



Richland County Council

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

November 16, 2017 – 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Seth Rose, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Chip Jackson, and Dalhi Myers

OTHERS PRESENT: Joyce Dickerson, Bill Malinowski, Greg Pearce, Norman Jackson, Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Shahid Khan, Ismail Ozbek, Michael Byrd, Tracy Hegler, Synithia Williams, Jamelle Ellis, Shane Kitchens, Will Simon, Brad Farrar, Geo Price, and Larry Smith

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Rose called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. October 24, 2017 – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Council Motion: Move to examine the EMS Department and receive a report on its current status [ROSE] – Mr. Rose stated Mr. Byrd was requested to provide hard numbers regarding the needs of the EMS Department.

Mr. Byrd stated in the agenda packet is a memo to Mr. Seals outlining the expenses and issues the EMS Department is attempting to address through the strategic initiative and the 2nd Year budget. Through the strategic initiative we have been identified \$2.5 million for funding capital needs for this year, which is awaiting Council's final approval on the repurposing bond process.

Mr. Rose stated he believes this passed the A&F Committee last month and is presently at the Council level.

Mr. Byrd stated the additional funds that are needed for the remaining portion of this budget year have been identified through the strategic initiative and by working with administrative staff and the Executive Committee Team. They have identified funding for any potential operational shortfalls to carry them through the budget year. Also, they are looking at several other incentives: night shift differential pay, salary gap, holiday pay, etc.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired of Mr. Byrd as to which bullet point he was presently on in the memo. He further stated Mr. Byrd enumerated the \$2.5 million, but it appears Mr. Byrd skipped over the

bullet points in the middle of the memo. It was requested that Mr. Byrd go back and cover those items.

Mr. Byrd stated Council was aware the absorbing the additional cost of dependent health coverage was a major step for all County departments, including EMS. They currently have \$200,000 in funding available in this budget year for equipment. Mr. Seals has given them an additional 8 positions, which they are working on filling now. As a part of the strategic initiative \$200,000 has been set aside for tuition reimbursement and other programs to increase the starting salaries for EMS, as well as, 5% raise for all incumbents. They are working with HR on the completion of the Comp & Class study, which they hope will show they need to made additional improvements in salaries.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there was an itemized budget that identifies how the \$200,000 for equipment is to be spent.

Mr. Byrd stated they are halfway through that process and are currently working on that.

Mr. Rose inquired if it was fair to say the first bullet points are already being implemented.

Mr. Byrd responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Rose stated that brings them down to the nightshift differential pay, salary gap pay, and holiday pay.

Ms. Myers inquired about the total amount that has been added to the budget to address the bullet points in the top half of the memo.

Mr. Madden stated if you combine the totals that are there, you are looking at upward of \$3 million to address capital, personnel, wages and equipment needs at mid-budget.

Mr. Byrd stated HR is studying the issues of differential pay, salary gap pay and holiday pay to determine if there is any best practices.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired once that has been resolved, if that would be something that would be recommended for implementation in the next fiscal year's budget or, as Ms. Myers suggested, mid-year and picking it up now.

Mr. Madden stated staff, including ESD management and the ECT, have been engaged in putting the details in with these initiatives. When you are dealing with pay there are certain things for IRS purposes that has been fine-tuned, so you are not crossing any lines with benefits that are not properly recorded. Once that is done, staff is prepared to provide a recommendation to Council through the committee process.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if that would be this fiscal year or next fiscal year.

Mr. Madden stated it would be in this fiscal year, unless there is a reason why it would be more advantageous to discuss it during Council's normal budgetary process.

Mr. Byrd stated personnel is also a part of the strategic initiative. Mr. Seals has stated they will add 24-48 new positions between this and the next budget year. Operations needs continue to rise. They have identified several areas of potential shortfalls, including medical supplies. Mr. Seals has identified funds that will assist in dealing with any shortfalls this fiscal year.

