



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Damon Jeter	Gwendolyn Kennedy	Greg Pearce (Chair)	Jim Manning	Seth Rose
District 3	District 7	District 6	District 8	District 5

**MARCH 22, 2011
6:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, South Carolina

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: February 22, 2011 [pages 4-6]

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Fund Balance Designation [pages 8-9]
3. FY 11 General Fund Unemployment Bill [page 11]

4. Mass Transit Funding [pages 13-14]
5. Moratorium on Hiring [pages 16-18]
6. Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round Three Funds Application [pages 20-22]
7. Video Streaming and Rebroadcast of Council Meetings [pages 24-25]
8. Fair Housing Proclamation [pages 27-29]
9. Community Development Week Proclamation [pages 31-33]
10. Budget Amendment for Risk Management [pages 35-36]

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION / INFORMATION

11. Caughman Creek Property Appraisal [page 37]
12. Clarification of Budget Motion [pages 39-40]

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

13. a. Sewer Tap Fee Assistance Program (Malinowski-November 2010)

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: February 22, 2011 [pages 4-6]

Reviews

MINUTES OF



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011 6:00 P.M.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair: L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.
Member: Damon Jeter
Member: Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy
Member: Jim Manning
Member: Seth Rose

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Bill Malinowski, Norman Jackson, Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy, Valerie Hutchinson, Michelle Cannon-Finch, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Larry Smith, Stephany Snowden, Melinda Edwards, Sara Salley, Valeria Jackson, Ebony Woods, Cathy Rawls, Gary Watts, Daniel Driggers, Ronaldo Myers, James Brown, Don Chamblee, Monique Walters, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 25, 2011 (Regular Session) – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jeter, to amend the agenda to move Items #11 and #7 to the beginning of the agenda. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Rose to take up Item #7 before Item #11. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Item# 1

Attachment number 1
Page 1 of 3

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Low Volume Alternative Paving Pilot Demonstration – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to allocate \$500,000 from the fund balance of the Road Maintenance fee to initiate the paving pilot.

Ms. Kennedy moved to forward this item to Council without a recommendation. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Livingston requested the following amendment to Mr. Jeter's motion: "to direct staff to explore other funding alternatives during the budget process." Mr. Jeter accepted the amendment.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Richland County Fifth Circuit Solicitor's Office Emergency Budget Request – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve the Solicitor's Emergency Budget request in the amount of \$164,754. A discussion took place.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to call for the question. The vote was in favor.

The vote was in favor of forwarding this item to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote was in favor.

Approval of SOVA Solicitation for Funds and Required Match-Solicitor's Office – Ms. Kennedy moved, seconded by Mr. Rose, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve the required match request in the amount of \$6,084.60 from the General Fund Undesignated Fund Balance. A discussion took place.

The motion failed.

Contract with Correct Care Solution Detention Center Medical Services – Mr. Jeter moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval of Alternative #1: "Approve the request to extend the contract with Correct Care Solutions for one year in an effort to develop a comprehensive RFQ and to complete the NCCHC recertification process." The vote in favor was unanimous.

Coroner Budget Amendment for 2011/2012 – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation to approve Alternative #1: "Approve the request to amend the Coroner's budget by adding an additional \$155,900." The vote in favor was unanimous.

Fund Balance Designations – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

FY11 General Fund Unemployment Bill – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

Mass Transit Funding – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

Moratorium on Hiring – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round Three Funds Application – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

Video Streaming and Rebroadcast of Council Meetings – This item was deferred to the March committee meeting.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/INFORMATION

Caughman Creek Property Appraisal [Recommend Executive Session] – This item was held in committee.

Clarification of Budget Motion – This item was held in committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:01 p.m.

Submitted by,

L. Gregory Pearce, Jr., Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Fund Balance Designation [pages 8-9]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Fund Balance Designations

A. Purpose

Based on the current volatility of the economy, County Council is requested to direct the County Administrator to designate the portion of the General Fund reserve balance necessary to fulfill all known long-term commitments current in place by Council inclusive of funding the on-going operations of the County.

