



RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Jim Manning	Valerie Hutchinson	Gwendolyn Kennedy (Chair)	Bill Malinowski	Seth Rose
District 8	District 9	District 7	District 1	District 5

**MARCH 27, 2012
5:00 PM**

2020 Hampton Street

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular Session: February 28, 2012 (pages 5-7)

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. Animal Care: Proposed Ordinance Revisions [Council Motion] (pages 9-12)
3. Printing, Mailing and Postal Services (pages 14-16)
4. Purchase of John Deere Excavator (pages 18-19)

5. Resolution in Support of National County Government Month April 2012 (pages 21-23)

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

6. a. Curfew for Community Safety (Manning-February 2010)
- b. Farmers Market Update (Council-May 2010)
- c. Review all Engineering and Architectural Drawing requirements to make sure there is no unnecessary charge or expense to citizens (Jackson-January 2010)
- d. Review Homeowner Association covenants by developers and the time frame for transfer and the strength of the contracts (Jackson-September 2010)
- e. To direct Public Works to review county ordinances and propose amendments that would allow the recovery cost to repair damage done to county public roads. The intent of this motion is to hold those responsible who damage the roadways due to the use of heavy vehicles, improperly parked property or other uses for which the type of roadway was not intended (Malinowski-April 2010)
- f. That Richland County enact a Tree Canopy ordinance and inventory to preserve and enhance the number of trees in Richland County (Malinowski-July 2010)
- g. Off-ramp Lighting (Rose-February 2011)
- h. In the interest of regional consistency and public safety, I move that Richland County Council adopt an ordinance (consistent with the City of Columbia) banning texting while operating a motor vehicle (Rose-April 2011)
- i. Direct staff to coordinate with SCDHEC and SCDOT a review of traffic light signal timing improvements in unincorporated Richland County and request a system of red/yellow flashing traffic signals be initiated to help reduce emissions. Unincorporated Richland County will also mandate ingress and egress turn lanes for all businesses and residential construction that would cause a slowdown of traffic on the road servicing that facility (Malinowski-April 2010)
- j. Staff, in conjunction with the Conservation Commission, will consider an ordinance change to prevent the crossing of any portion of a conservation easement with utilities unless by special exception and with specific requirements in place (Malinowski-September 2011)
- k. Review the process of the Development Review Team (Jackson-October 2011)

ADJOURNMENT



Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Regular Session: February 28, 2012 (pages 5-7)

Reviews

MINUTES OF



**RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 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., Paul Livingston, Norman Jackson, Milton Pope, Tony McDonald, Sparty Hammett, Roxanne Ancheta, Randy Cherry, Brad Farrar, John Hixon, David Hoops, Amelia Linder, Brian Cook, Valeria Jackson, Bill Peters, Daniel Driggers, pam Davis, Michelle Onley

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting started at approximately 5:03 p.m.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to nominate Ms. Kennedy for the position of D&S Committee Chair.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to close the floor for nominations. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Kennedy was unanimously elected as the D&S Committee Chair.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 24, 2012 (Regular Session) – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Hutchinson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward Item #7: "Former Farmers' Market Property-County Farmers' Market or SE Sports Complex" to the A&F Committee. The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

ITEMS FOR ACTION

Automated GIS-based Tracking Software for Land Development – Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for denial. The vote was in favor.

Community Development Week Proclamation – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that Council approve the amended proclamation for Community Development Week. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Evaluation of the needs and cost of improvement to County roads and infrastructure – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to accept this item as information. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Fair Housing Month Proclamation – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded Ms. Hutchinson, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that Council approve the request to adopt and present a Fair Housing Proclamation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Former Farmers' Market Property-County Farmers' Market or SE Sports Complex – This item was forwarded to the A&F Committee for action.

Ordinance to authorize a sanitary sewer easement to the City of Columbia for County owned property along a portion of Rosewood Drive – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that Council approve the ordinance authorizing the granting of a sanitary sewer easement to the City of Columbia. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Richland County South Paving Contract – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that Council approve the request to award this construction contract to R&T Grading, Inc. in the amount of \$1,000,000. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Selection of LandDesign Inc. as consultant for the preparation of two neighborhood Master Plans – Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation that Council approve "LandDesign, Inc." as the consultant and expenditure in an amount not to exceed \$289,000.00, which will allow the development of two Neighborhood Master Plan areas within the County.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:21 p.m.