Development and Services

November 16, 2017

Mr. Pearce stated, with regard to supplies, that is not totally a financial situation, but an availability problem.

Mr. Byrd stated there is some availability problems. They have to seek out alternatives. For example, there is one major drug manufacturer that is located in Puerto Rico that has been offline, so there have been potential shortages in some of those medications.

Mr. Pearce inquired about the narcan situation.

Mr. Byrd stated he believes it is presently stable.

Facilities have been identified and they have been working on those for several years. There have been space studies and cost estimates done with projections of approximately \$25 million for the Emergency Services facilities, which includes the potential for a 911 Center. That project has now been incorporated into the master facilities and needs assessment and plans.

Mr. Rose inquired as to when that happened.

Mr. Byrd stated it has been in the Renaissance program for several months.

Mr. Rose inquired if it would stand on its own.

Mr. Byrd stated he does not believe all of the details have been worked out, so that is something they are continuing to work with Administration on.

Mr. Madden stated they have been actively engaged in a comprehensive facility needs assessment. In addition to ESD, they have been examining all of County's operations, including those that fall outside of Council's directives, but we provide office space for by the State. What we want to do is present a plan that addresses all those needs. ESD and EMS is included in that, as well.

Mr. Byrd stated the Administrator's Office, Finance, Budget and ECT members have been working to ensure that we will not have any budget shortfalls the remaining part of this budget year.

Mr. Rose stated he wants to know, as a County Councilman, what are the needs of the department. His point is he does not want it to be so much that we are not going to have a shortfall. He wants to ensure that we are not just adequate, but that we have what we need. Maybe that means purchasing something else. That is what he is looking for guidance on, what are the needs of the department. He does not want something to happen and them say, "This committee vetted this issue and we did not have what we needed." As Director of this agency, he requested Mr. Byrd to tell him, what his needs are to be a top notch department? What do you need right now? Because he does not want us to be inadequate. He wants us to have the best. As he recalls, the last time we were talking about the need for 48 positions almost immediately.

Mr. Byrd stated they do need the positions. Mr. Seals is working hard to make that happen.

Mr. Rose stated the 48 does not include the 8. The plan is to hire additional 48 employees over the next 2 years, but he inquired if those employees are needed today.

Mr. Byrd stated realistically there is approximately 6 months left in this fiscal year. They can get geared up for the next positions by the time the new fiscal year begins. He further stated they have to recruit people and that is very difficult right now.

Mr. Rose stated he was hoping to hear this is the needs (i.e. personnel, supplies, etc.). He inquired if there is some top notch thing needed in ambulances the County does not presently have that needs to be funded.

Mr. Byrd stated there are some things that are needed, but those are funded in the \$2.5 million and the \$200,000. They are concerned about potential shortfalls in several operational accounts: communication expenses, uniforms and equipment, laundry and linen, and medical supplies. Working with the strategic initiative those funds have been identified to be available for the rest of the current budget year.

Mr. Rose inquired if they are going to continue to order.

Mr. Byrd stated they are going to continue to order the needed supplies and equipment.

Ms. Myers inquired if it was Mr. Byrd's opinion the EMS Services, as they stand today with the additional \$3 million given to the department mid-budget, we stand ready and no one should be nervous at night about the department. She reiterated that Mr. Byrd stated there were potential budget shortfalls, so currently there is no budget shortfall.

Mr. Byrd stated that is correct and they will continue to order supplies and equipment they need.

Ms. Myers stated with the assurance the County will pay those supplies because if they are needed for EMS we are certainly not going to let the bills stand out and not order.

Mr. Byrd stated Mr. Seals has been very clear about that.

Ms. Myers stated she agrees with Mr. Rose. We want to be sure everything the department needs to operate at topflight capability is provided. She inquired if the additional positions and \$3 million in funding will sustain the department until the Comp & Class study is completed and the needs evaluation is finished.

