

RICHLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT & SERVICES COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 28, 2000
5:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Bernice Scott, Chair; Susan Brill; J.D. “Buddy” Meetze; Greg Pearce; Thelma Tillis

OTHERS PRESENT: Joseph McEachern; James Tuten; Paul Livingston; Larry Smith; T. Cary McSwain; Darren Gore; Monique Walters; Marsheika Martin; Mullen Taylor; Ash Miller; Pam Davis; Andy Metts; Milton Pope; Tony McDonald; Ralph Pearson; Chief Harrell

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 24, 2000: Regular Session Meeting

Ms. Brill moved, and it was seconded, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Scott requested to move item C, Amendment to the Richland County Code: Storm Water Management, to the top of the agenda.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to move item-C to the top of the agenda. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to approve the agenda as amended. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Amendment to the Richland County Code: Storm Water Management

Ms. Scott stated she needed a motion to allow the Adams’ brothers to speak.

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to allow the Adams’ brothers to speak. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Adams requested Council to delete the variance language, section 8-25, of the Storm Water Ordinance.

A discussion took place on why the variance was needed in the first place.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Ms. Brill, to defer actions on this ordinance and answer the following questions:

- Request a written opinion from the County Attorney in regards to sections 8-25 (G, H and I) and 8-27 of the proposed stormwater ordinance.
- What do these sections establish as the policy of Richland County?
- What is the meaning of the words....”that will impede the free flow of water...” which appear in subsection (h)?
- Is there any conflict among these sections or between any of them?

Richland County Council
Development & Services Committee
November 28, 2000
Page Two

- Does the attorney have any suggestions for changes or clarifications in any of the language of any of these sections?

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Purchase of Vehicles for Special Services

Mr. McSwain stated these are replacement vehicles that have high mileage. He stated it is in the budget.

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the purchase of four Crown Victorias in the amount of \$84,863.60 for the Special Services Department.

Mr. Tuten requested for staff to look at a less expensive vehicle.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Purchase of Road Maintenance Equipment for Public Works

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to approve the purchase of two single axle dump trucks, one tandem axle dump truck, and one motorgrader for a total amount of \$256,168.00 for the Public Works Department's Road Maintenance Division. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Award of Contract for Miles Road & North Donar/Clemson Connector

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce, to approve the award of contract in the amount of \$239,280.17 to Wiley Easton Construction Co, for the implementation of the Miles Road paving, North Donar-Clemson connector, and Claudia-Hearn intersection improvement project. The vote was in favor. Ms. Scott and Ms. Tillis opposed.

Award of Contract for Sewer Relocation at US 176 & I-26

Mr. McSwain stated the State has requested the County to relocate the sewer line and they are willing to pay up to \$286,000.00.

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to award a contract in the amount of \$128,990.00 plus a 20% contingency to Wiley Easton Construction Co. for the relocation of sewer lines at the intersection of I-26 and US 176. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Award of Contract for Atlas Road Sanitary Sewer Project, Phase I

Mr. McSwain stated the City is paying \$64,000.00 for some of improvements of the change order.

Richland County Council
Development & Services Committee
November 28, 2000
Page Three

Mr. Meetze moved, seconded by Ms. Tillis, to approve a change order in the amount not to exceed \$125,061.00 to the Hobby Construction Company contract for the implementation of Phase I of the Atlas Road Sewer Project. The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS PENDING

Citizen Complaints about Genesis Cable Company

Mr. Milton Pope, Assistant County Administration, updated the Committee on the status of the review that is being completed prior to the transfer of ownership of the cable franchise. He stated Benchmark would provide to the County, free of charge, technical review of the existing system. He stated he would set up a citizen's advisory panel once that is complete.

Petition to close Vahalla Road

Ms. Brill informed the Committee that she and staff had met with neighborhood association members and that the Planning Director was preparing another proposal based on discussions that took place at the meeting.

Greenleaf Drainage Project

Mr. McSwain stated there is no change to this item; it is still tabled.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. Meetze, to adjourn at approximately 5:31 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Submitted by,

Bernice G. Scott
Chair

The minutes were transcribed by Marsheika G. Martin

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: Greenleaf Road Drainage Project

A. Purpose

County Council is requested to consider the construction and right-of-way acquisition costs associated with the Greenleaf drainage project and to make a determination as to proceeding with the project.

B. Background / Discussion

At its meeting of April 1, 1997, the County Council approved a storm drainage improvement program for construction of 15 drainage projects in the unincorporated portion of Richland County and, subsequently, authorized a bond issue in the amount of \$5,000,000 for that purpose. One of the 15 projects approved for funding is the Greenleaf Road Drainage Project.

To implement Council's action, the engineering firm of Hussey, Gay, Bell & DeYoung, Inc. was retained to prepare plans and specifications for this project. This work has been accomplished and right-of-way acquisition initiated. Two property owners were encountered who refused to grant right-of-way on their property. At its meeting of April 7, 1998, County Council authorized condemnation actions against these property owners. The appraisals required for these condemnations have been completed and they are tabulated below:

Francis C. Stuart	3546 Greenleaf Rd.	\$15,000
Eugene P. Long	3524 Northshore Rd.	<u>\$18,000</u>
Total		\$33,000

Since these amounts for compensation represent a substantial increase in the cost of this project, County Council's approval was sought before proceeding. At its meeting of July 27, 1999, the County Council directed that additional negotiations be conducted with these property owners. Since then, the lakefront property owners association for Upper Rockyford Lake, who are represented by Yancy McLeod as their environmental consultant, came out in opposition to the project. They believe that the project will result in a higher level of pollutants being discharged into the lake. Eugene P. Long is one of these property owners in addition to being one of the condemnations.

