



Richland County Council

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

March 27, 2018 – 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Pearce, Chair; Jim Manning, Gwen Kennedy, Chip Jackson, and Seth Rose

OTHERS PRESENT: Yvonne McBride, Norman Jackson, Bill Malinowski, Paul Livingston, Dalhi Myers, Joyce Dickerson, Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Tracy Hegler, Jamelle Ellis, Kim Williams-Roberts, Dale Welch, Brad Farrar, Trena Bowers, Larry Smith, Quinton Epps, Tim Nielsen, and Nancy Stone-Collum

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. February 27, 2018 – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, Manning, and Rose

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Rose

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

a. Conservation Commission manage County-owned historic and conservation properties [N. JACKSON] – Mr. Pearce stated he thought this item had come up previously. He inquired about the history of the item.

Ms. Hegler stated it came up in a related manner in June/July, as a result the Rowing Center was put under the Conservation Commission's management. This was also following a prior motion by Council to put the management of Pinewood Lake Park under the Conservation Commission. That was the action taken previously from a motion that was more in line with this one. The motion was more encompassing, but the action of Council was to just put those 2 entities into the Conservation Commission. The item is here before you again. In the report the committee will see where staff

tried to identify the properties that may fit within the context of the Conservation Commission's mission.

Mr. Pearce stated staff has inventoried all of the properties. The 2 alternatives recommended by staff are (1) to approve the motion for Richland County Conservation Commission to manage all County-owned historic and conservation properties or (2) to consider motion and make no changes to the current management structure for County-owned properties.

Mr. N. Jackson stated when the motion was made to put Pinewood Lake Park, a historic property/value, under the Conservation Commission....it fits the mission of the Conservation Commission managing historic properties. That is why he said all historic properties that fits that mission should be under the Conservation Commission. We should put all or none. They shouldn't put one and leave the rest out there. To be fair put all of them that fits the Conservation Commission mission under the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Pearce expressed that he did not know what to do with this item.

Mr. C. Jackson requested Ms. Hegler to explain the logic or rationale behind grouping the properties the way they did on the chart located on p. 13 of the agenda.

Ms. Hegler stated this is just staff's "stab" at the properties the County currently owns. They classified them as Historical & Cultural, Natural/Recreational in use or those that are unused at the moment and totally natural. They also in the report noted if there was a board or a body that was managing them already. For example, if you look under Historical & Cultural there is the Township Auditorium, Hampton-Preston, Woodrow Wilson, John CB Smith House and Hopkins Elementary. That is staff's impression of those being historic structures and staff noted who they are managed by. Of those that are Natural/Recreational in nature: Pinewood Lake Park and the Rowing Club, which are already managed by the Conservation Commission. Operational Services works with RCRC on a boat ramp out at the Rowing Center. Operational Services works on Bonuck Road on Lake Murray. Neighborhood Improvement has a potential park at property in the Spring Hill area. The County also has property on Decker Boulevard at the former Zorba's. The remaining are mitigation tracts, which are not utilized in real manner. These tracts are natural in nature.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if asked someone from the Conservation Commission, under the Historical & Cultural grouping, if they are involved with these, although they may not be managing them, what would there answer be.

Mr. Epps stated they have very little involvement with those properties. They do, at times, give grants and work with Historic Columbia and advise them on various things. One of the Commissioners did advise them on certain displays they have and helped them to get those displays done better.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, but there is no management responsibility or roles.

Mr. Epps responded Historic Columbia manages those properties. It is his understanding they are funded through H-Tax funds.

Mr. Pearce stated the County appoints board members to the Historic Columbia Foundation Board. The Columbia Historic Foundation used to be the Richland County Historic Commission. The Richland County Historic Commission deeded over their control to the Columbia Historic Foundation. They manage those properties on behalf of the County. The Township Auditorium operates as an Enterprise Fund and has a Board, which the County appoints to.

Ms. Hegler stated the County has a conservation easement on 3.2 acres on Blue Ridge Terrace.

Ms. Stone-Collum stated the Blue Ridge Terrace property is a conservation property that was acquired years ago through the Forfeited Land Commission. It is a small parcel with a conservation overlay.