Mr. Byrd responded in the affirmative. He stated they are in the process of determining what the needs are for the next budget year.

Mr. Malinowski inquired about who made up the County's Executive Committee Team.

Mr. Byrd stated the Executive Committee Team is made up of the department directors and they meet every Monday to go over tactical and strategic challenges.

Mr. Pearce stated it seems to him the most critical issue is the number of people we have employed. All the money in the world can be appropriated, but if the people are not out there for the job that continues to present a problem.

Mr. Byrd stated the number of paramedics available are very few and they would have to compete with other agencies to attract those paramedics to come to work for us.

Mr. Pearce stated the media reported that Calhoun County has raised their salaries. He is fearful we are going to get into a bidding wars where we raise our salaries and they raise theirs to keep their people. He believes the initiative he spoke to Mr. Byrd about regarding a job pool or career lab needs some priority attention. The suggestion is, we have an EMT training program here locally, and a part of Mr. Seals' package was to provide some incentive to pay tuition for that. Once

you come in as an EMT you need a career ladder and you want to move up to be a paramedic, but there is no way to become a paramedic in Columbia.

Mr. Byrd stated there is a training center for the Midlands region. It is not located in Richland County. The center is located on Leaphart Road in Lexington. There are 5 employees currently enrolled in class. An additional 15 candidates will start the program in January.

Mr. Pearce inquired if there would be any benefit to having a training facility in Richland County.

Mr. Byrd responded in the affirmative. He thinks there is an option for that and there have been preliminary discussions with the institution to do something.

Mr. Pearce stated there is a Medical University, a hospital with one of the finest simulation centers in the southeast, and a technical college that presently prepares the EMTs here. He inquired if there were people going to EMT school and if their positions are competitive.

Mr. Byrd stated currently the County is not paying for anyone to go to EMT school. Our emphasis now is putting EMTs into paramedic training.

He stated he does not want us to lose sight of the fact that we can provide this money and have those positions sitting there, but if there is no one applying for the job those positions are not going to do us any good.

Mr. Byrd stated he believes Mr. Pearce is right and there needs to be a career line. He hopes that is addressed in the Comp & Class study.

Mr. Pearce stated he believes that is the point Mr. Rose was making. We do not want to be an adequate EMS. We want to have an exceptionally good quality emergency program. The only way we are going to do it is to have people willing to come here to work for us for a period of time and make their careers here.

Mr. Byrd stated that is why the other incentives mentioned earlier is important.

Mr. C. Jackson stated although he agrees with Mr. Pearce. He believes a comprehensive look at all of the issues that would cause persons not to come into or leave our organization needs to happen. He states although he thinks pay and inadequate pool have an effect, the culture, climate, and morale within the organization impacts if a person wants to come into, stay within and take advantage of a career ladder within our organization needs to be a part of the discussion. To exclude any of those would be doing a disservice. Excluding the career path may not work. In his opinion, excluding the fact there needs to be a serious look at how people feel about their organization, we would have the same problem.

Mr. Byrd stated he agrees and they have tried to identify some of those things and make corrections.

Ms. Dickerson stated Mr. Pearce's comments addressed some of her issues. She agrees having money is one thing and having the personnel to do the job is another. How the program is set up is important. And how you design the program where it attracts and retains employees. Then they can look at way of growing and promoting employees. Having a quality program with the finances needed need is important to her.

Mr. Malinowski stated we need to find out what percentage of employees in this particular profession stay and make a career out of it with other counties. He believes we need that prior to coming up with a package to offer someone. In fact the statistical data shows that only 10% ever stay and make a career anywhere.

Mr. Byrd stated SC DHEC, as well as the SC EMS Association, are independently, but concurrently are looking into those exact issues because it not only affects us. It affects the entire State.

Mr. Rose stated it is his understanding right now Mr. Byrd is satisfied with all of the things the Administrator has put in place. He inquired if the committee is being requested to do anything at this time.