Submitted by,

Gwendolyn Davis Kennedy, Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Michelle M. Onley

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Animal Care: Proposed Ordinance Revisions [Council Motion] (pages 9-12)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Animal Care: Proposed Ordinance Revisions [Council Motion]

A. Purpose

Council is requested to review the motion made by Councilman Manning at the February 21, 2012 Council Meeting, and direct staff as appropriate.

B. Background / Discussion

The following motion was made by Councilman Manning at the February 21, 2012 Council Meeting:

I move that Council fix the animal shelter ordinance passed February 7, 2012 by implementing those items placed into the substitution motion made that same night. [Manning] Forwarded to the D&S Committee.

The substitute motion items referenced in Mr. Manning's motion are as follows:

1. Properly licensed animals should be given a second chance just as the ordinance gives a second chance to hunting dogs and performance dogs. [Meaning, if an animal is properly licensed, and is picked up by an Animal Care Officer and brought to the shelter, the animal can be released to the owner **WITHOUT BEING SPAYED / NEUTERED**. If the same animal is picked up again by an Animal Care Officer and brought to the shelter for a second time, the animal will not be released to the owner before it is spayed / neutered.]
2. Allow the owner 48 hours to have his/her animal spayed / neutered by their vet in lieu of allowing this operation to be performed at the shelter [by a licensed veterinarian], as is the current practice.

At the February 7, 2012 public hearing for the Animal Care Ordinance revisions, a Newberry County resident stated that her two dogs (Chows), which were being kept by her son at a City of Columbia address, were picked up by an Animal Care Officer after having dug out of the fence, and were brought to the shelter and spayed / neutered per shelter policy before being released to her. The Newberry County resident stated that she was upset that her dogs could not be released for the spay / neuter procedure to be performed by her veterinarian instead of having the procedure performed at the shelter by the licensed veterinarian, per shelter policy. She also stated that **two years ago**, a previously owned Chow was picked up by an Animal Care Officer, as the gate was left open by a pizza delivery man, and that the Chow was neutered at the shelter, per policy. **A year later**, the Chow died. Please note: Richland County Animal Care does not have any records regarding the pick-up of any dogs from this City address. Therefore, the dog(s) were picked up by City of Columbia Animal Care Officers.

Based upon the Newberry County resident's comments, Council discussed the possibility to allow an owner 48 hours to have his / her animal(s) spayed / neutered by their veterinarian in lieu of having this operation performed at the shelter by the on-site licensed veterinarian, as is the current practice.

Also at the February 7, 2012 Council Meeting, it was also suggested that “all properly licensed animals should be given a second chance just as... hunting dogs and performance dogs.”

The Joint County – City Animal Care Advisory Committee met Monday, March 12, 2012 to discuss these two items, and unanimously agreed that the two proposed amendments are not recommended. The discussions that took place at this meeting are documented below.

Allowing people 48 hours (or some other length of time) to use their veterinarians would completely disregard the current ordinance directive prohibiting pets from leaving the shelter unsterilized. (Please note that the Joint County – City Animal Care Advisory Committee also did not recommend allowing a second chance for hunting dogs, but Council decided to leave this exemption in place.)

If we allowed 2 days (or some other length of time) for the procedure to be performed outside the shelter, the shelter may find situations where pets “got lost,” “ran away,” “were given away,” etc. during those 2 days and therefore, the pets never make it to the vet for the procedure. Per the shelter, many people who reclaim their pets don’t even *have* a regular vet. What if an owner wants to take the animal to his / her vet (if they have one), but they don’t have the money?

Allowing a pet out of the shelter unsterilized may have dire consequences. As a point of reference, a pair of breeding cats, which can have two or more litters per year, can exponentially produce **420,000 offspring** over a seven-year period.

Furthermore, this new directive would place an extremely large administrative burden on City and County staff. A large work-load would be created to track and follow up with owners to ensure the surgery was done. Confirmation of the surgery via proper documentation would be required, as “one’s word” may not be sufficient.

