



Richland County Council  
Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee  
November 27, 2018 – 12:00 PM  
Administration Conference Room  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Dalhi Myers, Chair; Yvonne McBride, and Calvin Jackson

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston, Michelle Onley, Stacey Hamm, Michael Niermeier, Brandon Madden, Ashiya Myers, Randy Pruitt, Ashley Powell and Quinton Epps

1. **Call to Order** – Ms. Myers called the meeting to order at approximately 12:01 AM
2. **Approval of Minutes**
  - a. November 5, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of Agenda** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the agenda as published. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **Department of Juvenile Justice – Staff Recommendation of O’Neil Court for a new location** – Mr. Niermeier stated at our last meeting the committee directed staff to meet with DJJ. The meeting was held on November 7<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Jeanette McBride was very amenable to granting the extension to March 2019, in order to upgrade the O’Neil Court location. The staff recommendation is to move forward with using the O’Neil Court for the needs of the Department of Juvenile Justice facility and to authorize the staff and funding to do the upgrading.

Ms. Myers noted the cost has been identified as \$50,000.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if there is any modification of the existing MOU that would be needed to extend it to March.

Mr. Niermeier stated not to his knowledge. The Clerk of Court stated, in the meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup>, that it was more than fine with her. He stated the summary of action from the meeting is enclosed in the agenda.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he is trying to see whether or not we have any confirmation, other than the verbal comments from the meeting, and do we need anything other than that to move forward.

Mr. Niermeier stated he could look into it, and see if we need anything else.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the summary came from Mr. Niermeier, and he did not see anything from the Clerk

Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc Committee  
November 27, 2018

was his only reason for his inquiry.

Mr. Madden inquired if Mr. C. Jackson thought it would be helpful for staff to send a formal letter to all parties documenting what was discussed.

Ms. McBride stated she thought that would be a good idea.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there is a plan or schedule for when DJJ can move in.

Mr. Niermeier stated Randy Pruitt will be working with the people from DJJ for the buildout. Once we are approved to move forward, and Council authorizes us to move the identified money for such use, we decide on what needs to be gutted, sanitized, and replacing a few items, including the A/C. Between authorization in December and by mid-March it should be 90-99% complete.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to direct staff to send correspondence to all parties involved outlining the extension allowing DJJ to remain at the courthouse until March 31, 2019. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve staff's recommendation to use O'Neil Court to house DJJ. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **COMET Request for a temporary bus stop on the Dillard's property at Columbia Place Mall** – Mr. Niermeier stated since the County purchased the properties at the mall we have been in discussions with the COMET regarding their interest of moving a bus stop, which is currently off property and not very convenient or conducive for their ridership, onto County property, particularly the Dillard's. They sent a proposal several months ago about a permanent stop that they would build. However, we told them we are not sure what we are doing yet, so it would be premature to put anything permanent at the facility. Mr. Scheib and Mr. Andoh came back with a proposal for a temporary stop on the Dillard's property. It would be located at the same location where the permanent would be, but it would be temporary. It would be restriped, reinforced and coned for public safety. That would allow the COMET to get what they need out of without having a permanent fixture built there. 5

Mr. Scheib, COMET's Director of Planning and Development, stated the stop they have been using for Route 501 is offsite, ADA noncompliant, and located on private property. The land they would need to improve the site is also private property. They have been looking for a new location, and were delighted when they heard the County had purchased the mall property. As Mr. Niermeier has pointed out, next to Island #5, on the Dillard's side of the building, is a good location. They would love to improve the property. He understands the County has their own needs that could delay that process. At the same time, they have a more urgent service requirement. They are bringing in service from the Northeast, coming down from Wal-Mart on Decker Boulevard, and they are trying to make connections, but they cannot because there is not enough time because the stop is on the west side of the structure. Where they need to be is on the east side of the building. If they could get on that side of the property, they would paint and cone the stop. There would not be any concrete poured or a sheltered erected. They would allow the people to wait on the buses to make transfers.