B. Background / Discussion

In 2008, Richland County Council approved a comprehensive financial policy. The Director of Finance monitors the County compliance to the policy and periodically will make recommendations of amendments for Council to consider as changing financial conditions warrant. One of the key components monitored in considering a recommended policy change is any new or updated accounting standards that are acknowledged by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

Based on the current policy, the general operating fund balance at June 30th, 2010 was \$39.6m. Based on the request above we would recommend that additional designations be recorded as follows:

6/30/10 Undesignated FB	\$39.6m	
	(25.5m)	Designate based on County financial policy for required fund balance level
	(3.7m)	Designate the amount associated with the FY10 continental settlement to be used for Economic Development
	(7.8m)	Designate the net amount of fund balance estimated to be required for use in FY12&13 to keep general fund at current funding level due to declining and slower growth of non-tax revenues. This considers the use of the estimated millage cap.
	(1.4m)	authorize the amount of residual funds from the salary account at the end of FY10 be transferred toward the Other Post Retirement Benefit (OPEB) account which is currently underfunded.

6/30/10 amended undesignated FB \$ 1.2m

C. Financial Impact

This is a reporting change and will not have a financial impact to the County. It will change the view and interpretation of available fund balance.

D. Alternatives

List the alternatives to the situation. There will always be at least two alternatives:

1. Approve the request to amendment the financial policy and direct staff to comply with reporting requirements.
2. Do not approve.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that the County amend the financial policy as stated.

Recommended by: Tony McDonald Department: Administration Date: 2/04/11

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 2/4/11
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Recommendation is consistent with the County financial policy and the new Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncement effective June 30, 2011 for Richland County.

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Human Resources supports actions which are consistent with the County’s financial policy and the new Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncement effective June 30, 2011 for Richland County.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith Date:
 Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald Date: 2/16/11
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

FY 11 General Fund Unemployment Bill [page 11]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: FY11 General Fund Unemployment Bill

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to appropriate \$227,000 of General Fund fund balance to pay the County's Unemployment bill for the remainder of FY11.

B. Background / Discussion

In FY11, \$133,000 was budgeted for Unemployment costs. However, the first two bills for FY11 were \$93,163 and \$71,440 respectively due to an increase in claims reported. The total projected amount for the year is \$360,000. In order to pay this required expense for the remainder of the fiscal year, an additional \$227,000 is needed.

C. Financial Impact

This item will require the use of fund balance unless another funding source is identified.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the budget amendment providing adequate funds to pay the Unemployment bill.
2. Do not approve the budget amendment and identify an alternative funding source.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to appropriate fund balance in the amount of \$227,000 for the County's Unemployment bill.

Recommended by: Daniel Driggers Department: Finance Director Date: 02/04/2011

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 2/4/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 2/4/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Mass Transit Funding [pages 13-14]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Mass Transit Funding

A. Purpose

Council is requested to consider the motion made at the February 1, 2011 Council Meeting, and direct staff as appropriate.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made at the February 1, 2011 Council Meeting by Councilman Jackson and Councilwoman Hutchinson:

If funds from the Road Maintenance Fee cannot be used for the bus then for a permanent fix, reduce the Transportation Tax by 70% from \$10 to \$3 and to \$10 for commercial vehicles. [Jackson, Hutchinson]

Funding for mass transit for FY 12 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012) has been approved by Council to come from the Road Maintenance Fund.

Therefore, it is at this time that staff is requesting clarification direction from Council with regards to this motion.

C. Financial Impact

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

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion and provide clarification and direction to staff as appropriate.
2. Do not approve the motion.

