

Richland County Administration and Finance Committee March 22, 2021

MINUTES

Council Chambers 2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Malinowski, Chair, Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Joe Walker (via Zoom) and Jesica Mackey

OTHERS PRESENT: Overture Walker, Michelle Onley, Anette Kirylo, Leonardo Brown, Patrick Wright, Lori Thomas, John Thompson, Abhi Despande, Dale Welch, Nadia Rutherford, Randy Pruitt, Steven Gaither, Syndi Castelluccio, Kyle Holsclaw, Justin Landy, Geo Price, Zachary Cavanaugh, Bill Davis, Michael Maloney, David Bertolini, Stacey Hamm, Jennifer Wladischkin, Tamar Black, Aric Jensen, Dwight Hanna, Ashiya Myers, Michael Byrd, Jani Hussain and John Ansell

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Bill Malinowski called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00PM.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. <u>Regular Session: February 22, 2022</u> – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Mackey to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker, and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

. ITEMS FOR ACTION

a. Emergency Services - Emergency Management Division - Hazard Mitigation Plan Resolution

– The County Administrator, Mr. Brown, noted every 5 years Richland County goes through a process which includes 4 Midlands counties and the Central Midlands Region South Carolina to review, update and approve a joint all-natural hazards risk and mitigation plan. He noted it was important the plan is approved. Updating the plan will address the threat to natural hazards they pose to people on the property and allows the County to seek funding associated with those hazards.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to

adopt a resolution to approve the "All Natural Hazards Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan" for Richland County and the Central Midlands Region of South Carolina.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the updated plan is being written in conjunction with everyone or is one group drafting the plan.

Mr. Espinosa responded the Central Midlands Council of Governments are the stewards of the plan and contracted a consultant, but the plan was reviewed by Richland County Emergency Management Services.

Mr. Malinowski requested a list of the changes.

Mr. Espinosa responded he would provide the changes.

Mr. Malinowski requested the other units of government be listed to avoid confusion in the future.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. Emergency Services – Fire Division – Notification of Fire Intergovernmental Agreement Expiration in 2023 – Mr. Brown stated we previously discussed bringing items to the body before they expire for consideration. He noted we have an agreement with the Columbia-Richland Fire Department and the City of Columbia. The expiration of this agreement will be coming up next year. He stated there are several alternatives, which are listed in the agenda, and include, renewing the existing IGA. In conversations with the City Manager, there are things both governments want to reconsider and drafting a new IGA would the most reasonable option. He noted there is an opportunity for Council to consider other alternatives, as well. There is not an immediate need to make a decision, this is just an advance notice of the agreement's expiration.

Mr. Malinowski requested more details about the alternatives for the committee, as well as Council when it comes back. He requested Mr. Byrd provide a synopsis of what previously took place.

The committee received this as information.

c. Administrator's Office – Federal Certifying Officer and Environmental Officer – Mr. Aric Jensen, Assistant County Administrator (ACA), stated HUD, as well as other federal agencies, require a federal environmental review for a majority of their projects. As a part of that process, the County must have a designated certifying officer and a designated environmental officer. It has to be accomplished by resolution. The Certifying Officer has to be either the chair of the committee, CEO/Administrator, the Chief Administrative Officer or their designee, specifically the Council. HUD wants someone that can be held responsible for an environmental process to confirm what is actually accomplished. The Environmental Officer has to be someone that is a technical expert in environmental review. It is recommended it not be the same person as the Certifying Officer. The recommendation is for Mr. Brown, or a designated ACA, be the Certifying Officer and a technical person, of Mr. Brown's choosing, be the Environmental Officer.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the Environmental Officer can be assumed by an administering agency or consultant.

Mr. Jensen responded typically the Environmental Officer would be a third-party, or an in-house

expert in that field.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Mr. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve a resolution designating Mr. Brown, or his designee, as the Certifying Officer, and allow Mr. Brown to select an Environmental Officer, in compliance with the various federal rules and regulations.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous

d. Administrator's Office – Pawmetto Lifeline Request – Mr. Brown stated this item was introduced as a part of the Administrator's Report. It is being brought to the committee to seek direction on how to proceed. He noted the letter in the packet communicated a request for Richland County to donate their 50% of the facility to Pawmetto Lifeline.

Mr. Livingston stated 10 years ago the County and Lexington County had a problem with homeless pets. There was about 20,000 homeless pets with 90% of them being euthanized. The County wanted to gift half of the building to Pawmetto Lifeline, but was unable to due to outside issues.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Lexington County has agreed to gift their half.

Ms. Denise Wilkinson, CEO- Pawmetto Lifeline, stated, at this time, they have not approached Lexington County. She noted there are a lot of upgrades needed.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if there was a memorandum of understanding or an IGA between Lexington and Richland counties.

Ms. Wilkinson stated there were certain tasks they had to achieve annually, and they exceeded them every year.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if this building is on the list of County-owned buildings, as it is partly owned by Lexington County.

