFFIC	110	120	69	39	338
TRESPASSING	51	40	43	14	148
TRUANCY	0	2	0	0	2
VANDALISM	361	473	394	179	1407
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	28	20	21	14	83
WIRE FRAUD	6	4	6	3	19
TOTAL	4149	4437	3869	1888	14343

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD
 County Council District 11: Norman Jackson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	177	211	175	88	651
ALL OTHER LARCENY	295	398	313	153	1159
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	82	101	100	45	328
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	174	150	118	112	554
ARSON	2	3	5	0	10
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	90	78	77	36	281
BREACH OF TRUST	10	12	8	6	36
BURGLARY	304	314	254	145	1017
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	1	0	1	0	2
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	2	1	0	0	3
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	58	67	58	24	207
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	6	4	1	1	12
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	18	20	13	13	64
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	151	126	99	71	447
DRUNKENNESS	0	2	2	2	6
EMBEZZLEMENT	2	5	0	2	9
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	0	0	1	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	52	58	76	24	210
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	71	76	62	27	236
FORCIBLE FONDLING	13	18	17	6	54
FORCIBLE RAPE	8	7	4	2	21
FORCIBLE SODOMY	4	2	3	0	9
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	22	25	19	15	81
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	0	1	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	23	41	62	20	146
IMPERSONATION	21	24	26	11	82
INCEST	0	0	1	0	1
INCORRIGIBLE	19	22	18	5	64
INDECENT EXPOSURE	3	3	3	2	11
INTIMIDATION	93	90	101	59	343
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	4	5	7	2	18
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	15	13	5	2	35
MISSING PERSON	38	28	34	32	132
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	129	103	138	64	434
MURDER	1	1	1	2	5
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	121	124	152	62	459
OTHER, CIVIL	39	46	42	18	145
OTHER, DOMESTIC	42	49	39	34	164
OTHER, INSURANCE	5	2	4	1	12
PEEPING TOM	0	1	0	0	1
POCKET PICKING	0	1	1	0	2
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	2	1	0	1	4
PROWLER	2	2	0	0	4
PURSE SNATCHING	0	1	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	6	2	7	6	21
ROBBERY	19	28	21	11	79
RUNAWAY	77	55	63	20	215
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	1	1	0	0	2
SHOPLIFTING	36	41	38	17	132
SIMPLE ASSAULT	268	286	267	148	969
STATUTORY RAPE	2	3	2	2	9
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	16	10	10	6	42
SUICIDE	3	3	4	0	10
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	13	6	13	3	35
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	19	13	8	2	42
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	1	2	1	0	4
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	161	128	82	67	438
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	88	66	79	16	249
TRAFFIC	71	92	72	23	258
TRESPASSING	52	32	41	19	144
TRUANCY	0	2	1	0	3
VANDALISM	336	331	340	170	1177
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	25	20	19	12	76
WIRE FRAUD	5	3	5	1	14
TOTAL	3299	3359	3113	1611	11382

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 1: Bill Malinowski

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	6	5	4	2	17
ALL OTHER LARCENY	15	25	20	9	69
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	5	4	2	2	13
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	2	6	5	1	14
ARSON	2	1	2	0	5
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	1	7	4	0	12
BREACH OF TRUST	1	0	1	0	2
BURGLARY	10	12	10	6	38
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	0	0	0	1	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	1	1	0	1	3
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	0	1	1	1	3
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	2	2	2	0	6
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	5	5	9	1	20
DRUNKENNESS	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	1	2	2	2	7
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	3	6	0	0	9
FORCIBLE FONDLING	1	1	1	0	3
FORCIBLE RAPE	1	1	2	0	4
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	0	0	0	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	2	0	1	0	3
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	1	4	4	2	11
IMPERSONATION	0	0	1	1	2
INCORRIGIBLE	0	0	0	1	1
INTIMIDATION	2	2	4	0	8
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	0	0	0	1	1
MISSING PERSON	3	3	0	0	6
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	8	2	9	0	19
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	14	10	7	5	36
OTHER, CIVIL	1	1	0	1	3
OTHER, DOMESTIC	1	1	1	0	3
PEEPING TOM	2	0	0	0	2
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	1	0	0	0	1
ROBBERY	0	0	0	1	1
RUNAWAY	6	3	1	1	11
SIMPLE ASSAULT	5	3	7	3	18
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	1	0	0	1
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	0	1	0	2	3
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	83	49	57	17	206
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	11	7	6	0	24
TRAFFIC	6	0	2	0	8
TRESPASSING	1	2	2	0	5
VANDALISM	38	42	29	23	132
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	0	1	0	0	1
WIRE FRAUD	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	243	211	197	84	735

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 2: Joyce Dickerson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	33	31	28	14	106
ALL OTHER LARCENY	48	51	58	36	193
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	14	22	18	9	63
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	14	13	20	6	53
ARSON	1	1	0	0	2
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	19	23	16	11	69
BREACH OF TRUST	3	1	1	1	6
BURGLARY	40	62	46	30	178
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	6	10	10	10	36
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	3	8	3	0	14
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	2	4	4	0	10
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	22	33	20	12	87
DRUNKENESS	0	1	1	0	2
EMBEZZLEMENT	2	1	0	0	3
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	22	7	11	5	45
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	8	1	4	1	14
FORCIBLE FONDLING	1	1	3	2	7
FORCIBLE RAPE	3	3	3	2	11
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	0	1	1	3
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	5	1	1	2	9
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	1	0	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	1	12	9	5	27
IMPERSONATION	2	1	5	0	8
INCORRIGIBLE	1	1	1	1	4
INDECENT EXPOSURE	1	0	0	0	1
INTIMIDATION	10	15	11	5	41
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	3	0	1	1	5
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	6	3	3	1	13
MISSING PERSON	8	4	6	6	24
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	60	53	69	29	211
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	21	15	26	12	74
OTHER, CIVIL	5	3	3	3	14
OTHER, DOMESTIC	3	1	3	1	8
PEEPING TOM	1	0	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	1	2	0	2	5
ROBBERY	7	3	12	7	29
RUNAWAY	8	8	4	4	24
SHOPLIFTING	6	8	5	3	22
SIMPLE ASSAULT	41	30	29	11	111
STATUTORY RAPE	0	0	0	1	1
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	3	1	1	1	6
SUICIDE	0	0	0	1	1
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	0	0	1	4	5
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	1	1	1	1	4
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	112	56	69	31	268
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	34	20	30	9	93
TRAFFIC	41	39	18	10	108
TRESPASSING	4	3	4	1	12
VANDALISM	127	121	110	48	406
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	0	12	9	2	23
TOTAL	755	686	679	342	2462

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 3: Damon Jeter

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	42	39	44	13	138
ALL OTHER LARCENY	41	49	65	17	172
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	17	20	18	7	62
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	22	17	21	9	69
ARSON	2	1	1	0	4
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	15	23	17	13	68
BREACH OF TRUST	2	1	0	1	4
BURGLARY	51	52	63	28	194
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	1	2	2	0	5
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	15	12	15	7	49
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	4	5	8	3	20
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	4	3	0	2	9
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	28	24	25	19	96
DRUNKENESS	6	0	0	0	6
EMBEZZLEMENT	4	0	3	2	9
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	12	14	9	3	38
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	2	3	4	0	9
FORCIBLE FONDLING	5	2	3	1	11
FORCIBLE RAPE	2	1	4	2	9
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	0	0	0	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	5	3	5	0	13
FRAUD CHECK	1	2	0	2	5
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	4	12	12	7	35
IMPERSONATION	2	0	1	2	5
INCORRIGIBLE	1	1	0	1	3
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	1	0	1
INTIMIDATION	8	8	6	1	23
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	0	1	3	1	5
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	4	6	7	1	18
MISSING PERSON	3	4	4	2	13
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	47	57	48	21	173
MURDER	1	0	0	0	1
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	12	14	13	9	48
OTHER, CIVIL	3	2	2	2	9
OTHER, DOMESTIC	0	1	0	3	4
RESISTING ARREST	3	0	3	0	6
ROBBERY	10	9	28	5	52
RUNAWAY	8	5	4	3	20
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	1	0	0	1
SHOPLIFTING	11	3	0	4	18
SIMPLE ASSAULT	31	32	38	17	118
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	5	4	5	3	17
SUICIDE	0	1	1	1	3
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	0	3	4	0	7
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	2	2	0	0	4
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	2	1	0	3
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	93	67	67	14	241
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	30	31	22	14	97
TRAFFIC	39	37	30	10	116
TRESPASSING	6	8	2	5	21
VANDALISM	78	86	86	36	286
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	12	8	11	7	38
TOTAL	695	678	706	298	2377

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 4: Paul Livingston

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	11	17	25	17	70
ALL OTHER LARCENY	20	20	25	18	83
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	6	6	8	1	21
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	9	9	3	4	25
ARSON	2	0	0	0	2
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	11	12	15	4	42
BREACH OF TRUST	3	2	0	2	7
BURGLARY	31	30	27	17	105
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	6	7	3	4	20
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	0	3	2	1	6
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	1	1	2	0	4
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	11	15	13	5	44
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	0	1	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	5	4	3	4	16
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	2	1	2	2	7
FORCIBLE FONDLING	0	0	0	1	1
FORCIBLE RAPE	0	0	1	1	2
FORCIBLE SODOMY	0	1	0	0	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	1	1	1	0	3
FRAUD CHECK	0	0	1	0	1
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	2	1	7	4	14
IMPERSONATION	1	1	0	2	4
INCORRIGIBLE	1	0	0	0	1
INDECENT EXPOSURE	3	0	0	0	3
INTIMIDATION	3	7	4	3	17
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	1	3	3	1	8
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	0	3	3	0	6
MISSING PERSON	0	4	1	1	6
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	24	36	31	23	114
MURDER	1	1	0	0	2
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	7	9	8	8	32
OTHER, CIVIL	0	1	1	1	3
OTHER, DOMESTIC	0	1	0	1	2
OTHER, INSURANCE	0	0	1	0	1
POCKET PICKING	0	0	0	1	1
PURSE SNATCHING	0	1	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	2	1	0	0	3
ROBBERY	8	9	6	4	27
RUNAWAY	1	3	4	0	8
SHOPLIFTING	10	5	1	2	18
SIMPLE ASSAULT	16	21	18	8	63
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	3	0	0	1	4
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	0	0	0	1	1
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	0	1	0	0	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	21	36	65	19	141
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	13	16	18	7	54
TRAFFIC	15	12	14	3	44
TRESPASSING	1	2	2	1	6
VANDALISM	39	33	50	34	156
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	2	0	1	2	5
TOTAL	293	336	370	208	1207

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 5: Seth Rose

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	12	8	12	5	37
ALL OTHER LARCENY	15	13	17	5	50
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	3	7	5	3	18
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	0	2	3	2	7
ARSON	1	0	1	0	2
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	11	26	13	5	55
BREACH OF TRUST	0	0	2	0	2
BURGLARY	12	8	9	4	33
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	1	0	0	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	12	8	5	1	26
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	4	13	4	3	24
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	3	1	4	0	8
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	18	26	16	4	64
DRUNKENNESS	0	1	0	0	1
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	1	1	0	2
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	7	1	3	1	12
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	1	0	1	0	2
FORCIBLE RAPE	2	3	1	0	6
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	3	1	0	1	5
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	1	3	1	0	5
IMPERSONATION	0	0	2	0	2
INTIMIDATION	0	0	2	2	4
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	1	0	0	1	2
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	5	4	4	2	15
MISSING PERSON	2	0	1	1	4
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	11	10	11	5	37
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	5	7	4	3	19
OTHER, CIVIL	0	3	1	0	4
OTHER, INSURANCE	1	0	1	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	2	0	0	0	2
ROBBERY	1	5	5	2	13
RUNAWAY	0	2	0	0	2
SHOPLIFTING	3	3	8	0	14
SIMPLE ASSAULT	16	11	13	3	43
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	2	2	0	3	7
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	1	1	0	0	2
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	1	2	1	0	4
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	0	0	1	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	19	4	17	5	45
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	2	3	4	3	12
TRAFFIC	47	48	14	4	113
TRESPASSING	2	1	5	0	8
VANDALISM	18	19	15	19	71
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	3	4	1	4	12
TOTAL	248	251	207	92	798

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 6: Greg Pearce

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	5	11	5	8	29
ALL OTHER LARCENY	4	7	10	7	28
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	4	2	0	2	8
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	3	7	5	2	17
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	1	2	0	1	4
BREACH OF TRUST	0	1	0	0	1
BURGLARY	5	8	8	5	26
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	1	3	3	1	8
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	0	1	0	2	3
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	1	3	2	3	9
DRUNKENESS	1	1	0	0	2
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	2	3	1	0	6
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	2	1	0	0	3
FORCIBLE RAPE	1	1	1	3	6
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	0	1	0	0	1
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	1	1	0	2	4
IMPERSONATION	1	0	1	0	2
INTIMIDATION	1	3	0	0	4
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	1	0	2	0	3
MISSING PERSON	4	1	0	0	5
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	4	9	4	6	23
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	4	3	0	1	8
OTHER, CIVIL	1	0	0	1	2
OTHER, DOMESTIC	2	1	0	0	3
RESISTING ARREST	0	1	0	2	3
ROBBERY	2	3	2	0	7
RUNAWAY	0	2	0	0	2
SHOPLIFTING	0	1	3	2	6
SIMPLE ASSAULT	4	5	4	3	16
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	12	12	6	12	42
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	5	4	3	1	13
TRAFFIC	1	6	4	1	12
VANDALISM	19	15	13	8	55
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	0	1	0	3	4
TOTAL	92	120	77	76	365