Mr. Byrd stated, from the perspective of the agenda, he request this be accepted as information. He also requested support whenever this come before Council for the 2nd year of the Biennium budget process.

Mr. Rose inquired at this time, based on staff, if Mr. Byrd feels he is on target.

Mr. Byrd responded in the affirmative. He stated they need to get the 8 positions filled and that should get them close to the next budget.

Mr. Pearce stated he is not a member of the committee, but he would encourage the committee to request to have a quarterly report, so this issue stays in the forefront and allow Council to monitor the progress.

Mr. Rose stated that is an excellent idea.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to incorporate into the minutes a request that there be a quarterly report by the Director of EMS to this committee, which will then be forwarded to full Council.

Mr. Rose stated there is a motion on the floor to accept Mr. Byrd's report as his recommendation, as information only, and there be a standing quarterly report from the EMS Director to the committee beginning in January 2018.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Rose, and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Council Motion: Require that all municipal utility service providers must request consent and approval from Richland County Council prior to extending or accepting water and sewer infrastructure within the unincorporated boundaries of Richland County [MALINOWSKI] – Mr. Rose inquired if the IGA requested by the committee had been drafted.

Mr. Madden stated staff prepared a draft IGA and provided back to committee, as directed. The recommendation of the committee will be taken to full Council and proceed from there.

Mr. Rose requested Mr. Madden to outline the major points of what the IGA is to accomplish.

Mr. Madden stated essentially the IGA is attempting to put more teeth into the committee's directive. Initially, there was a letter provided by the City to the committee, which was reviewed.

The letter lacked the teeth needed to make it substantial. This is an attempt to be more of a substantial push for what the committee requested.

Ms. Myers stated the IGA is pretty true to the statute and what we are all supposed to be doing, but in Section 3 there is no time limit on how quickly the Administrator has to respond to the City. Many of the developers raised that as an issue that it might take some time. She inquired if we intentionally did not include a time limit for the Administrator to respond or if that was just an omission and staff would like a recommendation from the committee.

Mr. Smith stated there is not a timeframe in Section 3. There is one in Section 2. They were operating from what was actually in the letter that was sent. In Section 2, it contemplates that there would be an annual meeting and review of the City's plans they had for capital improvements that may affect the County in our service area. Those plans would be reviewed and, at that point, we would get some idea about any concerns we had. Apparently, once we got their plans we were required to meet within 30 days to discuss the plan if we disagreed. Section 3 talks about the fact, once the plan is reviewed, before the City can implement, construct or extend any lines they still have to get written approval from the County Administrator and/or County Council. Depending on how Council wants to set it up. This document is still a work in progress, if you will. We attempted to take the letter from the City and put it in some type of form that would bind both the County and the City. Certainly any recommendations the committee has to amend the IGA we will carry out your directive.

Ms. Myers inquired if the Planning Department had been consulted to find out how long it would take them to look at something and give Mr. Seals a recommendation.

Mr. Madden stated that specific question was not posed to the department, but we can do that.

Ms. Myers requested that a discussion take place with the Planning Department to determine what they consider a reasonable time for them to give a recommendation. The Administrator is not going to know as much as that team will and that is going to be where the bottleneck, if there is one, happens. Putting time limits around it may be helpful.

Mr. Rose inquired if this would come to Council for approval or is it just Mr. Seals and the Executive team. When they say consent is required, whose consent?

Mr. Madden stated, as a best practice, items that come to the Administrator typically would come before Council either through the committee process or directly to Council for action and/or information. In this instance, the intent is for it to come to Council via the Administrator. Once received the County Administrator would transmit the request through this agreement to Council or committee for review and feedback.

Mr. Rose inquired if it had been determined that Richland County is a service provider. He stated when he tried to wrap his brain around this, we do not have a water system. The statute refers to a service provider.