E. Recommendation

By: Motion by Councilman Jackson and Councilwoman Hutchinson

Date: February 1, 2011 Council Meeting

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: No recommendation required since the request is for clarification and direction.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 2/14/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: This is a policy question; however, it should be noted that the Road Maintenance Fee (Transit Fee) has been determined to be an appropriate funding source for the bus system, and has been used for the past four budget years for this purpose. The fee is currently \$10 for private vehicles and \$15 for commercial vehicles. If reduced as suggested in the motion above to \$3 and \$10 respectively, the annual revenue generated would be reduced from \$2.5 million to \$1.1 million.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Moratorium on Hiring [pages 16-18]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Moratorium on Hiring

A. Purpose

The purpose of this item is to request the Council's consideration of a motion made at the February 1, 2011, Council Meeting regarding a moratorium on hiring.

B. Background / Discussion

At the February 1, 2011, Council Meeting, Council Member Bill Malinowski introduced the following motion:

Based on the economy and decreased revenues, which would appear to reduce workload on staff, I move that a moratorium be placed on any hiring for positions that become vacant due to retirements or resignations.

It is assumed from the motion that the moratorium would apply to all positions, including public safety positions. From a management perspective, however, being unable to fill positions, especially public safety positions like Sheriff's Deputies, Detention Officers and Paramedics, can create significant voids that must be filled through the use of overtime which, in the end, can cost more than filling the vacant positions.

C. Financial Impact

It is difficult to determine the financial impact in terms of cost savings to the County since there is no way to predict which positions will become vacant and the monetary value of the corresponding salaries. As mentioned above, however, keeping positions vacant can often cost more than filling them due to overtime costs required to keep certain areas operational.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the motion to institute a hiring moratorium and direct staff as appropriate.

2. Do not approve the motion.

E. Recommendation

By: Motion by Council Member Malinowski Date: February 1, 2011 Council Meeting

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 2/7/11

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Based on the information it is unclear if a moratorium on hiring would benefit or hinder to the County's ability to provide services therefore I would not recommend a moratorium. While there are financial advantages to limiting the refilling of vacant positions we would recommend that any consideration be strategically implemented based on the type of operation otherwise it may create a burden to the county through;

- Increased risk in liability due to safety concerns
- Reduction of employee morale
- Loss of operational flexibility to provided required services
- Loss of quality to County services

Human Resources

Reviewed by: Dwight Hanna

Date: February 14, 2011

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: It appears the consideration is for a moratorium on hiring which is considered a "hard freeze". There should be a careful analysis to determine things such as the current financial situation, projected future financial status of the County, business demand changes in different departments and the specific strategic objectives of Richland County. If it is determined after analysis that a hiring freeze is the selected strategy, Human Resources recommends what is commonly called a "smart freeze", which would provide the County flexibility to evaluate the business need to fill vs. the financial cost and other potential consequences to leave a position vacant. It could be more strategically beneficial and/or cost efficient to fill a position than leave vacant.

There are several other factors that need to be considered such as but not limited to;

- Would moratorium diminish the County's ability to deliver safe services?
- Customer service quality and/or promptness could be affected in some areas.
- Business demand change (increase or decrease) in specific areas or departments. Economic downturns can increase business in certain areas while decrease business demands in other areas.
- Projected timing of economic recovery to prevent the County from being caught behind our competitors for qualified employees.
- The County could miss opportunities to hire valuable talent.
- Difficulty of recruiting for hard to fill and critical positions.
- Potential increase of turnover and/or loss of some top performers.

- Health insurance costs for employees increased about 10% as a result in benefit plan design changes.
- County employees have not received PEP increases or Longevity Pay because they have been suspended for two years.
- Increased demand that will be placed on employees who remain with the County if vacancies not filled.
- Potential for additional overtime of nonexempt employee and burnout of exempt employees.
- Potential demand for pay increases (i.e. Interim Pay) due to assuming additional duties from unfilled vacancies.
- There would need to be clear rules relating to how the hiring freeze would be implemented.
- There would need to be clear communication to employees about the hiring freeze to avoid confusion which could contribute to adversely affecting the objective.
- Potential adverse impact to Richland County *brand* as an employer competing for employees, especially if other local governments are hiring.
- Have the pros and cons of other possible solutions for addressing the budget been considered and compared to the hiring moratorium.