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM

County Council District 7: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy

CRIME	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	31	37	35	13	116
ALL OTHER LARCENY	54	60	74	36	224
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	10	14	19	9	52
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	15	5	12	14	46
ARSON	1	2	2	1	6
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	9	10	9	6	34
BREACH OF TRUST	4	6	2	3	15
BURGLARY	50	56	84	45	235
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	1	0	0	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	8	8	7	5	28
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	0	5	2	2	9
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	3	2	3	0	8
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	23	11	10	6	50
DRUNKENNESS	0	1	0	0	1
EMBEZZLEMENT	1	2	2	0	5
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	12	12	10	4	38
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	12	2	3	1	18
FORCIBLE FONDLING	3	3	1	1	8
FORCIBLE RAPE	4	4	5	1	14
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1	0	1	0	2
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	4	1	4	0	9
FRAUD CHECK	0	1	1	0	2
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	7	4	7	5	23
IMPERSONATION	3	4	2	0	9
INCORRIGIBLE	2	5	0	1	8
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	0	1	1
INTIMIDATION	19	12	7	5	43
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	4	5	0	2	11
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	5	1	4	3	13
MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE	0	1	0	0	1
MISSING PERSON	9	10	3	0	22
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	56	64	56	43	219
MURDER	0	0	1	0	1
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	21	24	15	11	71
OTHER, CIVIL	3	4	7	2	16
OTHER, DOMESTIC	2	1	3	3	9
OTHER, INSURANCE	2	0	1	2	5
PEEPING TOM	1	0	0	0	1
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	0	1	1	0	2
RESISTING ARREST	1	1	0	0	2
ROBBERY	4	4	8	5	21
RUNAWAY	10	6	8	8	32
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	0	1	0	0	1
SHOPLIFTING	9	12	16	8	45
SIMPLE ASSAULT	27	34	26	17	104
STATUTORY RAPE	0	1	0	0	1
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	4	1	2	2	9
SUICIDE	0	2	0	0	2
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	4	2	5	0	11
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	1	1	0	1	3
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	1	1	1	3
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	129	106	97	35	367
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	51	41	40	16	148
TRAFFIC	34	21	15	3	73
TRESPASSING	3	5	1	2	11
VANDALISM	112	117	152	65	446
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	3	2	7	4	16
WIRE FRAUD	0	3	0	0	3
TOTAL	773	739	771	392	2675

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
County Council District 8: Jim Manning

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	20	23	19	13	75
ALL OTHER LARCENY	46	45	27	13	131
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	7	13	8	5	33
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	10	4	12	1	27
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	5	4	5	9	23
BREACH OF TRUST	1	4	3	1	9
BURGLARY	36	30	48	22	136
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	8	9	10	4	31
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	3	6	9	4	22
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	2	1	1	0	4
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	7	11	7	9	34
DRUNKENESS	1	2	0	1	4
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	2	0	1	3
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	9	6	11	6	32
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	8	5	5	0	18
FORCIBLE FONDLING	0	3	3	5	11
FORCIBLE RAPE	3	3	1	0	7
FORCIBLE SODOMY	0	0	0	1	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	3	2	2	0	7
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	6	10	6	1	23
IMPERSONATION	2	2	2	0	6
INCORRIGIBLE	0	1	3	1	5
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	1	1	2
INTIMIDATION	13	8	12	3	36
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	2	0	0	0	2
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	1	6	4	1	12
MISSING PERSON	7	8	7	4	26
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	24	30	34	13	101
MURDER	1	0	0	0	1
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	17	19	16	4	56
OTHER, CIVIL	2	3	1	1	7
OTHER, DOMESTIC	1	3	3	0	7
OTHER, INSURANCE	0	0	1	0	1
POCKET PICKING	0	0	1	0	1
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	0	0	0	1	1
RESISTING ARREST	0	0	1	1	2
ROBBERY	4	5	5	1	15
RUNAWAY	11	6	10	5	32
SHOPLIFTING	6	2	3	7	18
SIMPLE ASSAULT	26	26	16	7	75
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	1	0	0	1
SUICIDE	2	0	0	0	2
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	0	2	2	0	4
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	1	3	0	0	4
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	78	65	76	19	238
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	26	27	19	6	78
TRAFFIC	12	19	9	8	48
TRESPASSING	4	2	3	0	9
VANDALISM	86	87	63	43	279
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	1	0	0	1	2
WIRE FRAUD	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	502	508	470	223	1703

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
County Council District 9: Val Hutchinson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	18	13	15	4	50
ALL OTHER LARCENY	36	29	49	11	125
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	4	11	6	5	26
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	5	7	9	4	25
ARSON	0	1	0	0	1
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	6	5	1	1	13
BREACH OF TRUST	1	3	3	2	9
BURGLARY	31	27	31	15	104
CURFEW/LOITERING/VAGRANCY VIOLATIONS	1	0	0	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	2	5	1	5	13
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	3	2	6	2	13
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	0	0	1	3	4
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	3	5	8	5	21
DRUNKENESS	0	0	2	0	2
EMBEZZLEMENT	6	1	1	1	9
EXTORTION/BLACKMAIL	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	9	7	5	4	25
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	8	6	3	0	17
FORCIBLE FONDLING	0	2	3	0	5
FORCIBLE RAPE	0	0	1	0	1
FORCIBLE SODOMY	0	0	1	0	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	2	3	4	1	10
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	0	0	1
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	7	7	8	3	25
IMPERSONATION	4	3	3	2	12
INCORRIGIBLE	0	2	0	0	2
INTIMIDATION	8	4	6	4	22
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	0	0	1	0	1
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	4	2	1	1	8
MISSING PERSON	5	2	4	0	11
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	15	10	16	7	48
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	11	9	14	4	38
OTHER, CIVIL	1	2	2	0	5
OTHER, DOMESTIC	1	1	0	2	4
PORNOGRAPHY/OBSCENE MATERIAL	0	0	1	1	2
PROWLER	0	1	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	1	1	0	0	2
ROBBERY	6	2	1	2	11
RUNAWAY	5	3	10	5	23
SHOPLIFTING	6	3	11	3	23
SIMPLE ASSAULT	30	16	17	10	73
STATUTORY RAPE	0	1	0	0	1
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	0	1	1	0	2
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	1	0	2	0	3
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	2	3	4	0	9
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	1	1	1	0	3
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	88	74	79	28	269
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	13	15	13	4	45
TRAFFIC	10	9	11	8	38
TRESPASSING	2	1	1	0	4
VANDALISM	82	72	56	31	241
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	0	0	1	0	1
WIRE FRAUD	1	2	0	1	4
TOTAL	441	374	414	179	1408

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
County Council District 10: Kelvin Washington

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	35	34	37	24	130
ALL OTHER LARCENY	63	102	59	39	263
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	11	10	17	3	41
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	16	27	16	5	64
ARSON	1	1	0	2	4
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	32	35	28	8	103
BREACH OF TRUST	3	2	1	1	7
BURGLARY	67	88	46	27	228
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	0	0	1	0	1
CURFEW/LOITERING/AGRANCY VIOLATIONS	0	0	1	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	7	3	13	7	30
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	6	4	7	3	20
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	2	1	4	3	10
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	16	14	14	5	49
DRUNKENESS	1	2	0	0	3
EMBEZZLEMENT	1	0	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	9	12	5	4	30
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	3	8	5	3	19
FORCIBLE FONDLING	1	2	1	1	5
FORCIBLE RAPE	3	3	3	5	14
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	5	3	1	1	10
FRAUD CHECK	1	0	0	0	1
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	1	2	6	7	16
IMPERSONATION	1	3	2	0	6
INCORRIGIBLE	1	3	0	0	4
INDECENT EXPOSURE	0	0	1	0	1
INTIMIDATION	11	12	8	6	37
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	5	0	1	1	7
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	2	4	4	4	14
MISSING PERSON	3	2	5	1	11
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	52	58	50	30	190
MURDER	2	1	2	0	5
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	13	15	10	5	43
OTHER, CIVIL	2	4	5	2	13
OTHER, DOMESTIC	7	3	2	4	16
OTHER, INSURANCE	1	0	0	0	1
PEEPING TOM	0	1	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	0	0	3	0	3
ROBBERY	7	5	5	0	17
RUNAWAY	9	11	7	3	30
SEXUAL ASSAULT W/ OBJECT	1	1	0	0	2
SHOPLIFTING	6	8	2	4	20
SIMPLE ASSAULT	38	31	24	21	114
STATUTORY RAPE	0	0	1	0	1
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	5	1	0	0	6
SUICIDE	0	0	1	1	2
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	7	3	6	3	19
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	1	2	1	0	4
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	2	0	0	2
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	68	79	47	59	253
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	34	32	36	10	112
TRAFFIC	13	17	13	5	48
TRESPASSING	5	3	5	1	14
TRUANCY	0	2	0	0	2
VANDALISM	92	137	114	36	379
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	1	3	2	3	9
WIRE FRAUD	1	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	672	797	623	347	2439

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Sheriff's Department

Reported Offenses*: CY2009, CY2010, CY2011, and 2012YTD, between 2:01 AM and 7:00 AM
 County Council District 11: Norman Jackson

CRIME	CY2009	CY2012	CY2011	2012YTD	TOTAL
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	21	23	19	12	75
ALL OTHER LARCENY	64	85	48	24	221
ALL OTHER OFFENSES	11	11	10	5	37
ALL OTHER RESPONSES	24	9	9	8	50
ARSON	1	3	0	0	4
ASSISTING OTHER AGENCIES	9	9	7	4	29
BREACH OF TRUST	3	2	1	1	7
BURGLARY	51	36	33	17	137
CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR	0	0	1	0	1
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	1	4	8	4	17
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	2	1	0	0	3
DRUG EQUIPMENT VIOLATIONS	0	2	0	0	2
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS	6	7	3	2	18
DRUNKENNESS	0	0	1	0	1
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	1	0	0	1
FALSE PRETENSES/SWINDLE/ CONFIDENCE GAME	8	10	8	2	28
FAMILY OFFENSES (NON-VIOLENT)	5	3	4	2	14
FORCIBLE FONDLING	0	1	2	1	4
FORCIBLE RAPE	0	3	1	0	4
FORCIBLE SODOMY	0	0	1	0	1
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING	3	1	0	1	5
FRAUD CREDIT CARD/ATM	3	8	7	1	19
IMPERSONATION	1	1	4	1	7
INCORRIGIBLE	0	1	2	1	4
INTIMIDATION	8	5	8	7	28
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	1	0	3	0	4
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATION	0	1	0	0	1
MISSING PERSON	3	5	8	3	19
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	52	36	49	21	158
MURDER	0	0	1	0	1
OBSCENE/HARASSING PHONE CALLS	15	22	16	6	59
OTHER, CIVIL	6	1	2	1	10
OTHER, DOMESTIC	3	7	3	3	16
OTHER, INSURANCE	0	0	0	1	1
POCKET PICKING	0	0	1	0	1
PROWLER	1	0	0	0	1
RESISTING ARREST	0	0	1	0	1
ROBBERY	1	2	2	1	6
RUNAWAY	5	8	13	1	27
SHOPLIFTING	3	1	1	1	6
SIMPLE ASSAULT	27	21	23	7	78
STATUTORY RAPE	1	0	1	0	2
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	3	2	0	0	5
SUICIDE	0	1	0	0	1
SUSPICIOUS FIRES	6	0	4	0	10
THEFT FROM BUILDINGS	3	0	0	0	3
THEFT FROM COIN-OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	0	0	1	0	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	81	45	31	28	185
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS OR ACCESSORIES	42	26	22	5	95
TRAFFIC	5	13	7	2	27
TRESPASSING	5	3	4	2	14
TRUANCY	0	1	0	0	1
VANDALISM	80	71	82	42	275
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	1	2	1	2	6
WIRE FRAUD	0	1	3	0	4
TOTAL	565	495	456	219	1735

*Only offenses reported to the Richland County Sheriff's Department are included in this data. Data is current as of July 10, 2012 and is subject to change daily.

Source: RCSD Visions

07/17/2012

Item# 2

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Contract Award: Pavement Condition Survey Project [**PAGES 41-44**]

Reviews

Notes

December 18, 2012 - The Committee recommended deferral to its January 22, 2013 meeting.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Contract Award: Pavement Condition Survey Project

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve the award of the Pavement Condition Survey to Applied Pavement Technology, Inc. in the amount of \$324,488.00.

