



Richland County Council

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

February 26, 2019 – 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gwen Kennedy, Chair, Allison Terracio, Jim Manning, Calvin Jackson and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Trenia Bowers, Sandra Yudice, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Larry Smith, Stacey Hamm, Edward Gomeau, Ashiya Myers, Ashley Powell

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

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. December 18, 2018 – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. Kennedy, to approve the minutes as submitted.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Manning and Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

In Favor: C. Jackson, Manning and Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ELECTION OF CHAIR** – Mr. Jackson nominated Mr. Manning for the position of Chair.

Mr. Manning declined the nomination.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to nominate Ms. Kennedy for the position of Chair.

The vote was in favor.

5. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

- a. I move that all RC contracts must be reviewed & approved by the Office of the County Attorney & that notices under of modifications to RC contracts must be sent to the County Attorney, but may be copied to external counsel, as desired [MYERS] – Mr. Smith stated the Legal Department concurred that contract and amendments could come through its office; however, if those

documents would include work orders, or similar documents, given the contract level of Richland County, they would not have the staff to review those kinds of documents.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to defer this to the March Committee meeting, and have Legal give the committee a listing of what they would and examples of what they feel like they would not be able to do, or would have costs associated with it.

In Favor: Jackson, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. I move that Richland County establish an Ordinance and/or Ordinance language revision to mirror or replicate that of the City of Columbia to reduce or eliminated the public safety concerns particularly with regard to those businesses that have had shootings on their business premises...[MANNING and KENNEDY] – Mr. Manning stated it is his understanding there may be some language in the ordinance that we may want to change or remove, but given the nature of this, he would move that we approve this item to go to Council for First, Second and Third Reading and a Public Hearing. There will be opportunities, as the ordinance moves along, to take those amendments up.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to adopt the nuisance ordinance in its proposed form, with any amendments Council may desire.

Mr. Jackson inquired if this ordinance will enable the Richland County Sheriff's Department to enforce with the degree of permanency that they have told him they do not currently have.

Mr. Manning responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson inquired if this is different than what we currently have, and if so, how is it different.

Mr. Manning stated it is different in that the Sheriff does not currently have the ability to go in and close down a business. They do not just go in and make the decision. It has to meet the listed criteria. The listed criteria are what the City of Columbia instituted. You are protected under this safety if you live in the City of Columbia, but not if you live in unincorporated Richland County.

Mr. Malinowski inquired, if there are violations against Federal and State law, do we need to repeat them in the ordinance because it is a violation of the law.

Mr. Manning stated that is an example of the language they may need to be amended. He would like for Legal to give us an opinion on this.

In Favor: Jackson, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton stated Council members received a request from the Sheriff's Department that we would consider an emergency ordinance that would approve this for a pilot. She did not know if it was appropriate to bring this before this body, or what the process is.

Mr. Smith stated what is on the agenda, at this point, for consideration, and which the committee voted to forward to full Council, was the ordinance that mirrored the City of Columbia was doing. He does not believe a part of the motion phased it in terms of doing anything on an emergency basis.

- c. Public Works: Medium Bulldozer procurement – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the requested acquisition through the Sourcewell (formerly NJPA) cooperative purchasing contract.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to why this matter had to come before the committee, since it seemed to be a routine procurement process request.

Ms. A. Myers stated the pricing is over the threshold that can be approved by the County Administrator.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to what the threshold is.

Ms. A. Myers stated it is \$100,000.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Kennedy, and Manning
The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Public Works: Asphalt Patch Truck procurement – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the requested acquisition through the North Carolina Sheriff's Association.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- e. Utilities: Award of contract for SCADA System Upgrade – Mr. Jackson inquired as to the benefit of this process and what the upgrade will do that is not currently being done.

Mr. Khan stated the SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) System is the brain of the system. It has process logic controls and other equipment tied together, which automates the operation of the pump stations, treatment plants, water system. Essentially, if you have a pump station in your backyard, there are sensors, so that as soon as the water gets to a certain level it rings the alarm. At which point, it would turn the pump on. It is basically, an automated control system, which is a mandatory part of the treatment business.