We do not know of any agency in the state that has a spay / neuter policy that allows an owner to have their pet’s surgery performed at his/her vet’s office.

More importantly, City and County Animal Care staff stated that **they have not received complaints regarding surgical procedures at the shelter in the past 3 years. The shelter performs at least 2,000 spay / neuter surgeries per year.** It is for these reasons that the Committee does not recommend this revision.

Allowing a pet a “second chance” before being spayed / neutered may allow pets to go on to breed for years before they possibly end up in the shelter again, as many of the largest offenders are back-yard breeders. Again, allowing a pet out of the shelter unsterilized on a first offense may have dire consequences. As a point of reference, a pair of breeding cats, which can have two or more litters per year, can exponentially produce **420,000 offspring** over a seven-year period.

The license fee for unsterilized pets is low enough that it does not encourage people as much as we would like to go ahead and spay / neuter their pets to avoid the higher fee. Sterilized pets = \$4 license fee; Unsterilized pets = \$20 license fee.

If we allow pets a “second chance,” we are going backwards in the grounds we have made in reducing pet overpopulation. Shelter intake will increase, which will drive up costs, which pet-owning and non-pet owning taxpayers will ultimately pay.

The spay / neuter ordinances that exist in Richland County and the City of Columbia are envied by animal care agencies across the state and region. The Advisory Committee respectfully requests that the County not lose ground on this matter, when such great strides have been made thus far!

Furthermore, as the City and County have a joint animal shelter, further revisions to the County’s animal care ordinance will result in the City’s and County’s ordinances becoming *further* apart, when it is recommended to bring the ordinances more in-line with each other so as to facilitate smoother day-to-day operations for both entities, and provide a clearer understanding of the animal care ordinances for all Richland County citizens.

Again, the Joint County – City Animal Care Advisory Committee unanimously agreed that the two proposed amendments are not recommended.

C. Financial Impact

Both proposals will have a negative financial impact. The administrative follow-up alone on both proposals will drive up the cost of shelter operations, and will cost pet-owning and non-pet owning taxpayers more money.

D. Alternatives

1. Do not approve the two proposals.
2. Approve the proposals as presented.
3. Approve the proposals as amended.

E. Recommendation

The Joint County – City Animal Care Advisory Committee unanimously agreed that the two proposed amendments are not recommended.

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/14/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

✓ Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

This is a policy decision and left to council discretion. Based on the ROA financial impact section, approval would have a negative financial impact on the County but the cost is not disclosed. Based on that comment, I would recommend that Council determine the financial impact of the decision prior to approving and appropriately address how that cost will be absorbed.

Item# 2

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 3/15/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Policy decision left to Council's discretion. If Council should approve Mr. Manning's motions, the new ordinance language would then need to be reviewed by Legal.

Administration

Reviewed by: Roxanne Ancheta

Date: March 15, 2012

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: While this is a policy decision of Council, it is staff's recommendation to support that of the Animal Care Advisory Committee. Not only will the proposed revisions place an administrative, and therefore, financial burden on the City and County, but the revisions may also have consequences such as uncontrolled breeding and unwanted pets if pets are allowed to leave the premises without being spayed / neutered. As stated in the ROA, over 2,000 spay / neuter procedures are performed at the shelter each year, and no complaints have been received in the past 3 years. The *exact* financial impact of these proposed revisions is unknown at this time, as we are not sure as to how many pet owners may request their pets be taken off-site to be spayed / neutered, nor are we sure as to the number of pets who may be allowed a "second chance." So while we cannot provide an *exact* dollar amount, we *can* provide Council with the fact that these revisions will have a *negative* financial impact on the City and County. Again, it is staff's recommendation to support that of the Animal Care Advisory Committee.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Printing, Mailing and Postal Services (pages 14-16)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: PRINTING, MAILING AND POSTAL SERVICES

A. Purpose

This request is to seek County Council approval and authorization to negotiate and award a contract for printing, mailing, and postal service for the Support Services Department and Treasurer's Office.

B. Background / Discussion

Request for proposal was published for certifying services to be provided using fully automated production processes that will be capable of tracking each individual mail piece through the printing, inserting, mailing processes and postage services.