B. Background / Discussion

Richland County Public Works advertised the Pavement Condition Survey Project on April 19, 2012. This project will entail the use of a sophisticated van service that will evaluate all of the County's paved roads and rate them based on various deficiencies and stresses based on the Engineering American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) 6433-03 standard. This ASTM standard will be used to rate the County maintained roads and give them an Overall Condition Index (OCI). This OCI value will then be used to rank all of the paved roads in the County.

Once the data is collected, it will be downloaded into the Cartegraph Pavement Management software. Applied Pavement Technology, Inc. will update our existing Cartegraph software as well as provide training for the software.

This analysis will be the basis for prioritizing resurfacing or other treatments to existing paved roads. With future updates, it will enable us to better predict rate of deterioration so that we are spending funds where they will have the most effect.

Six companies submitted on this proposal:

1. Applied Pavement Technology, Inc.
2. Civil Engineering Consulting Services
3. Chao and Associates
4. Infrastructure Management Systems
5. MGIS
6. Florence and Hutcheson

Applied Pavement Technology was the third ranked vendor, but the first vendor to assist in the Counties' Minority Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (MDBE) goals.

At this time, Council is being requested to approve the contract with Applied Pavement Technology, Inc. in the amount of \$324,488.00. This amount is at a rate of approximately \$600 per mile for the project. This project will be paid through Richland County Transportation Committee (CTC) funds.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- April 19, 2012 – Project was advertised.
- May 24, 2012 – Proposals and Qualifications accepted.
- June 8, 2012 – Evaluation packages sent out by Procurement.
- July 10, 2012 – All evaluation packages were completed and returned to Procurement.

Item# 3

- August 10, 2012 – Compiled scores sent out by Procurement requesting a combined recommendation.
- August 23, 2012 – Recommendation sent to Procurement asking to negotiate with Applied Pavement Technology.
- September, October and November 2012 – Negotiated with Applied Pavement Technology on pricing.

D. Financial Impact

This project is being funded by the CTC from the \$1.4 million that has been allocated to the 2013 Resurfacing Project.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to award this contract to Applied Pavement Technology in the amount of \$324,488.00.
2. Do not approve the request to award this contract to Applied Pavement Technology in the amount of \$324,488.00. Select another vendor.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that County Council award this project to Applied Pavement Technology Inc., in the amount of \$324,488.00.

Recommended by: David Hoops, P.E. Department: Public Works Date: 11/28/12

G. Reviews

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers
 Recommend Council approval
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 12/6/12
 Recommend Council denial

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood
 Recommend Council approval
 Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Six companies responded to the solicitation and were evaluated by three County Engineers; attached below are the names of the companies, where they are located, if they provided Minority Women’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (MWDDBE) and local participation and the evaluation standings.

	COMPANIES	LOCATION	MWDDBE/LOCAL PARTICIPATION	RATING
1.	Applied Pavement Technology, Inc.	URBANA, IL	Sub Woman-Owned (Local Columbia)	3 rd
2.	Civil Engineering Consulting Services	COLUMBIA, SC	Woman-Owned	4 th
3.	Chao and Associates	COLUMBIA, SC	Minority-Owned	4 th
4.	Infrastructure Management Systems	ROLLING MEADOWS, IL	NONE	1 st
5.	MGiS	PHOENIX,	NONE	2 nd

		AZ		
6.	Florence & Hutchenson	COLUMBIA, SC	Sub Woman-Owned (Local Columbia)	5 th

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: December 7, 2012

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

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

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 12/7/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval to award the contract to Applied Pavement Technology in the amount of \$324,488.00.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Existing Paved Road Resurfacing Funds Distribution **[PAGES 45-50]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Existing Paved Road Resurfacing Funds Distribution

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a method of distributing resurfacing funds and prioritizing roads that are in need of resurfacing.

B. Background / Discussion

- Section 21-20 of the Richland County Code addresses distribution of funds and prioritization of the paving of dirt roads, but not the resurfacing of paved roads. This section performs two functions:
 - First, it provides a method of prioritizing dirt roads to be paved based upon whether they will carry thru-traffic, the difficulty of present maintenance and the number of residences, churches and businesses served.
 - Secondly, this section distributes funds throughout the county based upon the prororation of the length of dirt roads in a council district compared with the total length of dirt roads in the county.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

- This item was referred to the D&S Committee by Councilwoman Hutchinson at the December 18, 2012 Council Meeting.

- Section 21-20 Road Paving Program was adopted on January 21, 2003. See attached Ord. No. 005-03HR.

D. Financial Impact

Although there is no financial impact associated with this request and funds are anticipated to remain available on a countywide basis, individual council districts may be affected by the availability of funds. For example, a district with a high percentage of deteriorated roads may not receive adequate funding, whereas a district with roads in better condition may have more funds available.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to create a method of distributing funds and prioritization of existing paved roads to be resurfaced in the same manner as dirt roads (Sec. 21-20).
2. Approve the request to create a method of distributing funds for resurfacing of existing paved roads in the same manner as dirt roads (Sec. 21-20), but prioritize based upon condition of road and traffic volume.
3. Do not approve the request to create a method of distributing funds for resurfacing of existing paved roads on a countywide basis and maintain the current policy.

F. Recommendation

Staff recommends approving the second alternative, distributing funds for resurfacing of existing paved roads on a countywide basis as prioritized by condition and traffic volume.

Recommended by: David Hoops

Department: Public Works

Date: January 4, 2013

Item# 4

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: 1/4/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council discretion

Comments regarding recommendation:

Request is a policy decision for Council and within Council discretion. Section D above notes that the decision does not have any additional cost associated but may redistribute funding based on approved policy.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/7/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Recommend Council discretion

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion. If Council approves a plan for resurfacing and would like to amend Section 21-20 (below) to include such plan, I would recommend that Council approve an ordinance by title only for first reading and then Legal will work with Public Works on ordinance language for second reading.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/7/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval of the second alternative - distributing funds for resurfacing of existing paved roads on a countywide basis as prioritized by condition and traffic volume.

ATTACHMENT #1

Sec. 21-20: Road Paving Program

(a) Road construction and paving projects administered by the county and funded from public funds shall be accomplished in accordance with a consistent, systematic program established and administered by the director of public works. Such program shall have the following basic characteristics:

- (1) Only county maintained roads will be paved utilizing public funds,
- (2) All county maintained dirt roads are eligible for paving, and
- (3) Paving will be accomplished in priority order at a rate permitted by availability of funding.

(b) The county engineer will acquire and maintain the following data on all roads proposed for paving:

- (1) Name;
- (2) County road number;
- (3) Map location code;
- (4) Beginning and ending points;
- (5) Length in miles and hundredths of a mile; and
- (6) Council district.

(c) In addition, the following data pertaining to the roads priority for paving will be obtained and recorded for each road:

- (1) Number of homes accessed from the road;
- (2) Number of businesses accessed from the road;
- (3) Number of churches accessed from the road; and
- (4) Maintenance difficulty factor.

For the purpose of determining the number of homes, business and churches accessed from a road, only those on parcels with no existing paved road frontage will be counted except when the distance from the paved road to the building exceeds 1320 feet.

(d) Roads will be prioritized in accordance with the following procedure:

A road's priority for paving will be established by the number of points accredited to it as described below divided by its length, with the highest total of points per mile constituting the highest priority. The points per mile (P) is calculated by the formula:

$$P = \frac{H+B+C+T+M}{L} \quad \text{Where:}$$

H=Number of points accredited for homes.

One point is accredited for each home accessed from the road. This will include mobile homes as well as permanent homes. It should be noted that the number of homes on a road is an indicator of the number of people using it as well as the importance of the road as a possible school bus route.

B=Number of points accredited for businesses.

Two points are accredited for each business accessed from the road. To be eligible for these points, a business must occupy a building separate from any residence and rely on the road for either customer traffic or routine use by company vehicles.

C=Number of points accredited for churches.

Two points are accredited for each church accessed from the road.

T=Number of points accredited for a through road.

Five points are accredited if the road is a through road connecting two different paved roads. It should be noted that a through road has the potential for people other than the residents to use it and it is also more likely to be utilized as a school bus route.

M=Number of points accredited for difficult maintenance.

From 0 to 10 points may be accredited to a road based on the difficulty on maintaining it in serviceable condition as determined through consultation with the roads and drainage manager.

L=Length of the road in miles and hundredths.

(e) A road's paving may be given top priority provided that all costs incurred by the county to pave it are paid by its adjacent property owners. Such costs may be included as an assessment on the tax bill of the property owners, to be paid over no more than a fifteen (15) year period with an interest charge equal to that paid by the county for bonds issued to fund construction. The county council may elect to have the total costs, plus interest, of the improvements allocated between the property owners either by a front footage assessment ratio, or by each lot being assessed an equal share of the costs and interest. Establishment of this assessment shall require approval of eighty percent (80%) of the property owners.

(f) Highways, streets or roads constructed or paved under the county's jurisdiction and maintained by the county shall meet the design and construction standards contained in section 21-6, above.

(g) The director of public works shall, within the best judgment of the engineering staff, establish appropriate alternate design and construction standards for low volume rural roads as a means of ensuring maximum cost effectiveness of road paving funds.

(h) Road paving funds will be distributed by county council district based on that district's portion of total county dirt road mileage. Pro rata fund distribution will be calculated as follows:

$$\text{District dirt road paving funds} = \frac{\text{Total dirt road paving funds} \times \text{district dirt road mileage}}{\text{Total dirt road mileage}}$$

Mileage refers to dirt road mileage in the county road maintenance system (i.e. public dirt roads that are routinely maintained by county public works forces). Roads will be selected for paving based on distribution/availability of funds and priority within that council district, as determined by the uniform road rating system contained in this section.

(Ord. No. 005-03HR, § I, 1-21-03)

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement between Richland County and Forest Acres [PAGES 51-59]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement
between Richland County and Forest Acres

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request is for Richland County and the City of Forest Acres jurisdictions to partner in the provision of required building code inspection and plan review of commercial buildings for the City of Forest Acres for the purpose of providing code compliance for commercial construction projects.

B. Background / Discussion

- Current Building Official is no longer employed by Forest Acres.
- On approximately December 1, 2012 a request was made by Mark Williams, City Administrator, to utilize Richland County's services.
- County Council is requested to approve this request in an effort to help Forest Acres during their search for another Building Official.
- County Council approved a similar agreement approximately three years ago with Forest Acres when they were without a Certified Building Official.
- The City of Forest Acres and Richland County recognize the positive impact this partnership will have in maintaining continuity of essential services through inspections and plan review on all commercial projects.
- Attached are the current proposed MOU (2013) and the previous (2010) Memorandum of Understanding.

If approved, Richland County will provide all plan review and inspections for commercial projects only. Forest Acres will issue the permit(s) and all approvals needed for the project to move forward and collect all appropriate fees.

This Agreement shall continue in force until June 30, 2013 unless terminated sooner in writing by either party upon the City's employment of its own Building Official or upon the County's inability to provide said inspection services. This agreement may also be extended by written request of the Forest Acres City Administrator or the Richland County Administrator.

Contractors shall call in all inspection requests to the Department, and the Department shall keep a daily log of all inspection requests, inspections performed and mileage accrued each day. Costs shall be billed to the City.

The services for inspections and plan reviews will be handled by licensed County inspectors and plans examiners, as required by the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation. The Building Official of Richland County shall interpret provisions of the applicable Building Code(s).

The fee agreed upon by Richland County and the City of Forest Acres for all inspections and re-inspections of existing and newly-permitted projects will be \$75.00 per hour per inspector/vehicle, plus mileage. Plan review fees on new construction permits will be collected by Forest Acres. The County fee for plan review 15% of the cost of the permit issued by Forest Acres, with such fees being billed to the City.

Item# 5

C. Legislative / Chronological History

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

D. Financial Impact

Funds to be collected will be minimal as the work load in Forest Acres was previously handled by a staff of two, the Building Official for commercial inspections and a Residential inspector that is still employed but not licensed to do commercial inspections or plan review.

Approximately two to three inspection requests are estimated per week, which is projected to be between \$150.00 and \$500.00 per week, depending on the number of inspections and hours spent conducting inspections. Plan review fees on new construction permits will be collected by Forest Acres, of which the County fee for plan review of 15% depends on the cost of the permit issued by Forest Acres. For example, the cost of a plan review on a \$50,000 building would be approximately \$75.00 and for a \$500,000 building the review fee would be approximately \$400.00 based on the County fee schedule; however, the County’s 15% will depend on Forest Acres’ fee for the permit(s).

Again, the costs associated with plan review and inspections for new and existing permits for commercial-related work will be billed to Forest Acres. Therefore, there should be no direct cost or negative financial impact to the County.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to provide building code services to Forest Acres. This will allow Forest Acres to be assured quality inspections and plan review for commercial-occupied structures are open to the public.
2. Do not approve the request to provide services to Forest Acres and require them to seek out other alternatives.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request for Richland County to provide assistance and services to the City of Forest Acres for inspections and plan review on commercial property.