Ms. Myers inquired about people that come to catch a bus there and have to wait in inclement weather.

Mr. Scheib stated they are waiting in inclement weather now. The current location does not have shelter. They would love to have the shelter, and they are going to erect one as soon as they get permission from the County. This is an important service upgrade that they feel strongly they need to do for the benefit of all

their customers. He stated this is their busiest route. It is not adequately served by the current stop, and they are not able to make connections with the route coming up from the Wal-Mart on Forest Drive.

Ms. Myers inquired if reinforcement is needed.

Mr. Scheib stated it is entirely possible they could damage the asphalt. In that cause, they would replace the asphalt with a more durable asphalt.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what the County's major concern is regarding not going on with a permanent structure. It appears to be something that is needed for the citizens, and also for their safety.

Mr. Niermeier stated he believes it is the uncertainty of the future use of the property. If we got rid of it tomorrow, and sold it for whatever reason, then there is a bus stop there that they have invested a significant amount of money into.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what the COMET's concerns are if they put a stop there and the property was sold and the owners would want it to be removed.

Mr. Scheib stated if the amenity remaining could not be a condition of selling the property, then they would be in a pickle because that is a much needed location. His understanding was there was going to be a study done to evaluate the property. The news that perhaps it is going to be sold is new to him. He stated the Penny investment would be about \$25,000. The rest would be Federal money. If we are talking a couple of years, the Penny investment is not so great that we would not want to pursue it.

Ms. McBride stated she is really thinking about the conditions that exist now where that bus stop is. If we are able to use that land, why not go ahead and provide a protected and accessible place for the bus riders. She goes out there quite frequently, and she is aware of where they drop off and pick up. She thinks it would in the interest of the County to want the safest place for our citizens.

Mr. Niermeier and Mr. Pruitt have been out there with the COMET, and discussed it extensively. When we brought the permanent solution, a few months back, they did not have any concerns with what the COMET was going to do. It was just going back to the uncertainty of the future of the property. If for some reason it was sold down the road, it could be a contingency in the sale. In the meantime, if we are fairly certain we are going to retain the property for future use, a permanent solution is not out of the realm of being possible right now.

Mr. Scheib stated they have some sunken costs. They had their engineering consultant to draw up plans for the more permanent facility. That is something that are prepared to move on quickly, if the County wants to pursue that. They came up with this as a stop gap measure because they thought there would be more of a delay.

Ms. McBride stated they had this discussion, but she is just thinking it through with a different perspective than before. And, realizing that it is one of the major exchange points.

Mr. Niermeier stated, in light of this discussion, you could do a temp-to-perm or if the committee wants to recommend going forward with a permanent, obviously with some risk involved.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to go forward with a permanent bus stop.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, the current stop does have a shelter.

Mr. Scheib stated the current stop does not have a shelter. There is one of those advertising benches that sits under a tree.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired about the reason for moving it right against the building opposed to out at the end of the parking lot where the road is.

Mr. Scheib stated, when he met with Mr. Niermeier and Mr. Pruitt, they looked around the property for the best location to facilitate the movement of vehicles, and the proximity to the building.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it looks like the actual location of the permanent shelter that Ms. McBride is proposing would be right against Dillard's. Is that correct? He inquired as to why it could be on the edge of the parking lot, as opposed to against the building. That way if we ever sold the building, it would not impact the seller because it would be further away.

Mr. Scheib stated they have gone through several iterations of the permanent shelter because there were some engineering challenges. There was a power pole in the way, an ADA consideration, and they did not want to take out any of the trees in the earlier iterations. He believes this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration that he has shared with Mr. Niermeier. He thinks this iteration was partly because of the proximity of the building. It was their understanding that the building was going to be used a number of things their passengers might wish to access. He supposes it could be located this way.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was responding to the question regarding the possible sale of building. It would be least impacted if the location of the stop were further away from the front door.

Mr. Livingston inquired what the estimated cost will be if the structure was put there permanently.