Mr. Smith stated he believes what the statute says is if we are not providing that service in our service area. While the County is not a large water service provider, there are certain sections in the County in our designated service area where we do provide that service. Obviously, we do not provide it in every part of our designated service area but it is provided for by the County in certain parts of our service area.

Ms. Myers stated, for example, SCE&G and all of the co-ops have assigned service territory. They do not all provide service in every corner of those territories, but the service territory has been assigned to them. So it is their right to provide service in that territory. If SCE&G wants to run a line in Tri-County Electric Co-op's territory they have to get permission because the territories are designated. By analogy, what happened in this plan was the County was assigned the territory that is unincorporated in Richland County and the City was assigned the boundaries of the City. There may be parts of the City where they are not technically providing service, but we cannot by right go there and the converse is true with the County. She believes the service territory designation does not mean we are currently running lines and providing service. It is our designated territory.

Mr. Malinowski stated there are 2 similar motions that will likely be coming to this committee recommending the County revisit providing water service to certain areas of Richland County. Without getting something in place, we will never be able to act on those motions or determine where, or if, we want to provide any type of water service because we never know what is going to happen from one day to the next. If we continue to drag this one out, like we have for approximately a year, then we will never come to any resolution on it because we keep sending it back for a tweak here and tweak there. He further stated if he was the City he would sitting there grinning like a Cheshire cat saying "well as long as they keep it in that committee, keep running the lines all over the place." We are not restricting them and he does not know if there is any legal remedy to go back and have them pull up the lines. He believes we need to begin to make some decisions and do it soon.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he would caution us not to overcomplicate the matter and muddy it. He believes there 2 issues. One issue is the builders and contractors who are attempting to do business are willing to comply with whatever ordinance is in place in order for them to be able to do their work and do their business. And then there is another issue about whether or not we believe there is any encroachment going on by the City, as it relates to being a water provider and services being provided. As he understood the motion the first time it came through, there needed to be approval given to authorize the City to be able to run those lines. Without that approval it would be unauthorized. If we now are going to talk about whether or not we even want them to have a right to even be able to do it in the first place, he believes that is a legitimate question and point to be raised. He is not sure, based upon the existing motion before the committee that is specifically what this speaks to. His point is, he would hope there would be the possibility of some sort of dual track. When a request was made to the City, the City would then simultaneously make that request to the County. Whatever amount of time it took for the City to respond, we would use that as the same litmus for the length of time it would take for us to respond. If our response reached the City in a favorable way, then the individual or organization would be notified. If it was unfavorable, again within that same timeframe, they would be notified. He would hope, like Mr. Malinowski said, we would not start dragging this out to the point that we go from a very simplistic request, and a reasonable turnaround time, to becoming really complicated in trying to determine whether or not we are going to prevent any encroachment by the City.

Mr. Rose stated maybe there is a way the IGA is drafted that could spell out how requests come in and it is running a simultaneous track rather than they are done with the process.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if the City had an opportunity to review and give feedback on the IGA.

Mr. Madden responded they have not. The intent was to receive feedback from the committee first and then provide it to the City.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to work into the IGA the time response (i.e. simultaneous track outlined by Mr. C. Jackson) and forward to the City for their feedback.

Development and Services

November 16, 2017

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Council Motion: If Developers, Builders, etc. cause any hardship on any community due to poor workmanship or unapproved or unpermitted work of any kind that fails, all of their building permits should be pulled and the builder not allowed to build until they fix the problem(s). The homeowners, nor the citizens, should have to pay to fix poor workmanship [N. JACKSON] – Mr. Madden stated included in the agenda packet is a brief narrative on the motion and what staff is currently doing regarding this. There are a few issues to be considered when it comes to unapproved or unpermitted work. Any specific questions regarding this item should be directed to Ms. Hegler.

Ms. Hegler stated staff is looking for direction on this item. Currently if we find out work is being done that unapproved, unpermitted or has any violations of our standards we do cite them. If you are requesting to do more than that, we need direction.