Recommended by: Donny Phipps Department: Building Codes & Inspections Date: 1/2/13

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: 1/7/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/7/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

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

Please see suggested changes to the MOU below.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/7/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval to provide temporary building code services to the City of Forest Acres.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)
)
)
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
AND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY
OF FOREST ACRES, SOUTH CAROLINA
AND RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH
CAROLINA

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 2013 by and between the City of Forest Acres and Richland County, South Carolina.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the jurisdictions to partner in the provision of required building code inspection and plan review of commercial buildings for the City of Forest Acres for the purpose of providing code compliance for construction projects; and

WHEREAS, The City of Forest Acres and Richland County recognize the positive impact this partnership will have in maintaining continuity of essential services through inspections and plan review on all commercial projects; and

WHEREAS, Forest Acres agrees to reimburse Richland County for the cost of inspections and plan reviews as indicated below;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the services and agreement described herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Richland County (hereinafter "County") will provide building code inspections and plan reviews of commercial buildings for the City of Forest Acres (hereinafter "City"), as follows:
 - a. The Licensed General Contractor (hereinafter "contractor") shall obtain approval(s) and all related permits from the City for a commercial building located, or to be located, within the boundaries of the City.
 - b. The contractor for a project shall submit plans for review and pay fees to Forest Acres and deliver said plans to the Richland County Building Department (hereinafter "Department"). Building plans may be submitted to the Department prior to the City's approval(s) in order to expedite the permitting process if desired by the contractor and approved by the City.
 - c. All new and existing permitted projects requesting an inspection will be billed at \$75.00 per hour per inspector/vehicle, plus mileage of 56.5 cents per mile. Plan review fees on new construction permits will be collected by the City. The County fee for plan review shall be fifteen (15%) of the cost of the permit issue by the City.
2. Contractors shall call in all inspection requests to the City and the Department shall keep a daily log of all inspection requests from the City, inspections conducted and mileage performed each day. All costs for plan review, inspections, or re-inspections shall be billed to the City on a monthly basis.

Item# 5

3. The City and County agree that services for inspections and plan review will be handled by licensed County inspectors and plans examiner, as required by the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation.
4. The Building Official of Richland County shall interpret provisions of the applicable Building Code(s). Such interpretations may be appealed to the Richland County Building Code Board of Appeals. Fees for an appeal shall be as set forth by County ordinance. In the event of an appeal, the Department will testify as to code requirements. However, expenses for staff time and material will be reimbursed by the City.
5. The City and its successors and assigns do hereby remise, release, acquit, and forever discharge the County, its employees, agents, successors, and assigns past, present, from future actions, causes of action, claims, demands, damages, costs, loss of services, expenses, compensation, third party actions, suits at law or indemnity of whatever nature, and all consequential damage on account of, or in any way arising from the services rendered under this Agreement, and further agrees to hold harmless and indemnify the County for any and all losses, claims, suits, and other liability arising from the services rendered under this Agreement.
6. This Agreement shall continue in force until June 30, 2013, unless terminated sooner, in writing, by either party upon the City's employment of its own Building Official or upon the County's inability to provide said inspection services. This agreement may also be extended by written request of the City Administrator or the County Administrator.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, have this _____ day of _____, 2013, set our hand and seal hereon.

CITY OF FOREST ACRES

WITNESSES:

Mayor

RICHLAND COUNTY

WITNESSES:

Chair

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
))
))
COUNTY OF RICHLAND) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
AND AGREEMENT BETWEEN FOREST
ACRES, SOUTH CAROLINA; AND
RICHLAND COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA**

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 2010, by and between the City of Forest Acres and Richland County, South Carolina.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the jurisdictions to partner in the provision of required building code inspection and plan review of residential and commercial buildings for the City of Forest Acres for the purpose of providing code compliance for construction; and

WHEREAS, the Forest Acres and Richland County Councils recognize the positive influence this project will have on the quality of life for residents of Forest Acres, and desire to provide essential services through inspections and plan review; and

WHEREAS, Forest Acres agrees to reimburse Richland County for the cost of inspections and plan review as indicated below;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the services and agreement described herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Forest Acres agrees to compensate Richland County for provision of services as follows and pay to Richland County for services provided.

Plan Review- Commercial: 15% of Permit value,

Residential: \$10.00 per review; up to 2,000 sq ft. and \$25.00 over;

Commercial inspections: \$50.00 per inspection hour for each inspector;

Residential one & two family inspections: \$30.00 per inspector;

\$.50 per mile for vehicles used

Re-Inspections are the same fee as initial request for inspections;

2. Forest Acres and Richland County, shall call-in all inspection requests to the Richland County permit office; contractors may also request inspections and re-inspections as required for inspections in Forest Acres city limits. A daily log shall be kept for all inspections.

3. Forest Acres and Richland County agree that services for inspections and plan review will be handled by state licensed inspectors and plans examiners, as required by South Carolina LLR.

4. Building code interpretations of the Building Official of Richland County may be appealed to the Richland County Code Board of Appeals. In the event of an appeal, the Richland County Department of Inspections will testify as to code requirements and Forest Acres will reimburse the County for the cost of inspection staff to appear before the board. Fees for appeal as set by County ordinance for residential and/or commercial.

5. Forest Acres and its successors and assigns do hereby remise, release, acquit, and forever discharge Richland County, its employees, agents, successors, and assigns past, present, from future actions, causes of action, claims, demands, damages, costs, loss of services, expenses, compensation, third party actions, suits at law or indemnity of whatever nature, and all consequential damage on account of, or in any way arising from the services rendered under this Agreement, and further agrees to hold harmless and indemnify Richland County for any and all losses, claims, suits, and other liability arising from the services rendered under this Agreement.

6. This Intergovernmental Agreement will continue in force until June 30, 2010 unless terminated sooner, in writing, by either party. This agreement may be terminated without

prior notice or extended by written request of the Forest Acres City Administrator or Richland County designee upon Forest Acres' employment of its own Building Official or upon Richland County's inability to provide said inspection services.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF WE THE UNDERSIGNED have this _____ day of _____, 2010, set our hand and seal hereon.

City of Forest Acres

WITNESSES:

Mayor

RICHLAND COUNTY

WITNESSES:

Chair

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Waste Management Landfill Leachate Treatment [**PAGES 60-67**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Waste Management Landfill Leachate Treatment

A. Purpose

County Council’s approval is requested to allow the Waste Management Landfill to construct a leachate pump station and force main to transport the leachate from the landfill to the City of Columbia Wastewater Treatment Plant.

B. Background / Discussion

Leachate is the accumulation of rainwater that falls on solid waste disposal trenches and other liquids that are naturally occurring in municipal solid waste. The landfill is designed to collect the leachate thereby prohibiting it from entering the groundwater system. Currently Waste Management collects and trucks their leachate to the City of Columbia’s (referred to as “the City”) wastewater treatment plant where it is subsequently treated. In an effort to make the landfill process more efficient, Waste Management is proposing to construct a pump station and force main which will pump the leachate from the landfill site to the City’s wastewater treatment plant. Construction of this system will eliminate the need to continue the leachate trucking operation.

Richland County is the designated management agency in the Central Midlands COG 208 Water Quality Management Plan for the drainage basin surrounding the Waste Management Landfill. In order for the Department of Health and Environmental Control to permit the construction of a pump station and force main to be pumped to the City of Columbia, an amendment to the Water Quality Management Plan will be required.

Owners of the Waste Management Landfill retained Brown and Caldwell to develop a plan to treat the leachate generated at the landfill site. Several options have been investigated and the recommended option is to construct a pump station and force main to transport the leachate from the landfill to the City’s wastewater treatment plant. Brown and Caldwell has provided a comparison of several options which is attached for your reference.

Upon review of the various options, the additional treatment requirements of the various wastewater treatment facilities, the construction and annual operation costs, it is believed that a connection to the City’s wastewater treatment plant is the best option currently available.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This is a staff-generated request; therefore, there is no legislative history.

D. Financial Impact

All costs associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed pump station and force main will be paid by Waste Management Landfill. There are no anticipated costs to Richland County.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the 208 Water Quality Plan amendment to allow Waste Management Landfill to construct a pump station and force main to pump the leachate to the City’s wastewater treatment plant.
2. Require Waste Management to construct all necessary pump stations, force mains and pretreatment systems to connect to the Richland County Lower Richland Wastewater Treatment Plant. This alternative may have a higher initial construction and annual operating cost, which would be paid by Waste Management.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the amendment to the Central Midlands 208 Water Quality Management Plan to allow the Waste Management Landfill to construct a leachate treatment system that connects directly to the City’s wastewater treatment plant.

Recommended by: Andy H. Metts Department: Utilities Date: 1/3/2013

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: 1/3/13
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:


Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 1/10/13
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council’s discretion; however, please note that the attached letter mentions that if we approve the construction, Waste Management property will then be annexed into the City of Columbia. As annexation was not mentioned in the ROA, I’m not exactly sure what was contemplated, but any annexation could have tax and other consequences. Also, the ROA mentions amending the Central Midlands COG 208 Water Quality Management Plan, but that plan nor any planned amendments have been attached for review; thus I cannot comment on any legal implications of such.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett Date: 1/16/13
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval of the 208 Water Quality Plan amendment to allow Waste Management Landfill to construct a pump station and force main to pump the leachate to the City’s wastewater treatment plant.

3800 Fernandina Rd, Ste 100
Columbia, SC, 29210
Tel: 803-873-9701
Fax: 803-873-9702
www.browncaldwell.com



September 13, 2012

RECEIVED

SEP 20 2012

Richland County Utilities

Mr. Andy Metts, Director
Richland County Utilities Department
7525 Broad River Road
Irmo, South Carolina 29063

143182

Subject: Leachate Force Main and Pump Station
Waste Management of South Carolina, Inc.
Richland County Landfill, Inc.

Dear Mr. Metts:

As you may know, we are the preliminary design engineers for Waste Management of South Carolina, Inc. (WM) on a force main and pump station project which would directly discharge leachate from their landfill, near the intersection of Screaming Eagle Road and Highway Church Road in Richland County, to the City of Columbia's Metro Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). Currently, WM trucks their leachate to the City's WWTP. In an effort to make their landfill process more efficient, they engaged Brown and Caldwell (BC) to perform a Management Study to determine the most economical solution to leachate disposal. Enclosed is the summary of the Management Study, which includes an option to dispose of the leachate at Richland County's WWTP. In order to dispose of the leachate at your WWTP plant, WM would be required to pre-treat the leachate, which would include a significant capital cost for them. As you can see from the study, the most economical leachate disposal solution is to directly discharge the leachate to the City of Columbia's Metro WWTP, who is planning to build a side stream treatment facility in the near future. This would also require WM to annex their property into the City of Columbia since it is contiguous with Fort Jackson. We have also enclosed a map depicting the preliminary routing of this direct discharge force main and pump stations for your use.

As you can see from the enclosed map, the WM's landfill site is located within the Richland County Utilities' wastewater service area, as dictated by the 208 Water Quality Management Plan written by the Central Midlands Council of Governments (CMCOG). In order for the City of Columbia to serve this parcel with wastewater service, an amendment would have to be requested to this Water Quality Management Plan. If you have no objection to this, please sign and return this document and we will contact the CMCOG regarding this process.

\\scl\apps\eng\project\143182\metts\120913\143182_fm\143182_fm.docx

Item# 6


Mr. Metts
Richland County Utilities Department
September 13, 2012
Page 2

We look forward to hearing from you regarding this amendment request. We are available to meet to review the information if needed. Please let us know if you have any questions or if we might provide additional information.

Very truly yours,

BROWN AND CALDWELL,
California Corporation

Based on the information provided, Richland County has no objection to the City of Columbia providing wastewater service to WM's Richland County landfill site and annexing this site into the City limits.