Human Resources would need to know more about the specifics and details on the hiring moratorium under consideration before we could understand well enough to recommend for approval.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 2/16/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: As noted above, mandating that positions not be filled once they become vacant can be as costly, or more so, that allowing the positions to be filled. Not filling vacant positions creates other potential problems, as well, such as service delivery concerns and public safety issues. It is not recommended, therefore, that a hiring moratorium be instituted. Instead, it is recommended that the County Administrator be allowed to retain the discretion to fill funded positions within the financial parameters established by the adopted budget.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round Three Funds Application [pages 20-22]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round Three (NSP-3) Funds Application

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to adopt the incorporation of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Fund Round III (NSP-3) into the Richland County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program as per the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 that was originally established under the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA). The funding source is SC State Housing Finance and Development Authority.

B. Background / Discussion

HUD has made an allocation of NSP-3 funds to states and certain local governments. South Carolina State Housing Finance and Development Authority (SCHFDA) received an allocation of \$5,615,020.00 for the entire state of South Carolina. The SCHFDA requested Richland County Community Development to apply for state NSP-3 funding because we are a NSP-1 recipient and there are areas located in Richland County that rank among the highest areas of greatest need in the state. These areas or neighborhoods have severe problems associated with the foreclosure crisis.

All activities funded by NSP-3 must benefit low- moderate- and middle- income (LMMI) households or areas up to 120% of the area median income. Richland County must target these funds to the areas of greatest need within the County and can expend the funds throughout the entire county, if it deems appropriate by the funding source. No more than 10% of the total award can be used for demolition. Thirty percent (30%) of the award must be used to benefit households 50% or below the area median income for rental housing. If funded, the Community Development Department will receive up to 1,319,529.70 from SCHFDA.

The NSP-3 funds can be used for the following eligible areas:

- Establish financing mechanisms for purchase and redevelopment of foreclosed homes and residential properties;
- Purchase and rehabilitate homes and residential properties abandoned or foreclosed;
- Demolish blighted structures;
- Redevelop demolished or vacant properties

The Census Tracts to be addressed include: CT 5, 107.03, 110 which fall within Council Districts 3 and 4. This was based upon the HUD based need score calculated by HUD using marketing conditions and other factors.

C. Financial Impact

The Richland County General Budget should incur no financial impact with the NSP-3 funds. No matching funds will be required from the County on NSP-3. In addition, the NSP-3 program provides administrative costs for the life of program. The proposed budget below lists the distributions of funding.

Proposed Budget

\$131,952.97	10% of award for demolition of unsafe, abandoned housing units
\$395,858.91	30% of award for 50% or below rental housing
\$535,567.62	Homeownership to be completed in areas of high concentration
\$ 200,000.00	Redevelopment to be completed in areas of high concentration
\$ 56,150.20	Administrative Cost for the life of the program
\$1,319,529.70	Total Funding

D. Alternatives

1. County Council can approve the request to adopt the incorporation of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round III (NSP-3) Fund into the Richland County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program as per the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010.
2. County Council can not approve the adoption and involvement of the NSP-3 Fund.

If the first option is not selected, Richland County will lose \$1.3 million dollars that would have been granted to Richland County to benefit communities that have foreclosed and abandoned properties. The SCHFDA will redistribute the funds to another high impact county.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to adopt the incorporation of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program Round III (NSP-3) Fund into the Richland County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program as per the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010.

Recommended by: Valeria D. Jackson
Date: 2/7/2011

Department: Community Development

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 2/08/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 2/8/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

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

Date: 1/8/11
 Recommend Council denial

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith
 Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Date:
 Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett
 Recommend Council approval
Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 2/17/11
 Recommend Council denial

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Video Streaming and Rebroadcast of Council Meetings [pages 24-25]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Video Streaming and Rebroadcast of Council Meetings

A. Purpose

The purpose of this request of actions is to provide an analysis to County Council of the resources and costs that would be associated with video streaming council meetings live via the county website and rebroadcasting council meetings on the county's cable channel.