Mr. N. Jackson stated Alexander Pointe, a development in his district, has a stormwater system was built without approval from the County. The entrance to the subdivision was built without approval from SCDOT. They have built over 200 houses and it is too late for DOT to move the entrance. There are only two 12-in. pipes carrying the water from the subdivision. It needs four 48-in. pipes. The developer did not get permission. There was not a study done and they built it. The County is going back and checking all the records and now the citizens have to pay for what they did. We met with legal for approximately 3 hours and legal told them to do their job. His point is we have bad apples sometimes. If we have rules and you do not abide by those rules and do something that is going to cause additional expense by the citizens, he does not believe that developer should be able to get a permit to build another house in Richland County until they pay to correct the problem. They should not say well it is too late. The development is about 8 years old and they are going to build another 200 houses in the same area, but they are not going to worry about it. A school bus almost overturned, with children in it. SCDOT has to block the road when it rains heavy because the children could drown or there could be a terrible accident because they did not follow the rules. He stated he is not trying to punish anyone. He is just saying, if you do not do the right thing there should be some rules to say you cannot do anything else until you clear it up. If the County has a contract with a contractor and they refuse to complete it or do it right, at the end of the day, we are telling them you will never get another contract until you do the right thing. So what is the difference in holding developers accountable for doing things wrong or their misdoing? They should be do the right thing and there should be rules or a policy to protect the citizens so they do not have to pay for the developer's mistakes.

Ms. Dickerson stated she has a rural community in her district that put up pools on top of septic tanks. The developer did not come to Council for a zoning change, so it was developed based on the rural standards.

Ms. Hegler stated the standards staff enforce are the ordinances and regulations that Council put in place. At that point of development, it does not come to you. We are checking the plans to ensure they meet those codes and ordinances. If they do, we are required to approve it. If they did not come before us, which is what she believes Mr. N. Jackson is addressing, when we find out about them we do have the authority to cite and fine. It may be a case where we need to go back and investigate that to ensure they did everything properly. Not all plans come before Council, but re-zonings do.

Ms. Dickerson stated that would also create a problem with roads. Basically, what happened to those developments because they developed them rural there were road problems later the County would not accept those roads because they had not come up to standard. Had they gone through the proper zoning, we probably could have addressed that issue. She inquired if that rule applies when they build rural and do not come before Council. And they do not get a zoning change and they build these roads that are substandard.

Mr. N. Jackson stated if he was to go and build a house today and did not get a permit from the County he would have to tear it down. If the building inspector comes and I'm building a shed and did not get a permit from the County, I have to tear it down. He has seen where we have problems and 20 years later we are taking over some roads in a development, but it was not build to standard. At the time, they got away with it and we have to pay to take it over. The citizens are the ones that suffer. They should be held accountable. He is not sure what we have in the policy to hold them accountable. If they say it's too late now and they do not have any money, but they continue to build Phase III and IV that is a problem.

Mr. Rose inquired if we have inspections that are real time or is that something that needs to be beefed up? He knows we have legal recourses. For example, if we catch someone in the act of not building to specifications, we can then get Mr. Smith to obtain an injunction, etc. through the court process. To address the concerns, we need to be sure we are being proactive to catch the noncompliance and not 20 years down the line. He inquired if we are actively going around and checking as the building is taking place.

Ms. Hegler stated they have inspections at all stages. She stated if you notice in the motion there are comments about developers and builders. These are different stages of development. Different teams review them and there are different inspectors for each. Assuming they came through and got a permit for it, they are actively inspecting it so they can catch it if there is a violation of the ordinances. If a building is being built that they do not know about, that did not come through them, they rely on hearing about it from others. They are actively inspecting construction site, buildings being built and insuring approved plans are being done to specifications.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to hold this item in committee and request Ms. Hegler to provide the existing language so the committee can analyze the language to determine if it needs to be beefed up.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Council Motion: HOA's operated by developers or management firms should be fined if due to their poor management, and not that of the homeowners, it causes a hardship on the homeowners or community. NOTE: There are improperly maintained detention ponds that have trees growing in them which causes flooding during a bad storm [N. JACKSON] – Mr. Madden stated staff is seeking additional direction. In addition to what staff is currently doing, are there any suggestions or directives from the committee or Mr. N. Jackson related to this motion?