The County Engineer's office has negotiated a compromise with Mr. McLeod that, at least partially, addresses the lakefront property owners' concern regarding the discharge of pollutants into the lake. It calls for revising the plans for the drainage project to include the installation of four in-line filtration structures designed to remove some of the pollutants from the stormwater. Although they still prefer that the project not be built, they will not oppose it if this revision is made and Mr. Long will agree to grant his easement for \$10,000. Mrs. Stewart will not grant an easement under any circumstances.

C. Financial Impact

This project is funded under the storm drainage bond issue. It is budgeted at \$145,000. Uncommitted funds in the bond issue account are sufficient to cover the project under any of the following alternative but one of the lower priority projects will have to be abandoned.

D. Alternatives

The alternatives available are:

1. Construct the project as originally designed. Under this alternative, the two easements would have to be condemned and the property owners compensated at fair market value as determined by the court. At a minimum, the compensation will be the figures tabulated above. The lakefront property owners can be expected to vigorously oppose construction of the project. The projected costs under this alternative are:

Engineering	\$ 9,850
Appraisals	4,000
R/W Compensation	33,000
<u>Construction</u>	<u>171,080</u>
Total	\$217,930

2. Construct the project with the filter structures. Under this alternative, one condemnation will still be required. The lakefront property owners will not oppose the project and the right-of-way compensation is reduced slightly. The construction cost, however is increased substantially. The projected costs under this alternative are:

Engineering	\$ 9,800
Appraisals	4,000
R/W Compensation	25,000
<u>Construction</u>	<u>231,000</u>
Total	\$269,800

3. Abandon the Project. At this point, only the engineering and appraisal costs have been incurred for a total of \$13,800.

E. Recommendation

In view of the opposition to this project, the limited benefit it provides and the escalation in the cost, alternative 3 is recommended.

Recommended By: Ralph B. Pearson, P.E. Department: Public Works Date: 8/11/00

F. Approvals

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore Date: 09/12/00

Comments:

Legal

Approved as to form by: Bradley T. Farrar Date: 9/15/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald Date: 10/17/00

Comments: Recommend that the project be abandoned.

Richland County Council Request of Action

Subject: High Speed Rail Study

A. Purpose

The County Council is requested to approve a budget amendment in the amount of \$7,500 to help fund an economic impact study to convince Congress and Amtrak to consider the Southeast as the next area for high-speed rail travel.

B. Background / Discussion

According to the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, the Chambers of Commerce from several Southeastern communities created an alliance to persuade Amtrak to make the Southeast region the next area for high-speed rail. This would have an enormous impact on economic development in the region as well as provide alternative transportation from one community to another. This issue arises following Amtrak's recent introduction of high-speed rail between Washington, New York, and Boston.

In order to build a strong case to Congress and Amtrak to consider the Southeast as the next region for this high-speed rail, it must be proven to be economically advantageous to do so. The newly formed alliance has committed to raise a total of \$250,000 in the respective communities, extending from Washington, DC to Jacksonville, Florida, to study this issue. The Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce is committed to raising \$30,000, \$7,500 each from Richland County and the City of Columbia and \$15,000 from local businesses, for this effort. The first \$25,000 would fund Columbia's share of the economic impact study, while the remaining \$5,000 would be used to increase awareness of this opportunity and to lobby the Congressional Delegation and Amtrak officials.

By contributing \$7,500 towards the cost of this study, Richland County is reaffirming its commitment to the coordinated planning of a regional transportation system. By joining with other governments and businesses, the Columbia area will be united with other communities along the Amtrak corridors to position the Southeast as the next stop for the high-speed rail.

C. Financial Impact

This request would require \$7,500 expenditure and would require a budget amendment to take funds from the Fund Balance.

D. Alternatives

1. Approve the \$7,500 request to help further develop the regional transportation plan through an economic impact study for high-speed rail in the Southeast.
2. Do not approve the request and maintain the current scope of the existing regional transportation plan.

E. Recommendation

It is recommended that Council approve the request of \$7,500 to contribute to an economic impact study of high-speed rail service to the Southeast region in partnership with the other governments involved as part of a comprehensive regional transportation plan.

Recommended by: Cary McSwain Department: Administration Date: 12/6/00

F. Approvals

Planning

Approved by: Randy Jorgenson

Date: 12/7/00

Comments:

Finance

Approved by: Darren P. Gore

Date: 12/7/00

Comments: There are no budgeted funds for this study. \$7,500 will be allocated from the general fund, fund balance by budget amendment.

Legal

Approved by: Larry C. Smith

Date: 12/7/00

Comments:

Administration

Approved by: Tony McDonald

Date: 12/7/00

Comments: It is recommended that Council approve a budget amendment in the amount of \$7,500 from the County fund balance for the purpose of participation in the Southeast high-speed rail study.