B. Background / Discussion

On February 1, 2011 Richland County Council approved a motion directing county staff to research the viability and costs that would be associated with streaming council meetings live via the website and review the resources that would be needed to videotape council meetings for rebroadcast on the county's cable channel.

It is significant to note that currently no broadcast infrastructure exists in Council Chambers and it is recommended that if Council chooses to move forward, then the following modifications and or equipment purchases are recommended by the Office of Public Information and Information Technology:

- I. Cameras (3)
- II. High Definition Broadcast Video/Live Streaming Production System (One Stop Shop)
- III. Upgrading of existing sound system to provide a separate mix for up to 16 mic inputs
- IV. Hosting for Video Streaming
- V. Video Archival System

*It is also important to note that all local governments currently streaming video and rebroadcasting council meetings have made significant infrastructure investments in cameras, audio, production and editing equipment. These comparable communities include Charleston, North Charleston, as well as the City of Columbia.

C. Financial Impact

It is estimated that the financial impact of purchasing the equipment to both video stream and broadcast council meetings would be approximately \$51,000.

D. Alternatives

List the alternatives to the situation.

1. Council may choose to stream council meetings live and rebroadcast meetings on Richland County Cable Channel 2.

2. Council may choose not to stream council meetings live or rebroadcast meetings on Richland County Cable Channel 2.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that if council chooses to move forward with this project that it directs county staff to conduct further research and provide a financial recommendation in time for the 2011/2012 budget cycle.

Analysis Provided by: Stephany Snowden Department: PIO Date: 02/08/2011

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 2/9/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion. Approval would require the identification of funding.

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 2/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Grants

Reviewed by: Sara Salley

Date: 2/10/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Council discretion

Administration

Reviewed by: J. Milton Pope

Date: 2-10-11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend denial/deferral of this item at this time and request that Council finalize its policy position on the matter. If approved the financing of the request should be moved to the FY 12 Budget process.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Fair Housing Proclamation [pages 27-29]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: FAIR HOUSING PROCLAMATION

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to adopt a Proclamation recognizing April as Fair Housing Month. The proclamation will be presented to a HUD official during the April 5, 2011 County Council Meeting.

B. Background / Discussion

As an Entitlement Community, Richland County Government receives an annual allocation of Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Program funds from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As a condition of receiving formula based funding the County certifies that it will affirmatively further fair housing. In order to affirmatively further fair housing we conduct an analysis to identify impediments to fair housing choice within the County. We also take appropriate action to overcome the effects of any impediments identified as well as maintain records reflecting the analysis. Among the impediments identified in the 2004 Analysis of Impediments was the lack of education of citizens about the fair housing law and citizen rights that it grants.

April is Fair Housing Month and the County has for the past seven years kicked off the month of April with presenting a Fair Housing Resolution to a HUD representative.

C. Financial Impact

There will be no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to proclaim April as Fair Housing Month in the County and present to a HUD representative and affirm the County's commitment to fair housing choice;
2. Do not approve the request to proclaim April as Fair Housing Month;
3. Choose an alternative method such as a published statement from Council

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request to proclaim April as Fair Housing Month and present to a HUD representative.

Recommended by: Valeria Jackson Department: Community Development
Date: March 1, 2011

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/8/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date:

Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 3/8/11

Recommend Council denial

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

FAIR HOUSING PROCLAMATION

COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

RICHLAND COUNTY PROCLAIMS APRIL 2011 AS FAIR HOUSING MONTH

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council recognizes April as National Fair Housing Month and remains strongly committed to affirmatively further fair housing through its policies, building codes and community development programs; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council commemorates the enactment of the Title VIII Civil Rights Act of 1968 as amended (Fair Housing Act); and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council rejects discrimination in the provision of housing on the basis of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, familial status, or disability; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council desires that its citizens be afforded Fair Housing Choice without the occurrence of discrimination; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council encourages positive action toward the elimination of discriminatory practices in the sale, rental, financing and all other housing transactions;

WHEREAS, the Richland County Council recognizes the County Administrator as the Fair Housing Administrator for Richland County; and

WHEREAS, The Fair Housing Administrator recognizes the Community Development Department as the official coordinator of all Fair Housing initiatives on behalf of Richland County; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Richland County Council is a partner of The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, acknowledges Fair Housing as one of the nations most cherished and fundamental values and proclaims April 2011 as Fair Housing Month.