Wayne E. Iseman, Vice President

Signature _____

Printed Name _____

Title _____

Date _____

Copy: Zane Ferris, Director of Landfill Operations (WM)

Enclosures

143132 correspondence file copy

Item# 6

Richland County Landfill Inc. Leachate Management Study


Category	City of Columbia Metro Plant			Kershaw County Utilities WWTP			Richland County WWTP	Palmetto Utilities WWTP
	Direct Haul to Metro Plant	Pipeline from Landfill to Metro Plant	Connect to Nearest Sewer Line Outside Palmetto Utilities Acquisition Territory	Connect to Sewer Line off Clemson Road at Earth Rd	Doby's Mill Pump Station	Kershaw Plant		
Capital Expenditure Estimates								
Probable Force Main Path (ft)	0	162,895	61,710	74,000	23,420	74,860	125,040	101,160
Construction Costs	\$0	\$4,210,252	\$1,996,296	\$811,650	\$800,342	\$2,238,836	\$3,214,554	\$620,466
Contingency (25%)	\$0	\$1,052,688	\$494,074	\$202,913	\$201,086	\$550,209	\$803,639	\$155,117
Engineering (10%)	\$0	\$421,075	\$169,630	\$81,165	\$80,434	\$223,684	\$321,455	\$62,047
Property Acquisitions (5%)	\$0	\$210,538	\$84,815	\$40,583	\$40,217	\$111,842	\$160,728	\$31,023
Bonds & Insurance (2%)	\$0	\$84,215	\$33,926	\$16,233	\$16,087	\$44,737	\$64,251	\$12,402
Total Pipeline Cost	\$0	\$5,979,248	\$2,208,740	\$1,132,548	\$1,142,266	\$3,126,307	\$4,564,667	\$881,067
Tag Fee	\$0	\$367,200	\$367,200	\$367,200	\$367,200	\$367,200	\$367,200	\$367,200
Application fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Life of Landfill (Yrs)	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Pre-Treatment Capital Costs								
All Inclusive	\$0	\$0	\$2,992,000	\$2,992,000	\$2,992,000	\$0	\$2,992,000	\$0
Pilot Study	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$0
Sub-Total	\$0	\$0	\$3,242,000	\$3,242,000	\$3,242,000	\$0	\$3,242,000	\$250,000
Grand Total Initial Investment	\$0	\$5,346,768	\$5,018,240	\$4,762,048	\$4,762,216	\$3,458,357	\$8,174,167	\$1,498,652
Capital Investment Spread Over 40 Year Life No Interest	\$0	\$158,669	\$150,456	\$119,051	\$118,655	\$86,459	\$204,354	\$37,464
Annual Pre-Treatment								
Gallons to Treat Annually	0	0	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	0	18,250,000	0
O&M Cost per gallon	\$0.0000	\$0.0000	\$0.0245	\$0.0245	\$0.0245	\$0.0000	\$0.0245	\$0.0000
Total Annual O&M Costs	\$0	\$0	\$447,125	\$447,125	\$447,125	\$0	\$447,125	\$0
Added Property Tax - Amortized	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$0
Pre-Treatment may add capital improvement tax	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000	\$0
Annual Treatment								
Gallons to Treat Annually	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000	18,250,000
Estimated Treatment Fee per Gallon	\$0.0690	\$0.0680	\$0.0042	\$0.0042	\$0.0042	\$0.0844	\$0.0100	\$0.0100
Estimated Annual Treatment Costs	\$1,249,750	\$1,249,750	\$76,650	\$76,650	\$76,650	\$1,540,300	\$182,250	\$182,250
Annual Total Cost	\$1,149,750	\$319,669	\$899,231	\$907,926	\$905,030	\$1,628,759	\$983,979	\$384,214
NOTES	Editing leachate management method							
ALL ESTIMATES IN THIS REPORT ARE PLANNING LEVEL ONLY AND ARE BELIEVED TO BE CONSERVATIVE (High). Once an option is selected a much more thorough analysis must be performed to determine costs to a higher level of accuracy.	Treatment fee includes \$0.035 per gallon for city treatment and \$0.028 per gallon haul cost with no line surcharge added.							
All calculation based on average if 50,000 gallons per day	Treatment fee based on published rates including surcharge for BOD level of 2000 mg/L and TSS level of 1300 mg/L							
Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) recommended as pre-treatment method based on level of pre-treatment necessary	Amortization into City is a requirement of connection - increased property taxes							
The estimated property tax increase and capital improvement tax resulting from amortization was provided by Richland County Assessors.	Estimate calls for 3 pump stations may not be required							
Pipelines (force mains) call for 4 inch lines	Long-term contract will be necessary							
Brown - Caldwell								

Brown and Caldwell

PRELIMINARY LOCATION FOR LEACHATE FORCE MAIN AND PUMP STATIONS
TO COLUMBIA METRO WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

ATTACHMENT

NOT TO SCALE



Item# 6

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Quit Claim Deed - Vinson [**PAGES 68-77**]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Quit Claim Deed - Vinson

A. Purpose

Council is requested to approve a Quit Claim Deed involving a triangular piece of land pointing east to west measuring 1,278 feet on the north and south sides and 31 feet on the east side located on the northeast corner of the Richland County Landfill Complex property on Caughman Road North.

B. Background / Discussion

Multiple surveys have been performed on the County landfill property (Parcel 06500-01-01) and on the property that was previously deeded to William Patrick Vinson (Parcel 6600-02-14). Surveys indicated that a 0.46 acre area overlapped both property lines, which also suggested that each party had a reasonable claim to the 0.46 acres. (See attached plat.)

County Council passed ordinance 007-06HR (3rd reading 2-7-06, see attachment 1) giving a Quit Claim Deed to William Patrick Vinson for the 0.46 acres; however, the Deed was never recorded. Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson, Mr. Vinson's wife, has become the sole property owner since Mr. Vinson's death on September 25, 2009. Mrs. Vinson is agreeable to recording a Quit Claim Deed for the property to resolve the disputed property line.

The approval of this request is needed to enable the County to complete the ongoing landfill property boundary survey. Based on the location of the 0.46 acres, deeding the land to Mrs. Vinson offered no adverse impact to the County in general or to future landfill operations specifically.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

This is a staff-initiated request. However, County Council passed ordinance 007-06HR (3rd reading 2-7-06) giving a Quit Claim Deed to William Patrick Vinson for the 0.46 acres. The Deed was never recorded and the property is now deeded to Mrs. Vinson since Mr. Vinson is deceased.

The Vinson's plat from February 23, 2005 is attached. The County's ongoing landfill property boundary survey data agrees with the Vinson survey.

D. Financial Impact

There is no anticipated financial impact associated with this request.

E. Alternative

1. Approve the request to approve the Quit Claim Deed and resolve the dispute.
2. Do not approve the request to approve Quit Claim Deed leaving the dispute unresolved.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the Quit Claim Deed.

Recommended by: Rudy Curtis

Department: Solid Waste

Date: 1/10/13

Item# 7

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 1/15/13

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/16/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Policy decision left to Council's discretion. The request will require an ordinance, which has been provided.

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/16/13

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval of the Quit Claim Deed.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. 007-06HR

BARBARA
C.O.S.
2006 MAR 7
RICHLAND COUNTY
FILED

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING QUIT CLAIM DEED TO WILLIAM PATRICK VINSON FOR A CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN RICHLAND COUNTY, APPROXIMATELY SEVEN (7) MILES NORTHWEST OF THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, BEING DESCRIBED AS A TRIANGULAR CROSSHATCHED AREA OF 0.46 ACRES MORE OR LESS, AND BEING A PORTION OF RICHLAND COUNTY TMS # 06600-02-14.

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

SECTION I. The County of Richland and its employees and agents are hereby authorized to grant a quit claim deed to William Patrick Vinson for a certain parcel of land, as specifically described in the "Quit Claim Deed", which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after February 7, 2006.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

By: *Anthony G. Mizzell*
Anthony G. Mizzell, Chair

Attest this 21ST day of

FEBRUARY, 2006

Michelle R. Cannon-Finch
Michelle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Amelia R. Linder
Approved As To LEGAL Form Only.
No Opinion Rendered As To Content

First Reading: December 20, 2005
Second Reading: January 3, 2006
Public Hearing: February 7, 2006
Third reading: February 7, 2006

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ____-13HR

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING QUIT CLAIM DEED TO DOROTHY JEAN ALLISON VINSON FOR A CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN RICHLAND COUNTY, APPROXIMATELY SEVEN (7) MILES NORTHWEST OF THE CITY OF COLUMBIA, BEING DESCRIBED AS A TRIANGULAR CROSSHATCHED AREA OF 0.46 ACRES MORE OR LESS, AND BEING A PORTION OF RICHLAND COUNTY TMS # 06600-02-14.

WHEREAS, Richland County Council previously passed ordinance 007-06HR which authorized a quit claim deed (the "Original Deed") for the same property described herein to William Vinson; and

WHEREAS, the Original Deed has been lost and was never recorded in the Richland County ROD; and

WHEREAS, in order to clarify a boundary dispute, Richland County desires to again grant a quit claim deed for the property to Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson, wife and successor in interest to William Vinson, who is deceased.

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

SECTION I. The County of Richland and its employees and agents are hereby authorized to grant a quit claim deed to Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson for a certain parcel of land, as specifically described in the "Quit Claim Deed", which is attached hereto and incorporated herein.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be enforced from and after _____, 2013.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

By: _____
Kelvin Washington, Chair

Attest this _____ day of _____, 2013.

Michelle Onley
Clerk of Council

Item# 7

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

QUIT CLAIM DEED
(Non-Abstracted Title to Real Estate)

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that Richland County, South Carolina, (the "Grantor") for and in consideration of the sum of Five and 00/100 (\$5.00) Dollars and other valuable consideration paid by Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson (the "Grantee"), the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, does hereby remise, release and quitclaim unto the said Grantee, Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson, her successors and assigns forever, subject to any and all existing reservations, easements, encroachments, restrictions, covenants, zoning, governmental regulations, land use regulations, rights-of-way and conditions of this deed that may appear on record or on the premises, the following described real property:

All that certain piece, parcel, or lot of land, situate, lying and being in the County of Richland, State of South Carolina, approximately seven (7) miles northwest of the City of Columbia, being described as a triangular crosshatched area of 0.46 acres more or less, shown as a part of the southwestern portion of Tract "C," bearing Tax Map Number 6600-02-14, commencing at Grid Tie Point No. 106 bearing North $69^{\circ}29'19''$ E for a distance of 1278.20' to Grid Tie Point No. 105, from thence bearing South $20^{\circ}58'13''$ E for a distance of 31.06' to Grid Tie Point No. 104, from thence bearing South $70^{\circ}52'49''$ W for a distance of 1278.83' to point of origin Grid Tie Point No. 106, all as shown in a Boundary Survey for William Patrick Vinson by Mark E. Mills, S.C.P.L.S. #10779, dated March 23, 2005, and recorded on _____ in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Richland County in Book _____ at Page ____ .

Said property being generally bounded as follows: on the North by the remainder of Tract "C" on said boundary survey; on the West by lands now or formerly of Divex, Inc.; on the East by lands now or formerly of William P. Vinson, Jr.; and on the South by lands now or formerly of Richland County, South Carolina.

This being a portion of the identical property conveyed to Richland County, its Successors and Assigns, by deed of William E. Caughman, Jr., and B. D. Caughman, of the County of Richland, and Marion R. Caughman, of the County of Orangeburg, dated July 15, 1974, and recorded July 15, 1974, in the Office of the R.O.D. for Richland County, South Carolina in Deed Book 322 at Page 272.

Tax Map Reference: 6600-02-14

MAILING ADDRESS OF GRANTEE:

Dorothy Jean Allison Vinson
7323 Monticello Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

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

To have and to hold all and singular the premises before mentioned unto the grantee, and the

Item# 7

grantee's heirs, personal representatives and assigns forever.

And, the grantor does hereby bind the grantor and the grantor's heirs and personal representatives to warrant and forever defend all and singular the said premises unto the grantee and the grantee's heirs, and personal representatives against the grantor and the grantor's heirs lawfully claiming, or to claim, any part thereof.

The grantee, by acceptance of this deed, acknowledges that the purposes of the conveyance and acceptance by the grantee of the property herein above-described are to resolve any dispute that may exist as to the accuracy of those portions of earlier recorded titles to real estate referencing the property conveyed herein and to reserve in favor of grantor an easement, right-of-way and encroachment right through and along the identical property conveyed herein for the purpose of grantor's accessing, servicing and maintaining its methane monitoring wells located in and around the property as more particularly shown on a Richland County Landfill Overall Topographic Map prepared by Wilbur Smith Associates, Project No. 392502, dated September 7, 2004, a copy of which is available for inspection during regular Richland County business hours at the Richland County Department of Public Works, 400 Powell Road, Columbia, SC 29203; said easement, right-of-way and encroachment right to exist in favor of Richland County for as long as is needed to carry out the purposes thereof relative to Richland County's methane monitoring wells.

Grantee agrees and binds its heirs, successors and assigns to hold harmless Richland County, its successors and assigns, from liability, damages, losses, costs, expenses, demands, claims, suits, actions and causes of action on account of illness, personal injury or death to persons or damage to property or other loss or liability arising from or in connection with the construction, maintenance, repair, removal, use or the fulfillment of any purpose or condition directly or indirectly connected with Richland County's methane monitoring wells contemplated herein and agrees to indemnify Richland County for any and all liability incurred or injury or damage sustained by reason of past, present or future such encroachment.

Any reference in this instrument to the plural shall include the singular and vice versa. Any reference to one gender shall include the others, including the neuter. Such words of inheritance shall be applicable as are required by the gender of the grantee.

WITNESS the grantor's hand and seal this ____ day of _____, 2013.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF:

RICHLAND COUNTY,
SOUTH CAROLINA

Kelvin E. Washington Sr., Chair
Richland County Council

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF RICHLAND) PROBATE


PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned witness, who after being duly sworn, deposes and says that s/he saw the within named Grantor, pursuant to due authority, sign, seal and as Grantor's act and deed, deliver the within written deed for the uses and purposes therein mentioned, and that s/he with the other witness whose name appears above, witnessed the execution thereof.

