



Richland County Council

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

May 22, 2018 – 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Pearce, Chair; Chip Jackson, and Jim Manning

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Kim Williams-Roberts, Trenia Bowers, Tim Nielsen, Ismail Ozbek, Sandra Yudice, Stacey Hamm, Steven Gaither, Jamelle Ellis and Larry Smith

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. April 24, 2018 – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

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

Mr. Malinowski stated that Item 4(c) is also on the A&F Agenda.

Mr. Madden stated it is appropriately on the D&S Agenda, but was included in the A&F Agenda for information to ensure the members, not on D&S, would have a chance to review the information.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Council Motion: Move forward with the feasibility of placing a hospital/emergency care facility in the Lower Richland Community. NOTE: It is mentioned in the Renaissance Plan but no solid documentation has been presented. This motion will start the process of working with the healthcare community of developing a plan and placing a facility in the Lower Richland community **[N. JACKSON]** – Mr. Pearce stated he contacted Mr. Vince Ford with Palmetto Health who gave him an update on work that has been underway for quite some time. According to Mr. Ford, they are completing an assessment of the Lower Richland community within the next 30 days and will be

making a recommendation to management as to what type of facility will best serve the needs of the community. However, Mr. Ford stated the next step, prior to completion of the assessment, will be for him to meet with the Acting Administrator to confirm certain information that was provided to him in previous discussions with Mr. Seals. Mr. Ford has been operating under the guidance that the County was planning to provide \$8 million toward the construction of this facility, and then provide \$1.3 million annual operating for the facility. He told Mr. Ford that may be case, but Council had not taken that up and had no information about that. Mr. Ford also mentioned a location behind the Food Lion. He stated, it was Council's understanding, the project was going on Air Base Road. Mr. Ford stated it would not work on Air Base Road. After the meeting between Mr. Ford and Dr. Yudice to confirm what the County's participation is going to be, Palmetto Health will make their recommendation on what they think the needs are. His suggestion would be to defer and/or table this item until such time as those discussions take place.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the reason he made the motion was because the Renaissance Plan was more of a vision. He did not want the citizens of Lower Richland to hear about a hospital and there is no mechanism or study going on. The motion was to make sure the citizens knew there was something in the works. His understanding the \$8 million was that it was for multiple things, but not the hospital because that was coming later. He also did not know about the annual funding.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to move this item to the Renaissance Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. C. Jackson stated one of the things he was trying to do, in a previous motion he is assuming will be going to the Renaissance Ad Hoc Committee, was to look at each one of the recommended under the Renaissance effort, and to have Council make a decision on them. For example, work that is underway, work that is in progress, and buildings that were purchased at Columbia Place Mall. Yesterday, he attended the Neighborhood Improvement Council's unveiling of a Broad River Road Corridor sign, another element of the Renaissance Plan. He feels very strongly that he does not want to start piece mealizing this effort. We vote against moving forward with the Renaissance Plan, but at the same time we are possibly sending other pieces of requests to the ad hoc committee. He wants us to look at, and find out, all of the pieces and parts of the Renaissance Plan that are underway. For example, with the Lower Richland hospital, we look at the magistrate office, library and aqua center and decide on all of these so we do not keep coming back every time there is another item. He agrees with Mr. N. Jackson, but there are still, at least, 4 other items in that plan that are in the community. He would hate for us to start having meetings, voting and moving each one of them individually in that area. And, then move to Northeast Columbia and do the same thing. By default, we end up backdooring the efforts of the Renaissance Plan.

Mr. N. Jackson stated we have land we have set aside for certain uses and he would not like to waste taxpayers' money in buying more land when we have land for it. We have a Sports Complex on Garners Ferry Road we spent \$1.4 - \$1.6 million on 40 acres and that was not even considered. Certain things were missing and he wanted to make sure we do not have to spend extra money for land or put something where a feasibility study was not done.

Mr. Pearce inquired if Mr. C. Jackson was speaking for this motion.