Proposals were received from two companies Southern Imaging Group and Cash Cycle Solutions. Evaluations were conducted and the evaluation team recommends Southern Imaging Group as the most responsive, responsible and advantageous solution for the County.

C. Financial Impact

The proposal is a negotiated process from which funding for the services will be from the designated accounts and budgeted amounts from the following departments:

- Support Services 1100185000,
- Treasurer Department 1100173000 and account number 1151173500

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the request to authorize the Procurement, Support Services and the Treasurer's office to negotiate and award a contract for the printing, mailing, and postal service.
2. Do not approve the request to authorize the negotiation and award of a contract.

E. Recommendation

- 1. Recommend County Council approval and authorization for the Procurement, Support Services and the Treasurer’s office to negotiate and award a contract for the printing, mailing, and postal service.

Recommended by: Rodolfo Callwood Department: Procurement Date: 3/13/12

F. Reviews

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers Date: 3/14/12
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood Date: 3/15/12
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

Support Services

Reviewed by: John Hixon Date: 3/15/12
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation: Funding is budgeted in the 110018500.521100 account as stated for this process.

Treasurer

Reviewed by: David Adams Date: 3/16/12
 ✓ Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial
 Council Discretion (please explain if checked)
 Comments regarding recommendation:

The purpose of the contract with Southern Imaging Group is to provide printing, mailing and postage services for the Richland County Treasurer’s Office to comply with taxpayer notifications as stipulated by state law. County Council is requested to approve an expenditure in an amount over \$100,000 for these services. These funds have been requested as part of the County Treasurer’s authorized budgets for Fiscal Year 12-13. Upon approval by County Council, the County Treasurer is authorized to negotiate and award the contract.

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean Date: 3/16/12

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: Tony McDonald Date: 3/16/12

Recommend Council approval Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend approval as requested.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Purchase of John Deere Excavator (pages 18-19)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Purchase of a John Deere 135D 15 Ton Hydraulic Excavator

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to approve a purchase in the amount of \$160,787.62 for a John Deere 15-ton zero turn excavator, Model Number 135D, from Flint Equipment Company located in West Columbia. The purchase is for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works, with available funds in budget account 3020735.5314.

B. Background / Discussion

The new excavator will be replacing a Caterpillar 330 CL, a 2004 model weighing more than twice as much as this unit. Being smaller and lighter, the new equipment will increase transportability and efficiency, making it suitable for a greater number of worksites. It will also use less fuel, while meeting the latest EPA Tier Three emissions standards. This engine will dramatically reduce nitrous oxide and particulate emissions, as called for in the Richland County Directive on Air Quality Policies. The zero-turn feature greatly enhances safe operation of the unit because the cab/engine compartment can turn nearly within the radius of the tracks, significantly minimizing the risk of striking a worker or damaging property in the work area.

A bid process was conducted by Procurement, and the most responsive and responsible bidder was determined to be Flint Equipment Company, in West Columbia, who offered the John Deere Model 135D excavator.

C. Financial Impact

The financial impact to the County will be the purchase of the excavator, available in the budget of the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works. The total cost of the excavator is \$160,787.62.

2011 John Deere Model 135D Excavator	\$ 150,269.00
South Carolina Sales Tax	\$ 10,518.62
Total Cost	\$ 160,787.62

D. Alternatives

There are two alternatives available:

1. Approve the request to purchase the excavator for the Roads and Drainage division of the Department of Public Works.
2. Do not approve the request to purchase the excavator for the Roads and Drainage Division of the Department of Public Works.

E. Recommendation

Recommended by: David Hoops, Director Department: Public Works Date: March 13, 2012

F. Reviews

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

Item# 4

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/13/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Procurement

Reviewed by: Rodolfo Callwood

Date: 3/14/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 3/14/12

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: 3/16/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation: Recommend Council approval of the request to purchase the excavator for the Roads and Drainage division of the Department of Public Works.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject

Resolution in Support of National County Government Month April 2012 (pages 21-23)

Reviews

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: A Resolution in Support of National County Government Month
April 2012

A. Purpose

The Richland County Office of Public Information is respectfully requesting that Richland County Council support a resolution honoring National County Government Month during the month of April.