Mr. Jackson stated it looks like the costs for it will be done in phases. He is curious what the total cost is.

Mr. Khan stated there are 3 phases. The 1st phase involves 7 major pump stations and the data control room. The other 2 phases are subject to the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan). The key part is it is one system. In order for it to operate in the right manner, Phase 2 and 3 have to be synchronized equipment as opposed to different types of equipment.

Mr. Jackson stated he is glad Mr. Khan said that. He does not want us to approve this part, and then hesitate or stumble when we get to Phases 2 and 3.

Ms. Wladischkin stated the Phase 1 cost is \$94,249; Phase 2, which includes Broad River - Central Site and Lift Station Remote Terminal Unit, Broad River Wastewater Treatment Plant, Eastover Wastewater Treatment Plant – Central Site and 7 RTUs is \$805,009; Phase 3, which

includes Hopkins Water System and Lift Station Remote Terminal Unit is \$100,687. The total costs would be \$999,945.

Mr. Jackson inquired how the financing for the larger piece will be done.

Mr. Khan stated it is a part of their current CIP, which will be brought to Council as a part of the fiscal budget. Subject to approval, he would like to move forward. The 2nd phase, is tentatively intended to go out in the next fiscal year, and the 3rd phase the year after.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, in addition to the things that Mr. Khan indicated, implementing this system will make it easier for us to prevent overflows and environmental problems.

Mr. Khan responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Malinowski stated, on the evaluation sheet, the higher the point value the better, but what about the cost proposal. Is it the higher the point value, the higher the cost?

Ms. Wladischkin stated the highest points awarded are for the lowest costs.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Terracio, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the upgrade of Process Control system to SCADA system.

In Favor: Terracio, Jackson, Newton, Kennedy and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

- a. Public Works: Bulk Item Collection Procedure – Community Input Report – Mr. Manning inquired if there was a list of how many meetings there were, where they were held and how many participants were at each meeting.

Mr. Braswell stated there were 6 meetings held around the county (Beatty Road, Campground Road, Blythewood, Hampton Street, Hopkins and Ballentine) and there were up to 30 people at some of the meetings. The meetings were approximately 2 hours in length. The majority of the citizens preferred keeping the same process for bulk item collection.

Mr. Manning inquired as to who made up the "Situation Team".

Mr. Braswell stated the team was put together by the former Administrator and consisted of the Ombudsman's Office, PIO, HR, Dr. Yudice, former Assistant to the County Administrator, Brandon Madden, and himself.

Mr. Manning inquired if this was specifically for this item.

Mr. Braswell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Manning inquired if the proposal was outlined in the briefing document.

Mr. Braswell stated the proposal of the Situation Team is:

- Haulers will collect bulk items from the curbside every other week on the same day as yard waste collection, alternating with the recycling week;

**Development and Services
February 26, 2019**

- The number of bulk items collected shall be limited to four (4) each collection day; and,
- The items must be able to be handled and lifted by human power.

Residents currently call into the division to schedule a pick up by the hauler.

Mr. Manning inquired if the proposal is more user-friendly.

Mr. Braswell stated the concern the residents expressed, about the proposal, was that if the bulk item were put out every other week, but happened to be put out late, it would remain on the curb for 2 weeks before pickup.

Mr. Manning inquired as to what the process will be now regarding this item.

Mr. Braswell stated it was before Council and they requested it be taken to the community.

Mr. Jackson stated, as a fact, he raised some objections during that Council meeting, and he used the term that "not all communities are created equal." He had some major reservations with this policy, as it relates to communities with HOAs and other organizations that monitor this much more closely. In communities where those organizations did not exist, there may be debris out there for weeks at a time, and debris larger than individuals could lift. He believes that is how it got referred to this committee.

Mr. Malinowski suggested having someone on the committee to make a motion to place this on the next committee agenda for action.

7. ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED:

- a. Rural Zoning vs. Open Space Provision – Rural minimum lot size is 0.76 acre lots. Open space provision will allow high density lots with green space set aside. The uses for housing are similar but the capacity is different; therefore, there should be a zoning change from any current zoning to another defined use [N. JACKSON] – No action was taken.

8. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:30 PM.