Development and Services

May 22, 2018

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was in terms of sending it to the ad hoc committee. He does not want it to die and get lost in the ad hoc committee that may be dissolved one day and the Renaissance goes away, which by default this goes away. He feels very strongly about the hospital in that area. If we send it somewhere, let's send it someplace it is going to get vetted properly and there is an analysis done, with action necessary to make it a reality.

Mr. Pearce stated, as a member of that committee, he is anxious for the committee to get to work.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION – Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the Chair designated the item for this committee, does the committee have the right to move it to another committee?

Mr. Pearce stated we have done that previously if the committee felt the item could be more appropriately dealt with by another committee for a specific reason. His understanding of what Mr. C. Jackson was referring to was to get a whole, instead of a piece meal, approach to Renaissance and that is what the Renaissance Ad Hoc Committee is supposed to be doing.

- b. An Ordinance Amending Chapter 17, Motor Vehicles In Traffic; Article II, General Traffic and Parking Regulations; Section 17-9, Through Truck Traffic Prohibited; so as to include Hobart Rd. – Mr. Pearce inquired as to whose district Hobart Road is in.

Mr. Madden stated it is in District 2 and a portion of District 7.

Mr. Ozbek stated this request came to us several times. It covers a DOT portion, as well as a County portion. The County portion is the one they are interested in. They have also communicated with DOT. Hobart Road serves as one of the main roads between Longtown and Farrow Roads. People use it, especially big trucks, as a cut through. In order for us to place a sign and enforce no through traffic, County Council has to give their permission.

Mr. Pearce inquired if Public Works was supporting that action.

Mr. Ozbek responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve an amendment to the Ordinance, Article II. General Traffic and Parking Regulations, Section 17-9 prohibiting through truck traffic on Hobart Road and Brookhaven within Richland County.

Mr. Manning stated he has heard this has come before us a lot of times. What makes it different this time?

Mr. Ozbek stated he does not believe it ever came to County Council attention. This is the first time he is bringing it up.

Mr. Pearce stated closing it to trucks has come up. Other issues, as he recalls, related to this road came up. For example, it was a very poor road, a lot of traffic on it, and trying to get it improved.

Mr. Ozbek stated he believes Mr. Pearce is referring a fatal accident. Finally, the project is the process of going through. This road is going to be relocated and the train crossing is going to be put in a safer intersection. It is related to this also. Staff observed these heavy truck crossings. Neighbors also send them pictures of the truck traffic. Public Works thinks it is a good idea to add Hobart Road to the ordinance prohibiting through truck traffic.

Mr. Manning stated, he knows for speed humps and traffic calming there is a list of criteria. How did we decide on the 16 roads in the existing ordinance? How would we decide on this? And, would there be a set of criteria for Council members to look at to see if, based on the criteria, they might have a road that needs this same attention.

Mr. Ozbek stated there is no set criteria like there is for speed humps or traffic studies. However, it usually starts with complaints with the neighborhood. He stated we could do a criterion, but it is so rare and far between these cut through streets for big trucks. In this case, apparently over the years, there was a complaint. This has come to Public Works directly and through Ms. Dickerson. Staff went out and observed the frequencies and took pictures. If Council is aware, in their districts, they are encouraged to contact Public Works.

Mr. Manning stated, for him, if there are no criteria, other than people complaining, he is concerned about how we have nothing that is evidence based or any kind of objective, as opposed, to subjective, anecdotal, we had complaints, and we went out and took a picture.

Mr. Ozbek stated there is some criteria, as to the type of street these trucks are traveling. These are streets are 2-lane regular subdivision roads. These roads were never designed for that. They are going to tear it up and it is going to be Public Works going back and repairing the roads, at taxpayers' expense. There are alternate roads. Trucks are taking advantage of that. It was an unintentional consequence of the location of the subdivision.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if there are designated routes for the trucks, if they do not use that route to get to where they need to go. And, what is the difference in length?