Mr. Scheib stated the cost would be approximately \$125,000. They have a similar structure at the Harbison Wal-Mart and that one was approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Livingston inquired what the minimum cost for a temporary shelter would be.

Mr. Scheib stated, if they did a temporary solution, but added the concrete, it would be approximately \$20,000 - \$25,000, including the concrete and the shelter.

Mr. Livingston stated so you would not have invested as much if it did not work out long-term.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he is willing support the motion if Ms. McBride is willing to allow there to be some study on the location of the stop itself. He stated he would hate for us to come back a year and half later and we do in fact sell the building and we have spent \$125,000. Then, it becomes an issue with the purchaser because the bus stop is right in their front door.

Ms. McBride stated she would agree to that if we take into consideration the convenience of the riders, in terms of the location. Even if we sell the building, we still have a mall where people will still need the bus stop. She is not even thinking about selling Dillard's. She is thinking about the citizens that are using it now, and they need that space.

Mr. Scheib stated perhaps they can ask Davis & Floyd to mock up the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative where it is further out, and then we can send it back to you.

Mr. C. Jackson stated his proposal is not necessarily further out into the parking lot; it is on a different side.

He was suggesting having it run parallel with the regular flow of traffic.

Ms. McBride accepted the friendly amendment.

Ms. Myers restated the motion, with the friendly amendment as follows: to forward to Council a recommendation the COMET be allowed to use the space Mr. C. Jackson has identified across from the Dillard's store for a permanent location, rather than at the door of the Dillard's.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Report on the possible use of the Brookfield Drive property** – Mr. Niermeier stated at the last meeting staff had put forward a potential recommendation to use the donated property across from Richland Northeast High School for the Dentsville Magistrate Office. It is an 18-acre parcel. Discussion ensued and it was requested to be brought back with additional recommended uses for the property. If you go back to the study from 2007, as a part of the planning area for Trenholm/Newcastle, it was suggested use of an 18-acre parcel for some type of ballfields, park space, and walk through areas. Other areas include the Decker/Brookfield area. At the end of the day, it is a donation of 18 acres, plus an additional 7.8 acres behind it, which we have not discussed because he does not believe the County is interested in it. He cannot say he would recommend anything but what the plan states, unless we decide to go elsewhere. Moving forward, it would nice to have a really good park in that area, and what staff would recommend. As far as a new site for a Dentsville Magistrate, we can keep looking because they are not in a bad place right now with their current location at the Center Court and Decker.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to use the site, based on the plans for a sports facility. The neighborhood has long been requesting it. We have done the Comprehensive Plan, which they recommended, and would be an asset to the community.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he would hope that we would make sure to identify funding. One of the problems with the neighborhood plans, as Ashley and others know, is that the plans are very robust, challenging and dynamic, but in most cases there is not supporting funding. He wants to support Ms. McBride's motion, but he wants to be clear that there needs to be some concerted effort placed toward identifying funding or it becomes a piece of property that we have that is not able to reach its maximum utilization.

Mr. Niermeier stated the real piece would be to accept the donation of the property from the school district to Richland County. Whereas, then we would have to work with the Recreation Commission for planning for the future use of that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he sees it a little differently. He has no problem with accepting the property, but if we accept the property under the pretense that we are going to do something and we never identify the funding; in his opinion, we have accepted the property under false pretense. To him, they are conjoined. We are not accepting the property, and then figuring out funding. He is saying, we accept the property with the understanding that funding must be attached to that, by the County. When we go to the Recreation Commission, and they say we have no funding, then where are we. He has seen too many properties, in certain areas and communities of the County, that never get the funding to do the kinds of things that other communities get.

Ms. McBride inquired as to who is providing this property.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Richland School District Two.

Ms. McBride inquired if this was the property that we voted on accepting already.

Ms. Myers stated we held this in committee. There were 2 parcels. Staff was to go back and look at what they thought could be used for. Staff has now come back and said, if we accept, we should only accept the 2<sup>nd</sup> parcel, and we should only accept that parcel for use as some sort of recreational space, rather than a magistrate space.