SIGNED AND SEALED this ___ day of _____, 2011, having been duly adopted by the Richland County Council on the ___ day of _____, 2011.

Paul Livingston, Chair
Richland County Council

ATTEST this ___ day of _____, 2010

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Community Development Week Proclamation [pages 31-33]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Community Development Week Proclamation

A. Purpose

Community Development is requesting the inclusion of the Community Development Week Proclamation on the April 5, 2011 Council meeting.

B. Background / Discussion

- CD Week provides the opportunity for grantees to meet with their congressional members, showcase projects and programs, and involve the local community, including local businesses, citizens, and community groups in the week-long celebration. It will be celebrated nationally this year from April 25th – April 30th. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the National Community Development Week campaign. Support for the event is crucial due the pending huge budget cuts to CDBG funding for federal fiscal year spending in 2011 and 2012. In addition, the Community Development Department will be planning CD Week activities to include:
 - **Letter Writing Campaign**
 - **Press Conference/Tour:** This will highlight what we have done throughout the County and include a tour for our Richland County Council, Administration and Congressional Members.
 - **Partnership Luncheon**
 - **Energy Expo/Fair Housing Event** out at Saluda Shoals on April 29th in conjunction with Lexington County

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact to do this proclamation.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to do the Community Development Week Proclamation and this will serve as another effort by Richland County to show the importance of CDBG in the community.
2. Do not approve the Proclamation.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended the Community Development Week Proclamation be made at the April 5, 2011 Council meeting.

Recommended by:
Valeria Jackson

Department:
Community Development

Date:
March 7, 2011

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 3/8/11

Recommend Council denial

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date:

Recommend Council denial

Administration

Reviewed by: Sparty Hammett

✓ Recommend Council approval

Comments regarding recommendation:

Date: 3/8/11

Recommend Council denial

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)

CD WEEK PROCLAMATION

COUNTY OF RICHLAND)

**RICHLAND COUNTY PROCLAIMS APRIL 25-30, 2011 AS
COMMUNIYT DEVELOPMENT (CD) WEEK**

Whereas, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program has operated since 1975 to provide local governments with the resources required to meet the needs of persons of low- and moderate-income, and CDBG funds are used by thousands of neighborhood- based, non-profit organizations throughout the nation to address pressing neighborhood and human service needs; and

Whereas, the Community Development Block Grant program has had a significant impact on our local economies through job creation and retention, physical redevelopment and improved local tax bases; and

Whereas, City, USA and other local governments have clearly demonstrated the capacity to administer and customize the CDBG program to identify, prioritize and resolve pressing local problems, such as affordable housing, neighborhood and human service needs, job creation and retention and physical redevelopment; and

Now, Therefore I, Paul Livingston, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Chairperson Richland County Council, do hereby proclaim the week of **April 25- 30, 2011**, as Richland County **Community Development Week** in Columbia, South Carolina, and urge all citizens to join us in recognizing the Community Development Block Grant program and the important role it plays in our community.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of Richland County to be affixed this 5th day of April 2011.

SIGNED AND SEALED this ____ day of _____, 2011, having been duly adopted by the Richland County Council on the ____ day of _____, 2011.

Paul Livingston, Chair
Richland County Council

ATTEST this ____ day of _____, 2010

Michielle R. Cannon-Finch
Clerk of Council

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Budget Amendment for Risk Management [pages 35-36]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Budget Amendment for Risk Management

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment to Risk Management in the amount of \$500,000 to pay liability claims.