WITNESS

SWORN to before me this

_____ day of December, 2013

_____(SEAL)
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: _____



DRAWN BY CHRISTOPHER W. BASS

SURVEYOR'S SEAL: SOUTH CAROLINA SURVEYOR, MARK E. MILLS, 10775

SURVEYOR'S SEAL: SOUTH CAROLINA SURVEYOR, GLENN ASSOCIATES SURVEYING, INC., No. 002238

C.S.A. SEAL: GLENN ASSOCIATES SURVEYING, INC., No. 002238

0.48 ACRE OVERLAP BY SURVEY FOR RICHLAND COUNTY

PT-PT	BEARING	DISTANCE
106-105	N 69°29'19" E	1278.20'
105-104	S 20°58'13" E	31.06'
104-106	S 70°52'49" W	1278.83'

GEODEIC AND SC STATE GRID POINT DATA

HORIZONTAL DATUM: NAD83 (2011)
VERTICAL DATUM: NAVD 88

POINT NUMBER: 174
 SC GRID COORDINATES
 NORTH: 840898.24
 EAST: 196910.77
 GEODEIC COORDINATES:
 LATITUDE: N 34°08'40.21683"
 LONGITUDE: W 081°06'08.75677"
 POINT NUMBER: 119
 SC GRID COORDINATES
 NORTH: 840613.42
 EAST: 196854.36
 GEODEIC COORDINATES:
 LATITUDE: N 34°08'37.59635"
 LONGITUDE: W 081°06'11.80453"
 POINT NUMBER: 139
 SC GRID COORDINATES
 NORTH: 839789.67
 EAST: 1968819.65
 GEODEIC COORDINATES:
 LATITUDE: N 34°08'29.24600"
 LONGITUDE: W 081°06'11.01785"
 POINT NUMBER: 108
 SC GRID COORDINATES
 NORTH: 837890.69
 EAST: 196483.44
 GEODEIC COORDINATES:
 LATITUDE: N 34°08'10.48310"
 LONGITUDE: W 081°07'02.58910"

Item # 7

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

To adopt and codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code **[PAGES 78-82]**

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: To adopt and codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code.

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to adopt and then codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code into the Richland County Code of Ordinances.

B. Background / Discussion

On June 7, 2011 County Council enacted Ordinance No. 028-11HR, which adopted the 2006 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code. However, on March 29, 2012 the South Carolina General Assembly ratified Act No. 143, which amended Section 6-10-30 of the South Carolina Code of Laws by adopting the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code, to wit:

"Section 6-10-30. The 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code is adopted as the Energy Standard. All new and renovated buildings and additions constructed within the State must comply with this standard."

Further, this law went into effect on January 1, 2013 and all building code officials must now enforce it. Although the Richland County Building Codes and Inspections Department is currently enforcing this updated code, the Richland County Code of Ordinances currently shows the International Energy Conservation Code as being the 2006 edition. Adoption and codification of the latest energy code is in the public interest, as it provides accurate information to interested citizens.

C. Legislative / Chronological History

The South Carolina General Assembly ratified Act No. 143 on March 29, 2012 and it was signed into law by the Governor on April 2, 2012. This law amended Section 6-10-30 of the South Carolina Code of Laws by adopting the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code, which is now State law in all jurisdictions. The 2009 edition has more stringent requirements than the 2006 edition did for many building elements and equipment. Also, additional tests are now required for mechanical systems testing, and there are increased standards for the building envelope and the associated inspections.

This is a staff-initiated request. Adopting and codifying the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code will allow the public to have more readily available access to the correct building codes in effect at any particular time.

D. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to amend Section 6-192 of the Richland Council Code of Ordinances to adopt the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code by approving the attached ordinance. If this alternative is chosen, the County Code of Ordinances will be

consistent with State law, and it will be easier for Code enforcement officers to enforce, as they can then cite Section 6-192 of the County's Code.

2. Do not approve the request to amend Section 6-192 of the Richland Council Code of Ordinances by approving the attached ordinance, which adopts the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code. If this alternative is chosen, the County and its citizens will still have to comply with the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code, but it will conflict with the information provided on the County's website regarding which building codes are currently in effect. In essence, the website would be providing incorrect information to the public.

F. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to adopt and codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation by approving the attached ordinance so that this information can be placed in the Richland County Code of Ordinances and be posted on the internet, thereby being more available to interested citizens.

Recommended by: Donny Phipps Department: Building Codes Date: 1/11/13

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: 1/16/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 1/16/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/16/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval to adopt and codify the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY COUNCIL FOR RICHLAND COUNTY
ORDINANCE NO. ___-13HR

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHLAND COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 6, BUILDINGS AND BUILDING REGULATIONS; ARTICLE XI, ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE; SECTION 6-192, ADOPTED; SO AS TO ADOPT AND CODIFY THE 2009 EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE.

WHEREAS, Act No. 143 was ratified by the South Carolina General Assembly on March 29, 2012 and signed into law by the Governor on April 2, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Act No. 143 amended Section 6-10-30 of the South Carolina Code of Laws by adopting the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code, which mandates that this Code be used for all commercial and/or residential construction in the state of South Carolina, effective January 1, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Building Codes and Inspections Department is now enforcing the 2009 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code; however, the Richland County Code of Ordinances currently shows the International Energy Conservation Code as being the 2006 edition; and

WHEREAS, adoption and codification of the latest building codes is in the public interest as it provides accurate information to interested citizens.

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

SECTION I. The Richland County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 6, Buildings and Building Regulations; Article XI, Energy Conservation; Section 6-192, Adopted; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 6-192. Adopted.

There is hereby adopted by the county council the ~~2006~~ 2009 International Energy Conservation Code, including Chapter 1 (Administration and Enforcement), and all amendments thereto, as published by the International Code Council, Inc. The construction, alteration, repair, or maintenance of every building or structure shall conform to the requirements of this Code.

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

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

SECTION IV. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective from and after _____, 2013.

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

BY: _____
Kelvin E. Washington, Sr., Chair

ATTEST THIS THE ____ DAY

OF _____, 2013

Michelle M. Onley
Clerk of Council

RICHLAND COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

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

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

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Caughman Lake Property Study (Pinewood Lake Park) [PAGES 83-111]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Caughman Lake Property Study (Pinewood Lake Park)

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a request to provide direction regarding the best use of developing Pinewood Lake Park, which is a part of the Caughman Lake Property.

B. Background / Discussion

In May 2012, during the FY13 budget process, the Honorable Norman Jackson made a motion to fund \$750,000 for the Caughman Lake Property to include infrastructure improvement, picnic sheds, fish-cleaning stations, defined lake edge perimeter, detailed and paved walking path with security lighting and a foot bridge, restoration of the historic house, preservation of other dwellings on the property and the completion of a comprehensive study for current and future improvement. County Council approved costs of up to \$50,000 to fund the study. The findings of the study, which were recently completed, are attached herein.

The purpose of the study was to determine the best use of the Caughman Lake property. Input was received from local residents on their needs, and economic impacts were measured to determine future impacts from a park. The consultant's cost estimates for the proposed Pinewood Lake Park are presented in two forms: the "scaled-down" version and the "full scale development" of the park.

The scaled-down version has an estimated cost of \$1,144,077 and would include:

- Pond Cleaning
- Asphalt Walking Trail
- Docks
- Picnic Tables
- Grills
- Bike Racks
- Remodeling and Repair of the Existing House and Auxiliary Buildings
- New Picnic Shelter for 250 people
- Entrance Signage and Gates
- Fence Repairs
- Clearing, Gravel Parking Areas and Gravel Roads
- Landscaping
- Playground Equipment

The consultant has recommended full-scale development of the park and has an estimated cost of \$4,198,927. This version would include all of the features in the scaled-down version, and include the following additional features:

- Bulkhead Wall
- Boardwalk
- Horseback Trail
- Picnic Shelter for 500 people (climate controlled with public restrooms)
- Fish Cleaning Stations
- Amphitheater with Storage and Public Restrooms\
- Additional Parking and Gravel Roads
- Fitness Stations
- Lighting and Security Cameras/Call Boxes

- Petting Zoo
- Mountain Bike Circuit
- Gardens
- Dog Park
- Utilities (needed to support the additional park features)
- Offsite Road Improvements and Signage

C. Legislative/Chronological History

1. Caughman Lake Property was purchased in November 2011.
2. FY13 Budget motion was made in May 2012.
3. Study was completed by Chao and Associates/Carolina Consultants Group in November 2012.

D. Financial Impact

The costs are estimated to range from \$1,144,077 to \$4,198, 927, depending on which option is selected. Funding may come from the Hospitality Tax and other possible sources of funding.

E. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to fund the infrastructure of the Caughman Lake Property at \$1,144,077 for the scaled-down version.
2. Approve the request to fund the infrastructure of the Caughman Lake Property at \$4,198,927.
3. Do not approve either request to partially or fully fund the infrastructure of the Caughman Lake Property.

F. Recommendation

This is at Council’s discretion.

Recommended by: Honorable Norman Jackson Council District: 11 Date: 1/3/13

G. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 1/16/13
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:
 The request is a funding decision on the approval and scope of the project and is within Council discretion. At this point, Finance has not been requested to provide any funding options however once a tentative scope and cost is approved a funding strategy can be developed.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 1/16/13
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

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

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

Date: 1/16/13

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy decision. Recommend allowing Administration to come back with funding options if Council approves moving forward with the development of Pinewood Lake Park.

PINEWOOD LAKE PARK



Prepared By

**Chao and Associates, Inc.
Carolina Consultants Group LLC**



November 2012

Item# 9

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Population	2
Pinewood Lake Park and the Region	3
The Facility	4
New Structures	6
Existing Structures	8
Living History Farm	9
Pinewood Lake Visitors Survey	10
Economic Impact of Visitors Spending	13
Study Limitations and Errors	14
References	15
Appendices	
Appendix A: Definition of Economic Terms	i, ii
Appendix B: Conceptual Layouts and Cost Opinions	iii
Attachments: Conceptual Layout	
Conceptual Cost Opinion	
Phase 1 Conceptual Layout	
Phase 1 Conceptual Cost Opinion	

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the best use of Pinewood Lake better known as (Caughman Pond) 61.7 acres of which 44 acres includes a 20 acre stream fed lake in the Lower Richland community. Note: It appears as though Nick Caughman was the owner of Caughman's Pond in Lykesland, S.C. beginning in the early 1800's - with more information and photographs apparently available at the University of South Carolina's - South Carolinian Library. Included in the study is input from local residents on their desires and needs in the community and what would attract tourists to the park. Future local economic impacts of visitors to Pinewood Lake Park (PLP) in the near future are also addressed. Economic impacts are measured as the direct and secondary sales, income and jobs in the local area resulting from spending by park visitors. The economic estimates are produced using a Money Generation Model. Three major inputs to the model are:

- 1) Number of visits broken down by lodging-based segments,
- 2) Spending averages for each segment, and
- 3) Economic multipliers for the local region

Inputs are estimated from a Recreation Facilities Visitor Survey, and input-output modeling software. The model provides a spreadsheet template for combining park use, spending and regional multipliers to compute changes in sales, personal income, jobs and value added in the region, the Lower Richland Community.

This study for a passive recreational park focuses on the Southeastern portion of Richland County; an area which encompasses a large swath of Richland County to the south of Fort Jackson. The area has been described as containing one of the largest concentrations of African-American-owned lands in the US, where around 2/3 of the 330 square miles of land in "Lower Richland" is owned by African-Americans. It is also claimed that Lower Richland County is the largest contiguous mass of pristine farmland within a 15-minute drive of a state capitol or major metropolitan city on the East coast. The Southeast area is also a major residential and commercial area, which runs the gamut from older homes in established neighborhoods to new, large homes set on spacious lots; an area with a bustling commercial heart comprising a wide variety of businesses along US 378 - the Sumter Highway. The Southeast sector is currently undergoing both a commercial and residential resurgence, with most activity focused around the Garners Ferry Road corridor. Since the redevelopment of Woodhill Mall in 2004, a number of new stores and eateries have opened up or expanded. A new Wal-Mart, several restaurants and a number of hotels have been built including a conference center, The Medallion.

The Hopkins area of Lower Richland County has become a major residential growth area with 4,424 new housing units permitted between 2000 and 2006, with new apartments/ condominiums around Williams-Brice stadium and along Garners Ferry Road accounting for 40% of all new housing units in Richland County in that period. The major impediment to greater growth in this area has been a lack of infrastructure, particularly water and sewer lines in the eastern portion of the sector, a situation that will be resolved through an ordinance to extend a sewer line from Columbia to the town of Eastover comes to fruition. Several lines have been installed in the area and will see expansion as the sewer line is complete. The Southeast area is also home to some of the largest employers in the Columbia area (International Paper, Sysco, Square D, Wal-Mart, McEntire Air Guard, Fort Jackson, etc.) and commuter traffic, coupled with high truck traffic along area roads, particularly US 378, which carries significant traffic to and from the Grand Strand area, is leading to increased congestion. Furthermore, whenever water and sewer lines are extended, further development is bound to occur bringing the potential for more changes to this area.

The plan of Shop Road Extension into Hopkins from Pineview Road a growing commercial corridor will bring alternative routes and relief to potential traffic congestion in the area. In 2001 after 911 a major connector and the only connector to the Northeast Columbia area was closed. Wildcat Road spanning seven miles through Fort Jackson from Leesburg Road to Percival Road at Clemson Road was closed. Since then South Carolina received its first National Cemetery on Fort Jackson. The reopening of Wildcat Road would bring much relief to traffic congestion on Garners Ferry Road, Leesburg Road, I-77 and I-20 to Clemson Road.