Ms. Kennedy requested the address for the Blue Ridge Terrace property.

Mr. Malinowski stated on p. 11 of the agenda under "Issues" it says, "The main issue is the County's capacity to manage properties already effectively handled by non-profit boards, such as Historic Columbia Foundation (HCF) and the Township Board of Directors." He inquired as to why we should reinvent the wheel on the ones that are being effectively managed already and begin incurring costs for management.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to what the mission of the Conservation Commission is.

Ms. Hegler stated it is to oversee and further conservation, preservation, historical and cultural assets of the County.

Mr. N. Jackson stated all the properties owned by the County was managed by non-profit organizations through H-Tax funding from the County. One was singled out and sent to the Conservation Commission for management. The Conservation Commission did not have the staff or the means to manage it. That is not what they do. That is not their mission. His point was that if you are going to single out one property and say that property should go under the Conservation Commission, but by the mission of the Conservation Commission, if you are putting one, you should put all. You should not single one property out and say we just want this property under the Conservation Commission, but we won't consider the rest. If they were managed by a non-profit organization, similar to the others, he thinks they should all be treated the same way. That is why he made the motion. You cannot just have one and not talk about the others. That is off the table. He stated it seems unfair. There is an uproar in the community about what took place and what is happening. The Conservation Commission was not designed to manage and operate properties. They usually give grants and assist those organizations to manage the properties.

Mr. C. Jackson stated where he was going with his line of questions was he was trying to determine, of the ones not listed here as already being managed by the Conservation Commission, who they were being managed by, what their purposes were and whether the Conservation Commission had

any involvement with them, so the technical definition of being managed by them would be answered in his mind. That is why he only asked about the first 5 because the next group, all of them, except for a couple, are managed the Conservation Commission. The bottom group are managed by the Conservation Commission. He was trying to ascertain whether or not managed by, but involved with and participating in, etc. by the Conservation Commission was more than was being indicated on the list in order to understand Mr. N. Jackson's motion. He stated he believes he heard Mr. Epps and others say that under the first grouping, they are involved but they are not managed by. In his mind, the only one that is a question is #5 - Hopkins Elementary, Old Hopkins Presbyterian Church. The others are functioning, operating, and being managed by organizations that have expertise in those areas. Historic Columbia clearly would have expertise in an area of managing the Hampton-Preston and Woodrow Wilson. The Township Board would have expertise in doing its work. Just like the Library would or any others. He does not have any heartburn with those. The only one he has a question about would the Hopkins Elementary, Old Hopkins Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Pearce inquired what a portion means.

Ms. Hegler stated it is a part of a parcel, not the whole parcel.

Mr. Pearce stated, as he recalls, the John CB Smith House is over on the Palmetto Health property. He inquired as to what they use that for.

Ms. Hegler stated staff was going through and finding County-owned property that they felt like fell into this motion.

Mr. Pearce stated that Palmetto Health manages the John CB Smith House, so that is another one. He inquired at the Hopkins Elementary, Old Hopkins Presbyterian Church.

Ms. Stone-Collum stated she was surprised to find this property. The parcel the school is on is owned by the County. On the property is the small Old Hopkins Presbyterian Church. It is a historic building and not used as a church. The school contracts with a private individual to mow and take care of it.

Mr. Pearce stated you could say Richland School District I is managing that property.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there is any information regarding how well or not well the management of Pinewood Lake has been going, as it relates to the supervision by the Conservation Commission. He inquired if it has been a problem. Is it working? Is it not working? Is it too early to tell? Is there any feedback on it?