Mr. N. Jackson stated he had spoken to legal about what has been happening. Usually in a development the developer manages the homeowners' association until it is 100% built out. They have rules or governance of the development. Apparently some of the companies that manage these homeowner associations does not have board members, bylaws, etc. When the homeowners ask what they are doing with the regime fee or annual fees the homeowners get no response, but are threatened by the management company they will put a lien on their property if they do not

Development and Services

November 16, 2017

pay. He has constituents complaining this is unfair and inquiring about what they need to do to hold them accountable. He stated he needs information from staff or legal if there is anything Richland County can do in the initial plan development when the plans are submitted to the County or when they register the governance with the Clerk of Court's Office. Or if there is any recourse for the citizens. His understanding so far is that if they do not a board or bylaws they cannot force the homeowners to pay a fee, unless that is established.

Mr. Rose stated the committee was out of time and requested Mr. Madden to incorporate Mr. N. Jackson's comments.

Mr. Rose moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to hold all remaining action items in committee.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Myers, Rose and McBride

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. To simplify the emergency preparedness process in the future, I move that Richland County coordinate with the City of Columbia and other municipalities to identify different types of emergency shelters/facilities and certify them, meaning what is required and the readiness of the facility factoring in accessibility due to potential obstructions i.e. impassible bridges, roads, etc. Working with recreation centers, schools districts, churches and other civic centers to qualify and certify these facilities to accommodate citizens in need during certain crisis. In this process each certified facility would be updated annually. Working with Councilmembers willing to participate from each district would also improve the process. NOTE: Shelters to include overnight stay, storage and accommodate the Red Cross and other agencies. Facilities to include storage for distribution to designated areas [N. JACKSON] – This item was not taken up.
- f. Council Motion: Direct staff to research changing the ordinance relating to water runoff so in the future it will require environmental studies and not allow any runoff that exceeds the current runoff from the undeveloped property. This motion should be reviewed/completed and provided to the Planning Commission no later than their June meeting [MALINOWSKI] – This item was not taken up.
- g. Petition to Close Portion of Old Percival Rd/Spears Creek Rd – This item was not taken up.
- h. Deed to the City of Columbia for water lines serving the Ballentine Branch Library – This item was not taken up.

5. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS

- a. Council Motion: Develop an emergency plan with SCDOT to immediately repair Rabbit Run Road and Bitternut Road. Developers' constant neglect to repair the storm drainage system causes dangerous flooding. A school bus almost overturned in the flood this morning (April 24, 2017) on Rabbit Run Road. We cannot afford to endanger the lives of citizens, especially school children because of neglect [N. JACKSON] – No action was taken.
- b. Council Motion: Direct Legal to research what is required to enact a parking ordinance in communities/subdivisions [McBRIDE] – No action was taken.
- c. Council Motion: I move that we re-allocate some of the funding we used to increase the general fund balance farther above the minimum policy amount than it already was, and given that the FY16-17 budget produced a surplus, to EMS [MANNING] – No action was taken.

Development and Services

November 16, 2017

- d. Council Motion: If an employee is in need of sick leave, any employee can donate that leave to a specific person and not just a sharing pool [MALINOWSKI] – No action was taken.
 - e. Revisit the 2002 Richland County Water Plan, and any updates, for providing water to unincorporated areas of Richland County and in conjunction with the future Lower Richland Sewer Project [MALINOWSKI and MYERS] – No action was taken.
6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 PM.