Population:

2012 Population for the Lower Richland is 72,141, with the median age of 36.2 in the identified study area. In 2000, the Census count in the area was 60,094. The rate of change since 2000 to 2010 census was 1.45 percent annually. The five-year projection for the population in the area is 75,853, representing a change of 1.72 percent annually from 2010 to 2015. Currently, the population is 48.2 percent male and 51.8 percent female. Per Capita Income 2010 Per-Capita Income \$23,654; 2010 Total Households 28,656

2010 Average Household Size 2.39 the household count in this area has changed from 23,623 in 2000 to 28,656 in 2010, a change of 1.90 percent annually. The five-year projection of households is 31,621, a change of 1.99 percent annually from the current year total. Average household size is currently 2.39, compared to 2.50 in the year 2000. The number of families in the current year is 17,587 in the specified area. Current median household income is \$45,686 in the area, compared to \$54,442 for all U.S. households.

Pinewood Lake Park and the Local Region

Pinewood Lake Park is located along the Garners Ferry Road corridor on a floodplain about 8 miles southeast of Columbia, South Carolina near the towns of Hopkins and Gadsden. PLP houses a historic site with seven buildings including five barns of historic significance to the area a hut and houses dating back to the early 1900's. The property was the site of a grits mill then later used as a private popular spot or playground. It was known as Caughman Pond. Currently the park has a 0.8 mile trail in poor condition which when restored and completed would be 1.2 miles including a 800ft boardwalk completing a loop and connecting several trails and over 20 acres of backwoods, hiking trails. For the 20 acre lake canoeing, kayaking and fishing are the most popular requests.



Because of the parks historical value and unique rural character it is different to any recreational facility in the study area. It gives opportunity for shared uses by recreational, historical, cultural and educational elements. The Richland County Recreation Commission agreed to operate the facility for the recreational purposes as they are best suited managers of the property. The Richland County Conservation Commission also has interest on the cultural and historical value of the park. Lower Richland was once a rich thriving farming community and there is interest for a Living History Farm to be included on the property from the educational and historical interest in the area.



The park has the potential to host in excess of 50,000 recreation visitors annually. The local region was defined as a four county area including Calhoun, Lexington, Richland and Sumter counties in South Carolina. This region roughly coincides with an hours driving distance for which potential spending reported in a visitor survey. The four county regions had a population in excess of 720,000 in 2010.

The Facility:

In preparing the property for visitors of which a majority of approximately 76% will be considered tourists because of its historical value and unique uses which no other park in the area offers, repairs and construction will need to be done.

For the lake with visual inspection with it drained there has been some erosion along the shore line which is recommended to be cleared and defined with buckhead wall in certain places to be determined by an engineer. In order to enhance the aesthetic appeal of the lake, as well as maintain safety, it is recommended not to use rock or concrete as a means for shoreline erosion protection. Instead, shorelines should be seeded with a mixture of wetland plants and North American Green's C350 Composite Turf Reinforcement Mat (C-TRM) should be surface applied to retain the soil and seed.

Although seemingly minor, the repetitive action of wind-driven waves across lakes and ponds can gradually erode shorelines to a point where they may encroach upon nearby buildings or landscape features. Repairs for such receding shoreline damage can be very costly if the problem is not promptly addressed. Prevention is certainly the best medicine. By installing the C350 both above the high water line and below the low water line, shorelines can be protected against erosive action throughout yearly precipitation cycles. The winter months are a perfect time to

drain the lake killing most of the unwelcomed weed and cleaning as it has been sitting for a number of years.



The existing trail needs repair and some construction with a variation of asphalt and other materials suited for different areas. A boardwalk will need to be constructed to complete the 1.2 mile trail loop. Existing docks need replacing for sightseeing and fishing.



New Structures:

Seven picnic shelters with tables and benches including grills and running water equipped with a sink to complete full furnished rental sheds. Each shed should be able to accommodate 250 people.



One climate controlled with public restrooms 3,000sf is needed.



Two fish cleaning stations, one on the east side and the other on the west side of the lake.



Playground and equipment to be constructed and erected per design.



The area is known for its outside concerts and part of the survey recommends an Amphitheatre with storage building and public restrooms. Public restrooms will be needed on both sides of the lake for greater convenience to the park visitors. A garden and community farming is included close to the historical structures. The recommended mountain bike circuit of 0.6 mile which could include a skateboarding facility could be constructed on the County owned property across Old Garners Road. This property would be a good location for an overflow parking area to accommodate large scale events. There is an additional 10+ acres available adjacent to the lake property already owned by the County. The acquisition of this piece of land would buffer the park from the surrounding commercial properties and also allow for the expansion of trails and gardens. It is recommended to negotiate with the land owner of the remaining property of 10+ acres to add it to the original parcel to accommodate these facilities and for consistency in management of the park.



An entrance

Existing Structures:

Remodel the existing 2,300sf house for an office and craft store. Repair existing auxiliary buildings for the required exhibits and uses by the Conservation commission and any educational partnership with local schools or area colleges.



Living History Farm:

The focus of the Living History Farm will be on both science (agriculture) and social studies for students in the surrounding areas. Students will have the opportunity to sample the everyday life of farm family living in Richland County between the early 1800's through to today. Classes can observe and participate in activities that would have been commonplace on traditional family farms. Plowing with mules, making lye soap, grinding grits, blacksmithing, curing meat, preserving vegetables, milking cows, and harvesting crops are only a few hands-on activities the farm will offer.

The science can be tied in with agribusiness to help visitors learn about how farming contributes to society today as well. Various buildings currently on the site will house mini-museums to teach about the history of farming in Richland County throughout the years and could be designed internally to be time-appropriate. Additionally, a museum store could be established to help fund the farm. Events at the farm will change with the seasons. As the farm year progresses, events and demonstrations will change to interpret the activities that take place on the farm annually.

Preserving the past for your future! Pinewood Lake Living Historical Farm is an educational piece dedicated to the preservation and presentation of Lower Richland's agricultural heritage. A living museum - like stepping back in time! "A fabulous place of fun while learning!" .

At Pinewood Lake the staff will partnership with the Richland One School District in educating area youth. As fellow educators, they understand the challenge for teachers to find time for field trips when more and more content is required to be taught each year.

Students will have the opportunity to take advantage of many excellent field trips that are close at hand and offer a wealth of educational experiences at affordable prices.

The lesson topics and objectives are closely correlated to the School District Core Curriculum Standards as well as the most commonly taught [science](#) and [social studies](#) topics in local schools. The programs would include hands-on activities, pre- and post- trip lessons, and take home follow-up activities. [Professional development courses](#) will also available.



Pinewood Lake Visitor Survey, 2012

An area park visitor study was conducted at Caughman Park and Hopkins Park from August 15-24, 2012 (CCG). The study measured visitor demographics, activities, and travel expenditures. Questionnaires were distributed at community/Home Owners Association meetings to a sample of 223 visitors at the parks. Visitors returned 165 questionnaires for a 74% response rate. Data generated through the visitor survey were used as the basis to develop the spending profiles, segment shares and trip characteristics for the Lower Richland area Park visitors.

Most visitors will spend two to four hours visiting the park. Seven percent would visit the park for more than one day during their stay in the area. About two thirds of the visitors will come to the area primarily to visit Pinewood Lake. Thirteen percent of visitors came to visit friends and relatives in the area.

Visitor Segments

The model divides visitors into segments to help explain differences in spending across distinct user groups. Five segments were established for Pinewood Lake visitors:

Local day users: Day visitors who reside within the local region, defined as a 60 minute drive of the park.

Non-local day trips: Visitors from outside the region, not staying overnight in the area. This includes day trips as well as pass-through travelers, who may be staying overnight on their trip outside the region.

Motel: Visitors staying in motels, hotels, cabins, or B&B's within a 60 minute drive of the park

Camp: Visitors staying in private or public campgrounds within a 60 minute drive of the park

Other OVN: Other visitors staying overnight in the area with friends or relatives or not reporting any lodging expenses

The visitor survey was used to estimate the percentage of visitors from each segment as well as spending averages, lengths of stay and party sizes for each segment. Forty-five percent of the visitors are local residents, 28% are visitors from outside the local area not staying overnight within a sixty minute drive of the park, and 28% are visitors staying overnight within a sixty minute drive of the park. Half of the overnight visitors are staying in motels, cabins or B&B's, 7% are camping and 7% are staying with friends or relatives or in other unpaid lodging (Table 2). The average spending party was 2.5 people.

Three fourths of local residents will make the trip primarily to visit the park. Non-local visitors on day trips and campers will more likely make the trip primarily to visit the park than visitors staying in motels or with friends and relatives.

Table 2. Selected Visit/Trip Characteristics by Segment. 2005

Characteristic	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Segment share (survey)	45%	28%	14%	7%	7%	100%
Average Party size	2.61	2.54	2.30	1.95	3.14	2.54
Length of stay (days/nights)	1.00	1.00	2.07	2.47	1.00	1.63
Re-entry rate	1.15	1.05	1.26	1.47	1.20	1.16
Percent primary purpose trips	76%	65%	49%	79%	33%	67%

Pinewood Lake hosted potential of hosting 50,000+ recreation visitors in 2013. Recreation visits are allocated to the five segments using the segment shares in Table 1. These visits are converted to 29,185 party trips by dividing by the average party size and re-entry rate for each segment (Table 3).

² The average of \$70 is lower than the \$103 spending average in the VSP report (2005) due to the omission of outliers and treatment of missing spending data.

Table 3. Recreation Visits and Party Trips by Segment. 2012

Measure	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Total
Recreation visits	37,935	23,604	11,802	5,901	5,901	84,301
Party visits/trips	12,662	8,833	4,061	2,064	1,564	29,185
Person trips	32,998	22,456	9,351	4,020	4,916	73,740
Percent of party trips	43%	30%	14%	7%	5%	100%
Party nights	12,662	8,833	8,420	5,100	1,564	36,579

Table 4. Average Visitor Spending by Segment (\$ per party per trip)

Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other	OVN	All Visitors
In Park						
Souvenirs	0.88	3.43	4.36	9.05	0.92	2.62
Donations	0.19	0.69	0.95	1.84	0.00	0.53
In Community						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	0.00	156.28	0.00	0.00	22.40
Camping fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.53	0.00	2.63
Restaurants & bars	5.05	7.19	60.49	27.21	24.09	16.40
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	2.63	2.31	13.44	25.84	18.86	6.75
Gas & oil	3.99	5.65	25.67	22.11	12.77	9.36
Local transportation	1.54	7.26	6.44	0.00	0.00	3.63
Admissions & fees	0.15	1.04	0.00	0.01	1.82	0.49
Souvenirs and other expenses	1.71	2.22	11.57	25.53	6.36	5.12
Grand Total	16.15	29.80	279.21	153.12	64.83	69.92

The sampling error (95% confidence level) for the overall spending average is 22%. A 95% confidence interval for the spending average is therefore \$70 plus or minus \$14 or (\$56, \$84).

1 These percentages vary slightly from the VSP report (CCGLLC) as some visitors listing motels or campgrounds as lodging types did not report any lodging expenses and are classified here in the other OVN category.

Table 5. Average Spending per Night for Visitors on Overnight

	Motel	Camp	Other OVN
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	75.38	0.00	0.00
Camping fees	0.00	16.81	0.00
Restaurants & bars	29.18	11.01	24.09
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	6.48	10.46	18.86
Gas & oil	12.38	8.95	12.77
Local transportation	3.11	0.00	0.00
Admissions & fees	0.46	0.75	1.82
Souvenirs and other expenses	7.68	14.00	7.28
Grand Total	134.68	61.98	64.83

The average of \$70 is lower than the \$103 spending average in the VSP report (CCGLLC) due to the omission of outliers and treatment of missing spending data.

On a per night basis, visitors staying in motels spent \$135 in the local region compared to \$62 for campers and \$65 for other overnight visitors. The average per night lodging cost was \$75 per night for motels and \$17 for campgrounds.

Pinewood Lake Park visitors* will spend more than \$2 million in the local area annually when completed. Total spending was estimated by multiplying the number of party trips for each segment by the average spending per trip and summing across segments.

Overnight visitors staying in motels, cabins or B&B's accounted for 56% of the total spending. Thirty-five percent of the spending was for lodging, 23% restaurant meals and bar expenses, 13% gas and oil, and 11% souvenirs including the park gift shop.

Not all of this spending would be lost to the region in the absence of the park as many visitors are local residents and many non-residents come to the area for other reasons. Spending directly attributed to the park visit is estimated by counting all spending for trips where the park was the primary reason for the trip. Half of the spending outside the park was counted for day trips if the trip was not made primarily to visit Pinewood Lake. The equivalent of one night of spending is attributed to the park visit for overnight trips made to visit other attractions, friends or relatives or on business. All spending inside the park was counted, but all spending by local visitors was excluded.

*This assumes that these visitors will spend an extra night in the area to visit Pinewood Lake.