B. Background / Discussion

The budget set forth for fiscal year 10-11 is \$1,035,977. Claims will exceed the budgeted amount and could reach the requested amount of \$1,535,977 (original budget plus budget amendment).

C. Financial Impact

The general fund will be reduced by \$500,000 to pay for liability claims. Any amount not paid for claims the County is legally obligated to pay will be returned to the general fund.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to cover liability claims for the remainder of this fiscal year.
2. Do not approve the budget request.

E. Recommendation

Approving the budget request is recommended.

Recommended by: David Chambers Risk Management February 17, 2011

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/2/11

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Approval would require the identification of a funding source.

Legal

Reviewed by: Larry Smith

Date:

✓ Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation:

Administration

Reviewed by: Tony McDonald

Date: 3/2/11

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval, with funds to come from the fund balance of the County's General Fund.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Caughman Creek Property Appraisal [page 37]

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Clarification of Budget Motion [pages 39-40]

Reviews

To amend Section 16 of the budget ordinance as follows: “The County Administrator is granted authority to redirect budget dollars and transfer up to \$100,000 between all departments within the same fund. This shall include the transfer of one unfunded position.”

Verbatim Minutes

June 15, 2010

Mr. Livingston: I have a motion here that I passed out to you. This is not a motion in regard to adding or taking away from the budget, but it came about in a discussion with the Vice Chair and I had with the County Administrator. I’ll explain the motion once I read it. The County Administrator is granted authority to redirect budget dollars and transfer up to \$100,000 between all departments within the same fund. This shall include the transfer of one unfunded position. And the reason we thought this was real important is for example if the Administrator feels like there’s a need to make a change from one department to the next one and not being able to do that could hamper the process of getting things done. And the reason we said one because also too we don’t want complete departments changed. But, at least, if you can save money by shifting one person to another position and a little bit of funding that certainly can make his job a lot easier, so, all that is to simply make that amendment to the budget ordinance. Chair entertain a motion reference that amendment.

Mr. Jeter: I make the motion that we amend Section 16 of the budget ordinance that the County Administrator is granted authority to redirect budget dollars and transfer up to \$100,000 between all departments within the same fund. This shall include the transfer of one unfunded position.

Ms. Dickerson: Second.

Mr. Livingston: Moved properly seconded...Mr. Malinowski...

Mr. Malinowski: Can you explain further the last line comment the transfer of one unfunded position?

Mr. Livingston: Let’s say, for example, it may be better served instead of hiring someone to switch them and money to another department or something of that nature. It would be easy to do that if you give that money to the Administrator. See what I’m saying?

Ms. Kennedy: No.

Mr. Livingston: Let’s say, for example, you got the Planning...any department and you decide it would be better if this person worked in that department and I

can shift them over and shift the fund with them. It would be a lot easier for the Administrator.

Mr. Malinowski: That's transferring an already funded position to a department.

Mr. Livingston: Yeah, but to make that other department more effective the other department don't need it. What's wrong with that?

Mr. Malinowski: Because you're saying transfer of one unfunded position. The person you're transferring is already funded. So, therefore, you ought to say the transfer of one funded position.

Mr. Livingston: What I was referring to that position wouldn't be funded in the previous department...transfer the money and the person. We wouldn't have the funds in the department for it, so transfer the person and the funds. Now why doesn't that make sense?

Mr. Malinowski: Because that means you're transferring a funded position and a funded person to the department.

Mr. Livingston: Well you can say it that way. That will be the same thing.

Mr. Malinowski: It's not the same thing. Unfunded means there are no funds. Funded means there are.

Mr. Livingston: What you're transferring is the funds and the person.

Mr. Malinowski: Alright if we can word it that way.

Mr. Livingston: Any other discussion? There being none. Those in favor of the motion say aye...opposed nay. Motion carries.

Items Pending Analysis

Subject

a. Sewer Tap Fee Assistance Program (Malinowski-November 2010)

Reviews