Ms. Allison Steele stated she cannot say for sure the alternate route, but it is approximately a 10-minute difference. It is not a significant inconvenience for them to go around.

Mr. N. Jackson stated these subdivision roads are low volume and paved differently. There is a lot of areas trucks use through subdivisions. If there is a criterion we could say, based on the criteria, if communities start to complain. It is an inconvenience because it is a subdivision. We should not have these trucks driving through subdivisions.

Mr. Ozbek stated from the neighborhoods perspective there is noise and from the County's it is tearing up the roads because they are not designed for it.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if any of this is in the Penny Program.

Mr. Ozbek responded it is not. The only upcoming improvement is the relocation of the railroad crossing.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION – Mr. Pearce stated, if we are going to relocate the crossing on the railroad, would that not change the route of the road.

Ms. Steele stated it will shift it down a couple hundred feet. Hobart Road has two 90° degree turns.

Mr. Pearce stated it would make sense to move it to Hobart Road and connect Hobart Road as one straight shot.

Mr. Ozbek stated that will make it more convenient for the trucks. In other words, that is another reason why we highly recommend you approve this to get on the list. Public Works has spoken with DOT, since this is the DOT portion, and they will allow the County to post a sign saying "No Through Traffic Ahead" on their side also.

Mr. Pearce stated he does not believe Mr. Ozbek answered his question, which was exactly where is the relocation going to go.

Mr. Ozbek stated you will be going straight across instead of making a left and a right. The subdivision was designed for the relocation. It will make it much more convenient for the trucks if you do not have the signage and enforcement.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Ozbek to be specific with him. It will be Hobart Road to Hobart Road?

Mr. Ozbek stated it will be Hobart Road to Hobart Road.

Mr. Pearce stated so that will make it a straight shot from Longtown Road all the way to Farrow Road.

Mr. Ozbek responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pearce stated, if the road is straightened out, he now has a problem with the trucks not using the road. It will become viable route back and forth. He inquired about what he is missing.

Mr. Ozbek stated, complaints obviously, and tearing up the subdivision roads. Trucks going through a local, residential neighborhood.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the trucks are usually about 50,000 tons and subdivision is designed for motor vehicles only.

Mr. Ozbek stated it is also the repetition.

Mr. Malinowski inquired why the County does not end it at Wilkinson Drive and not make it across. Now they do not have the cut through and let the State worry about their portion.

Mr. Ozbek stated they are not doing anything on the State portion.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why we should construct a "joiner" piece from Holbart to Holbart across those tracks.

Mr. Ozbek stated that is a completely different subject. That predates him. It was part of a lawsuit.

Mr. Malinowski stated if you end it at Wilkinson Drive, then you eliminate the portion up there it will solve the problem.

Mr. Madden stated the concerns presented by Council, in regards to this item, if it is the will of the committee, staff would take this item, vet it, take in Mr. Manning's concerns about the lack of an established criteria, and then present it back to Council, at a later date.

Mr. Malinowski stated when Mr. Ozbek said, "We are going to put signage up that says 'No Through Trucks.'" That was done on Dorn Road, in his district, and did absolutely zero good. There is no one to sit there all day and enforce it. They kept going right through there anyway. And, we will probably wind up with the same thing. He would think, if it has to cross, then do some speed humps in there. If he is a big truck, he is not going to want to take my time slowing down over those speed humps. Especially, if I know I cannot go all the way across when I get to the end.

Mr. Pearce stated the Chair will entertain a substitute motion to defer this item to a future date to give staff the opportunity to examine criteria for this type of matter and review alternate solutions to this particular problem.

Mr. C. Jackson made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Manning, to defer this item.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor of the substitute motion was unanimous.