Mr. Brown responded he was not sure, but can provide that information.

Mr. Malinowski stated they would not be selling the building, but gifting it. He wants to make sure it is done in accordance with the guidelines for disposal of property.

Mr. Malinowski moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with the donation of the County's 50% interest in the facility pending the following: review by Administration and Legal of any existing IGAs or MOUs and determination if we would be in violation of anything with the donation.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey

The vote in favor was unanimous.

e. <u>Richland County Utilities - "Willingness to Serve" Letter for Savannah Wood Amenity (Tax Map Serial # R21900-06-14</u> – Mr. Brown stated before the committee is the standard "willingness to serve" letter. Anytime there is a request for service the County looks at capacity, and based on

whether or not there is capacity, the County will issue a "willingness to serve". Staff brings the willingness to serve to the committee stating they have the capacity for the request and asks the committee if they are willing to extend the willingness to serve.

Ms. Mackey inquired if this is an extension of a sewer line.

Mr. Brown stated, for example, if someone requests sewer availability for 5 taps, and the County has 10 taps available, staff would come before the committee to request to submit the willingness to serve letters notifying the individual we have 5 taps available, based on our capacity. If an individual asked for 15 taps, and we only had 10 available, we would not be able to serve them because it would be beyond our capacity.

Ms. Mackey stated, for clarification, the sewer infrastructure is already there and we are giving them access to taps.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Mackey inquired about the timeframe of when someone requests a tap.

Mr. Bill Davis, Utilities Director, responded, when a piece of property is available, the driving factor for the letters is an attempt to get the real estate sold, as it is often a requirement to have sewer and water available. He noted, when a request for taps comes in, Utilities has two responses, either we do not have capacity or we are willing to serve and a letter is issued.

Mr. O. Walker inquired if this request is for staff to issue willingness to serve letters for taps already in place, which will allow the individual to use the taps.

Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative.

Mr. O. Walker stated, in the media, it was portrayed as an expansion of sewer services. As a result, there would be a massive development to follow.

Mr. Brown stated, while the County is expanding sewer service in another community, the two issues might have gotten conflated and this request was a part of an expansion. This is just a letter stating the County's willingness to serve.

Ms. McBride inquired if there is a competitive process in granting the willingness to serve requests.

Mr. Brown responded it is first come, first served.

Mr. Davis noted if someone asked for all of the capacity, they would have to show the County a plan or resubmit for construction within one year.

Mr. Malinowski stated his concern is the letter gives someone 12 months, and they could change their mind in the 11^{th} month, and cause an individual who is ready to move forward to lose out on securing taps because of the 12-month window.

Mr. Davis stated currently we do not have the ability to stop that from happening.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in the media, it stated the committee would approve the particular sewer service to these potential developments, but that was not true. The committee, after vetting

different information and situations, recommends to Council what they think Council should do. It is Council that gives final approval, not the committee.

Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the willingness to serve letters for Savannah Wood Amenity (Tax Map Serial #R21900-04-14), McCords Ferry Phases II and III, Laurinton Farms (Tax Map Serial #R24700-02-08), Bunch Tract (Hunter's Branch) (Tax Map Serial #R21800-01-06), Bunch Tract – Commercial (Tax Map Serial #R21800-01-06), and Alexander Point (Tax Map Serial #R21900-04-26).

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey

- **f.** Richland County Utilities "Willingness to Serve" Letter for McCords Ferry Phase II and III See motion on Item 4(e).
- g. <u>Richland County Utilities "Willingness to Serve" Letter for Laurinton Farms (Tax Map Serial #R24700-02-08)</u> See motion on Item 4(e).
- h. <u>Richland County Utilities "Willingness to Serve" Letter for Bunch Tract (Hunter's Branch)</u> (Tax Map Serial # R21800-01-06) See motion on Item 4(e).
- i. Richland County Utilities "Willingness to Serve" Letter for Bunch Tract Commercial (Tax Map Serial #R21800-01-06) See motion on Item 4(e).
- j. <u>Richland County Utilities "Willingness to Serve" Letter for Alexander Point (Tax Map Serial</u> #R21900-04-26) See motion on Item 4(e).

5. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

- a. Request the Business License Ordinance be reviewed and changed to address items that are allowed by state law but are not being done by Richland County and resulting in large amounts of money not being collected. I will provide additional information to Assistant Administrator Jensen for review and handling prior to it getting to a committee [MALINOWSKI December 7, 2021]] No action was taken.
- **b.** Evaluation of Offer: Tax Map Serial # R06400-01-01 & Tax Map Serial # R06500-01-01 No action taken.
- 6. **ADJOURNMENT** Ms. Mackey moved, seconded by Ms. McBride to adjourn.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, J. Walker and Mackey.

The vote in favor was unanimous

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40PM.