Table 6. Total Visitor Spending by Segment, 2005 (\$000s)

	Local	Day trip	Motel	Camp	Other OVN	Visitors
In Park						
Souvenirs	11.18	30.33	17.71	18.69	1.44	79.34
Donations	2.40	6.10	3.87	3.80	0.00	16.17
In Community						
Motel, hotel cabin or B&B	0.00	0.00	634.73	0.00	0.00	634.73
Camping fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.73	0.00	85.73
Restaurants & bars	63.98	63.52	245.67	56.17	37.68	467.02
Groceries, take-out food/drinks	33.29	20.40	54.59	53.34	29.50	191.13
Gas & oil	50.51	49.95	104.28	45.63	19.98	270.34
Local transportation	19.49	64.15	26.16	0.00	0.00	109.80
Admissions & fees	1.92	9.15	0.00	0.02	2.84	13.93
<u>Souvenirs and other expenses</u>	<u>21.68</u>	<u>19.61</u>	<u>46.99</u>	<u>52.69</u>	<u>9.95</u>	<u>150.93</u>
Grand Total	204	263	1,134	316	101	2,019
Segment Percent of Total	10%	13%	56%	16%	5%	100%

Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending

The economic impacts of Pinewood Lake Park visitor spending on the local economy are estimated by applying the spending attributed to the park to a set of economic ratios and multipliers representing the local economy. Multipliers for the region were estimated with the

IMPLAN system using 2001 data. The tourism sales multiplier for the region is 1.40. Every dollar of direct sales to visitors generates another \$.40 in secondary sales through indirect and induced effects⁴.

Impacts are estimated based on the visitor spending attributed to the park in Table 75. Including direct and secondary effects, the \$1.4 million spent by park visitors supports 35 jobs in the area and generates \$1.6 million in sales, \$661,000 in labor income and \$994,000 in value added (Table 8).

Personal income covers wages and salaries, including payroll benefits. Value added is the preferred measure of the contribution to the local economy as it includes all sources of income to the area -- payroll benefits to workers, profits and rents to businesses, and sales and other indirect business taxes.

The largest direct effects are in lodging establishments and restaurants. Spending associated with park visits supports 12 jobs in hotels, 9 jobs in restaurants. Indirect effects result from tourism businesses buying goods and services from local firms, while induced effects stem from household spending of income earned from visitor spending. The local economic impact of all \$2.0 million in visitor spending

Study Limitations and Error

The accuracy of the MGM2 estimates rests on the accuracy of the three inputs: visits, spending averages, and multipliers. Recreation visit estimates rely on counting procedures at the park, which may miss some visitors and count others more than once during their visit. Recreation visits were adjusted for double counting based on the number of days respondents reported visiting the park during their stay in the area.

Spending averages are derived from a 2005 Visitor Survey. Estimates from the survey are subject to sampling errors, measurement errors and seasonal/sampling biases. Due to relatively small samples and considerable variation in spending, the overall spending average is subject to sampling errors of 22%.

Spending averages are also sensitive to decisions about outliers and treatment of missing data . To carry out the analysis incomplete spending data had to be completed and decisions had to be made about the handling of missing spending data and zero spending reports. Conservative assumptions were adopted.

First, cases reporting some expenses but leaving other categories blank were completed with zeros. Respondents that did not complete the spending question were assumed to spend no money on the trip. Twenty-three percent of the cases had missing spending data. Most of these were local visitors or day trips. Dropping these cases instead of treating them as zeros would increase the overall spending average from \$70 to \$91. This change would increase spending totals and impacts by 30%.

The small samples make the spending averages somewhat sensitive to outliers. Twenty-four cases involved large parties of more than seven people and two cases reporting expenses of more than \$1,000 were omitted in computing spending averages, yielding a final sample of 300 cases for the spending analysis⁶. The overall spending average was \$70 omitting outliers compared to \$86 with outliers.

Reports of spending for long stays and large parties are deemed unreliable. Spending reported for large parties may not include everyone in the party. Recall of spending for very long stays may also be unreliable and such stays frequently involve multiple stops and activities, so that much of the spending is unrelated to the park visit. Since spending averages are applied to all visits, the procedures are equivalent to substituting the average of visitors in the corresponding visitor segment for these outliers.

Although sample sizes are small for most segments, the spending averages are consistent with those at similar parks. Estimated nightly room and campsite rates are also reasonable for the area. As the sample only covers visitors during a single week, we must assume these visitors are representative of visitors during the rest of the year to extrapolate to annual totals. Multipliers are derived from an input-output model of the local economy. Input-output models rest on a number of assumptions, however, errors due to the multipliers will be small compared to potential errors in visit counts and spending estimates.

REFERENCES

Grandy Scott Historian, (Living History Farm); Kelvin Wembs, Principal LR High School, (Academic Programs); James Brown, Director Richland County Recreation Commission, (Management and Maintenance); Jones and Associates, (Visitors Survey)

Appendix A: Definitions of Economic Terms

Term	Definition
Sales	Sales of firms within the region to park visitors.
Jobs	The number of jobs in the region supported by the visitor spending. Job estimates are not full time equivalents, but include part time positions.
Labor income	Wage and salary income, sole proprietor's income and employee payroll benefits.
Value added	Personal income plus rents and profits and indirect business taxes. As the name implies, it is the net value added to the region's economy. For example, the value added by a hotel includes wages and salaries paid to employees, their payroll benefits, profits of the hotel, and sales and other indirect business taxes. The hotel's non-labor operating costs such as purchases of supplies and equipment.
Direct effects	Direct effects are the changes in sales, income and jobs in those business or agencies that directly receive the visitor spending.
Secondary effects	These are the changes in the economic activity in the region that result from the re-circulation of the money spent by visitors. Secondary effects include indirect and induced effects.
Indirect effects	Changes in sales, income and jobs in industries that supply goods and services to the businesses that sells directly to the visitors. For example, linen suppliers benefit from visitor spending at lodging establishments.
Induced effects	Changes in economic activity in the region resulting from household spending of income earned through a direct or indirect effect of the visitor spending. For example, motel and linen supply employees live in the region and spend their incomes on housing, groceries, education, clothing and other goods and services.

Total effects

Sum of direct, indirect and induced effects. Direct effects accrue largely to tourism-related businesses in the area. Indirect effects accrue to a broader set of businesses that serve these tourism firms. Induced effects are distributed widely across a variety of local businesses.

Appendix B: Conceptual Cost Opinions and Layouts

This engineer's opinion of probable cost is made on the basis of the engineer's experience and qualifications and represents the engineer's best judgment as an experienced and qualified professional generally familiar with the industry. However since the engineer has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or services furnished by others, or over the contractor's methods of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, the engineer cannot and does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction cost will not vary from the opinion of probable cost as prepared by the engineer.

Additional Notes:

1. Quantities are purely estimates based off of the attached conceptual drawings. Actual quantities will be determined at the conclusion of final design.
2. Unit costs are our best estimates based on similar projects. These costs are not guarantees. A number of factors may affect these costs when ultimately priced by a contractor.

It would be an optimal use of the design, professionals time and the County's money to construct this project in its entirety and not have to do the design in pieces. However, should the funding not be available for the full scale development of the Pinewood Lake Park a scaled down version (Phase 1) plan has been proposed and would create an enjoyable space for the users of the park and incorporate most of the wants and needs obtained from the visitors' survey.

EJ
.fm
..!!) r.u

S" ..



T

Richland County

Improvements	
-- 1"	Entrance Monumentation -- Fence
.....	Dock
III	Picnic Table
-	Part Bench
-	Grill
-	Trash Receptacle
O	Picnic Shelter
Ct	Lamp Posts/Call Boxes
-Trail	Gravel Drives and Parking
—	Water Linea
•	Drinking Fountain
-	Sanitary Sewer
D.	Fitness Station

Chao & Associates, Inc.
 CMI • & If f d d l - l l u M l l
 7a. I l M C c u t
 C d . . . B C 2 1 2 1 0
 (6 W) 7 7 7
 F o n e (8 0 3) 7 1 2 - 8 1 2 0
 E m a i l t c . c o m



PINEWOOD LAKE PARK CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT

Pinewood Lake Park Conceptual Cost Opinion

Prepared By: Chao and Associates, Inc.
Date: October 3, 2012



Description	Est. Qty	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Pond and Trails				
Bulkhead Wall	700	lf	\$286	\$200,200
Pond Cleaning	1	ls	\$5,000	\$5,000
Boardwalk	800	lf	\$640	\$512,000
Asphalt Walking Trail	5280	lf	\$45	\$237,600
Horseback Trail	2600	lf	\$35	\$91,000
Docks	3	ea	\$2,000	\$6,000
Picnic Tables	20	ea	\$1,000	\$20,000
Benches	20	ea	\$500	\$10,000
Grills	10	ea	\$200	\$2,000
Bike Racks	2	ea	\$200	\$400
			Total Pond and Trails	\$1,084,200
Existing Structures				
Remodel existing house	2300	sf	\$85	\$195,500
Existing Auxiliary Buildings Repairs	3645	sf	\$55	\$200,475
			Total Exist Structures	\$395,975
New Structures				
Picnic Shelters 250 ppl	7	ea	\$60,000	\$420,000
Picnic Shelter 500ppl (climate controlled) w/ Public Restrooms	3000	sf	\$65	\$195,000
Fish Cleaning Stations	2	ea	\$5,000	\$10,000
Amphitheater w/ Storage and Public Restroom	1	ls	\$350,000	\$350,000
			Total New Structures	\$975,000
Perimeter and Vehicular Access				
Entrance Features, Signage and Gates	1	ls	\$75,000	\$75,000
Fence Repairs	1	ls	\$3,000	\$3,000
Clearing	4.5	ac	\$3,500	\$15,750
Gravel parking areas and curb stops	5	ea	\$30,000	\$150,000
Gravel Roads	2100	lf	\$52	\$109,200
			Total P&VA	\$352,950
Miscellaneous				
Fitness Stations	5	ea	\$750	\$3,750
Lighting	50	ea	\$450	\$22,500
Security Cameras/Call Boxes	8	ea	\$1,000	\$8,000

Item# 9

Landscaping	1	ls	\$75,000	\$75,000
Playground Equipment	1	ls	\$10,000	\$10,000
Petting Zoo	1	ls	\$12,000	\$12,000
Mountain Bike Curcuit	3200	lf	\$10	<u>\$32,000</u>
Total Miscellaneous				\$163,250

Gardens

Gravel Garden Path	1500	lf	\$10	\$15,000
Gardens/Landscaping/Irrigation	1	ls	\$35,000	\$35,000
Benches	8	ea	\$500	<u>\$4,000</u>
Total Gardens				\$54,000

Dog Park

Fence	950	lf	\$8	\$7,600
Benches	3	ea	\$500	\$1,500
2" Waterline and Water Fountain	380	lf	\$7	<u>\$2,470</u>
Total Dog Park				\$11,570

Utilities

Water lines	3600	lf	\$12	\$43,200
Drinking Fountains	6	ea	\$1,000	\$6,000
Sewer Lines	1280	lf	\$12	\$15,360
Manholes	10	ea	\$2,500	\$25,000
Electrical	1	ls	\$5,000	\$5,000
Tap and Impact Fees	1	ls	\$5,000	<u>\$5,000</u>
Total Utilities				\$99,560


Offsite Road Improvements

Misc Road Improvements	1	ls	\$225,000	\$225,000
Signage Offsite	1	ls	\$15,000	\$15,000
Total Offsite Road				\$240,000

Subtotal	\$3,181,005
Contingency (20%)	\$636,201
E & A Fees (12%)	<u>\$381,721</u>
Grand Total	\$4,198,927



!!!T



Pinewood Lake Park Phase 1 Cost Opinion

Prepared By: Chao and Associates, Inc.
Date: October 3, 2012



Description	Est. Qty	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Pond and Trails				
Pond Cleaning	1	ls	\$5,000	\$5,000
Asphalt Walking Trail	4200	lf	\$45	\$189,000
Docks	2	ea	\$2,000	\$4,000
Picnic Tables	5	ea	\$1,000	\$5,000
Benches	7	ea	\$500	\$3,500
Grills	3	ea	\$200	\$600
Bike Racks	2	ea	\$200	\$400
			Total Pond and Trails	\$207,500
Existing Structures				
Remodel existing house	2300	sf	\$85	\$195,500
Existing Auxiliary Buildings Repairs	3645	sf	\$55	\$200,475
			Total Exist Structures	\$395,975
New Structures				
Picnic Shelters 250 ppl	1	ea	\$50,000	\$50,000
			Total New Structures	\$50,000
Perimeter and Vehicular Access				
Entrance Features, Signage and Gates	1	ls	\$75,000	\$75,000
Fence Repairs	1	ls	\$3,000	\$3,000
Clearing	1.5	ac	\$3,500	\$5,250
Gravel parking areas and curb stops	2	ea	\$30,000	\$60,000
Gravel Roads	1000	lf	\$52	\$52,000
			Total P&VA	\$195,250
Miscellaneous				
Landscaping	1	ls	\$10,000	\$10,000
Playground Equipment	1	ls	\$8,000	\$8,000
			Total Miscellaneous	\$18,000
			Subtotal	\$866,725
			Contingency (20%)	\$173,345
			E & A Fees (12%)	\$104,007
			Grand Total	\$1,144,077

Item# 9