B. Background / Discussion

Each year since 1991 the National Association of Counties has encouraged counties across the country to actively promote their own programs and services to the public during the month of April. This year, the Richland County PIO is using the month as a catalyst to jump start a year-long campaign entitled, "What Your County is Doing for You," which will highlight the work of county employees on the website, newsletters and via video.

During the month of April, Richland County will be promoting the 2012 Lawnmower Exchange; National Child Abuse Prevention Month; Fair Housing Month; Community Development Week, as well as the citizen's academy Richland 101.

C. Financial Impact

There is no financial impact associated with this request.

D. Alternatives

1. Richland County Council approves the resolution in support of National County Government Month.
2. Richland County Council does not approve the resolution in support of National County Government Month.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Richland County Council support the resolution honoring National County Government Month

Recommended by: Stephany Snowden

Department: PIO

Date: 3/13/2012

F. Reviews

Item# 5

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

Finance

Reviewed by: Daniel Driggers

Date: 3/14/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

Legal

Reviewed by: Elizabeth McLean

Date: 3/15/12

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: Stephany Snowden

Date: 3/15/12

Recommend Council approval

Recommend Council denial

Council Discretion (please explain if checked)

Comments regarding recommendation:

National County Government Month - April 2012

“What Richland County is Doing for You”

WHEREAS, the nation’s 3,068 counties provide a variety of essential public services to communities serving more than 300 million Americans; and

WHEREAS, Richland County and all counties take seriously their responsibility to protect and enhance the health, welfare and safety of its residents in sensible and cost-effective ways; and

WHEREAS, Richland County’s mission is to create engaging and comprehensive opportunities to further bring citizens and government together.

WHEREAS, during the month of April 2012, Richland County Government will observe National County Government Month with a citizen awareness campaign, titled **“What Richland County is Doing for You ”**; and

WHEREAS, each year since 1991 the National Association of Counties has encouraged counties across the country to actively promote their own programs and services to the public they serve; and

WHEREAS, the **“What Richland County is doing for You”** campaign will highlight the many services and policies that enhance its residents quality of life.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Richland County Council hereby proclaims April 2012 as National County Government Month and encourage all County officials, employees, schools and residents to support the **“What Richland County is Doing for You”** campaign.

ADOPTED this ____day of April 2012

Kelvin E. Washington, Sr., Chairman
Richland County Council

ATTEST this__day of April 2012

Michelle Onley
Interim Clerk of Council

Items Pending Analysis

Subject

- a. Curfew for Community Safety (Manning-February 2010)
- b. Farmers Market Update (Council-May 2010)
- c. Review all Engineering and Architectural Drawing requirements to make sure there is no unnecessary charge or expense to citizens (Jackson-January 2010)
- d. Review Homeowner Association covenants by developers and the time frame for transfer and the strength of the contracts (Jackson-September 2010)
- e. To direct Public Works to review county ordinances and propose amendments that would allow the recovery cost to repair damage done to county public roads. The intent of this motion is to hold those responsible who damage the roadways due to the use of heavy vehicles, improperly parked property or other uses for which the type of roadway was not intended (Malinowski-April 2010)
- f. That Richland County enact a Tree Canopy ordinance and inventory to preserve and enhance the number of trees in Richland County (Malinowski-July 2010)
- g. Off-ramp Lighting (Rose-February 2011)
- h. In the interest of regional consistency and public safety, I move that Richland County Council adopt an ordinance (consistent with the City of Columbia) banning texting while operating a motor vehicle (Rose-April 2011)
- i. Direct staff to coordinate with SCDHEC and SCDOT a review of traffic light signal timing improvements in unincorporated Richland County and request a system of red/yellow flashing traffic signals be initiated to help reduce emissions. Unincorporated Richland County will also mandate ingress and egress turn lanes for all businesses and residential construction that would cause a slowdown of traffic on the road servicing that facility (Malinowski-April 2010)
- j. Staff, in conjunction with the Conservation Commission, will consider an ordinance change to prevent the crossing of any portion of a conservation easement with utilities unless by special exception and with specific requirements in place (Malinowski-September 2011)
- k. Review the process of the Development Review Team (Jackson-October 2011)

Reviews