Mr. N. Jackson stated it was managed well when it was under the non-profit organization. Since it is under the Conservation Commission it has not been managed well. As a fact, on April 10th some of the seniors who play bingo have invited the County Administrator and Council members out to the park to see what is going on. The foundation that was handling has been handling it for approximately 4 years. He understands they hired a staff person, but the staff person is really for the large tracts for the eco-tourism piece. The Commission itself had made a motion to allow the

Foundation to manage certain and the County manage certain parts. There is some misunderstanding with the staff and who should manage it. Staff said the Conservation Commission did not want to manage it, but the Conservation Commission said that is not true. They would like to keep the Foundation doing the daily operations and the commission handle repairs, cleaning the property, etc. Some people came and spoke about it and there are some more that want to come speak because they are not satisfied with the Conservation Commission's handling it.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if we could consider doing a joint or dual role of management, as apparently is being done in other instances here under the Historical & Cultural group. Unfortunately, he had only been on Council approximately 3 months when this happened; therefore, he did not know enough at the time the decision was made. He stated his concern is that Pinewood Lake Park get off the ground and functioning in a manner which will make all of proud. If it needs some more direct management assistance by someone other than the Conservation Commission, but we think the Conservation Commission makes a good neutral third-party to manage it, would we not be willing to consider having a joint oversight between the two groups.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is what the Conservation Commission recommended. Not the staff, but the commission.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, he understood Mr. Epps to say Richland County does not have any management responsibilities for the entities under the Historical & Cultural heading.

Ms. Hegler stated that is correct. Those are all done though H-Tax.

Mr. Malinowski stated he would like to hear from the Conservation Commission and/or staff on their viewpoint on how well or poorly Pinewood Lake is being managed.

Mr. C. Jackson stated when he referred to joint management he did not mean joint management with the Conservation Commission. He stated #4 on the list is joint management between Palmetto Health and the Ronald McDonald Charities. He meant joint in that sense.

Mr. Rose stated he would like to see how the meeting between staff and the seniors at Pinewood Lake Park goes and see what the Administrator's recommendations are after the meeting. He recommended moving this item to the next committee meeting and ask Mr. Seals to update us as to how the meeting went. In addition, to ask for staff's input.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to defer this item until the April committee meeting and get a recommendation from Mr. Seals.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, and Rose

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. I move to declare "bump stock" "bump fire stocks" "trigger crank" and "gat crank" trigger devices illegal in Richland County. NOTE: In 2010 the US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and

Explosives declared a “bump stock” is a firearm part is not regulated as a firearm under the US Gun Control Act or the National Firearms Act [MANNING] – Mr. Pearce inquired if Mr. Smith had any comments regarding this item. This item would require an ordinance.

Mr. Smith stated what is being posed from Mr. Manning’s motion is that the County adopt the same ordinance, which the City of Columbia has adopted.

Mr. Pearce stated the proposed ordinance will ban, in a technical sense, these particular items.

Mr. Smith stated, in effect, it bans possession of any item which has the ability to increase the fire power of a firearm. In effect, if it enhances the ability to shoot faster then that’s what this attempts to prohibit someone from having possession of.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve this item.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, and Rose

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Develop an overlay for Garners Ferry Road and Sumter Highway Corridor eastward, for setbacks, signage, borders, shrubbery, and other appearances to keep the rural character [N. JACKSON] – Mr. N. Jackson stated the citizens of the Lower Richland community have always advocated to keep the rural character of the area. They did not want it to be another Two Notch Road. They wanted it to be different. For example, as you travel to Hilton Head Island, the signage, the setbacks and everything is slightly different. The signage is low. The color scheme is similar to natural colors. If you create an overlay similar to that for that corridor it will be tune in keeping the rural character.

Mr. Pearce inquired where Mr. N. Jackson wanted to start this on Garners Ferry Road.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he wanted it to start from Lower Richland Boulevard toward Sumter.

Mr. Pearce inquired of Ms. Hegler if this is something the County does.

Ms. Hegler stated the County has a number of overlays. She was glad to hear where Mr. N. Jackson wants to start from. As you can see in the report, a lot of that is already zoned rural. She reminded the committee the County is updating the Code and we could do it at that time.

Mr. Pearce inquired if it is something that can be taken care of with the Code.

Ms. Hegler stated we could do it as an overlay, which sets a separate set of requirements on top of the underlying zoning district or we could handle it through the zoning regulations themselves. Council could reconsider how they do signs everywhere.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to consider this item during the Code rewrite.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, Kennedy, Manning, and Rose

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:29 PM.