- c. Richland County Utility Systems – Sewer Rates – Mr. Madden included in the agenda packet is a briefing on the County's Utility System. As you know, we have 2 systems that operate as Enterprise Funds, or businesslike activities. You have the Broad River and Lower Richland Utility Systems. There are a number of matters that will be brought to Council for decisions, as it relates to combining that utility system or its consideration of the rates from the recently completed rate study and Capital Improvement Plan. Staff is requesting the committee to accept this as information, and allow staff, in July, to schedule 3 work sessions to allow time for Council members to attend 1 of 3 to hear a detailed briefing on this. Staff will bring this back after the work sessions for Council vetting and action.

Mr. Pearce stated the motion before us is whether or not to accept the briefing documents, as information, and approve proceeding with scheduling 3 Council work sessions in July to discuss the utility system.

Mr. Manning stated, he is still unclear, if it is important to the Council, we schedule a work session for something, but why are we scheduling three?

Mr. Pearce stated so you would be able to attend 1 of the 3. You would have 3 opportunities, according to your own individual schedule, you could attend 1 of the 3.

Mr. Manning inquired then why aren't all our work sessions in chunks of three? If it is a good idea. It's a good idea. One of the things is, we are elected 11 single member districts, and when we come together collectively, and we get the synergy, and we hear from other people, when we are all together as a Council. But, if it is better to have options, than do it that way, then it seems like all our work sessions should be done that way. Also, with these being work sessions, he will be looking for those to be livestreamed and videotaped, archived as work sessions. Because that is what we do with Council work sessions. He stated he would actually like 5 options.

Mr. Pearce stated he respects Mr. Manning's position, but he does not believe that is germane to this particular item. However, when it goes to full Council for consideration, it will would be more appropriate to bring that up at that time. He does not believe, at the committee level, we can address a procedural matter that impacts on all work sessions.

Mr. Manning stated as long as that is not a part of the agenda item and the motion, that is fine with him.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Manning to state what motion he would be comfortable dealing with. For example, to accept the briefing document for information.

Mr. Manning moved, to accept the briefing document as information and forward to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Pearce stated, for clarification, on scheduling the work sessions.

Mr. Manning stated that is what the item is. He did not think that was actually the item. He stated Mr. Pearce said it was not germane for us as a committee to take that up.

Mr. Pearce stated he does not believe it is because he does not believe a committee can make a recommendation.

Mr. Manning stated that is why he said to send it to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Pearce stated, so your motion is, to take this item and send it to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if this was time sensitive.

Mr. Madden stated the decisions that need to be made for the utility system are time sensitive. Understanding a lot of the information regarding the utility systems that, that information can be somewhat complex. The intent was to allow the time for staff to walk Council through those decisions and the backup information supporting, or not supporting, those decisions.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, if in fact it goes to Council and Council recommends that we conduct work sessions, we basically just lost the time if we would have done it directly by forwarding a motion from this committee.

Mr. Pearce stated he believes that is correct.

Mr. Malinowski stated, if it was recommended that there be 3 work sessions, he would not think it is too time sensitive. Also, in coming back with information for the work sessions, he noticed in the water portion that the more water a person uses the cheaper the price gets. He would think that is backwards in this times, if we are trying to conserve. That is people want to be wasteful and use more, or need more water, they should have to pay more. Why give someone an incentive to use more.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is not sure if staff has received information from Central Midlands Council of Governments yet, but there is an option that the County may be able to take over another sewer system. It was approved by Central Midlands recently.

Mr. Madden stated he has not seen it, as of yet, but that does not mean we have not received it.

Mr. N. Jackson stated Central Midlands did approve giving Richland County an option to purchase a large system. If we take it over it will have an effect on the rates.

Mr. Pearce stated, for the record, that we no longer have a quorum.

ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED

- a. Council Motion: Review Section II(i)(2)(4) of County Ordinance 043-14HR, "If twenty-five (25%) percent or more of all such property owners decline said road paving, then the subject road shall not be paved". This seems to go against the way most items are done in our country, by majority, so why shouldn't a majority also decide if a road should be paved or not? [MALINOWSKI] – No action was taken.
5. **ADJOURNMENT** – Due to the lack of a quorum, there was no action to adjourn the meeting.