Mr. Niermeier stated the property is not going anywhere. If we need to sit on it for a while and open discussions with the Recreation Commission; as opposed to accepting property now without a means to improve it down the line.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he knows we have a very comprehensive neighborhood improvement plan. We are getting ready to do a Comprehensive Plan update, and we probably have 5% of the money for what is in the plan; 95% of the plan is not funded.

Mr. Livingston stated one of the intent of the Master Plan was to create an opportunity, and encourage, a lot of private investment. It was never the intent for the County to fund everything in the Master Plan. He thinks it we would be a better idea not to tie it down to Recreation Commission. We might get a public/private partner that wants to create something there. There are all kinds of opportunities to make these things work.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, she thought Mr. Niermeier was suggesting was that we accept the property for recreational use.

Mr. Livingston stated he was not responding to what he was suggesting.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he said to seeking funding. He did not say from the Recreation Commission.

Ms. McBride stated she thought she said we could accept the property, if we used it for the recreational part in the Newcastle/Trenholm Road area. She does not see why we should accept the property and not know how we are going to use it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, when we take it to full Council, and Mr. Malinowski asks that very question, we need to have it clear in our head what the plan is. He can hear him asking, "How are you going to use?" and "How are you going to pay for it?"

Ms. Myers inquired if Mr. Niermeier was suggesting a revised staff recommendation. She thought he said staff would go back and see if there were uses that we could actively make of it, and find funding sources for those uses, and come back with a recommendation.

Mr. Niermeier stated, based on the plan, we have found uses for it. The 2<sup>nd</sup> part, the funding, he would have to work with Planning to identify funding.

Ms. Myers restated the motion as follows: to accept the property for potential recreational use for Newcastle/Trenholm Road.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated we will expect Mr. Niermeier to circle back with some suggestions.

Mr. Madden stated, for clarification, on the Brookfield motion it was for the Decker/Woodfield, not Trenholm Acres.

Ms. McBride stated the motion is wrong.

Ms. Myers stated this is the Renaissance Plan that it was in. She inquired if Ms. McBride wanted to correct the motion.

Ms. McBride stated she is not going to make the motion because she made it for Trenholm Road.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to reconsider this item. The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated a correction would be that the Renaissance Plan, that staff was talking about was the Decker Blvd/Woodfield Park plan from 2007. That plan contained a recommendation that there be some sort of park in that area. There was never one placed there, so they were recommending that we use this plan as the basis that it would be nice to use this property as a park.

Ms. McBride stated she remembers another plan at Trenholm.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to look for ways to fund a park, or some other recreational use, as outlined in the 2007 Renaissance Plan for Decker Boulevard/Woodfield Park area, and recommend that Council accept that portion of the Brookfield Drive property being offered by School District Two. The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **Update on the real property purchase/divestiture policy as requested by Councilman Malinowski** – Ms. Myers stated there is a draft that Mr. Niermeier has put together. She has not seen the draft, but it is circulating internally through our Legal Department, Risk Management and Procurement Department. The draft will be brought to us once it has completed circulation. She stated this is the policy on purchasing and divesting property that we asked the staff to come up with. She would expect those recommendations to be presented at the next committee meeting.

8. **Letter requesting County to purchase property at 215 Monticello Road** – Mr. Niermeier stated this is a triangular piece of property off of Monticello Road. The staff recommends not entertaining the purchase of the property.

Ms. Myers suggested, given where we are with Mr. Niermeier's recommendations, that accepting any more property, until we have a process, just creates more confusion.

Ms. McBride stated she missed the Council meeting last week. She thinks Mr. Livingston made a motion a couple of weeks ago in regards to putting in place a procedure for purchasing property. She inquired if that came up.

Ms. Myers stated that was the previous item. Staff has drafted a policy, sent it to Risk Management, Procurement and Legal for vetting, and they are going to bring it back to us at the next committee meeting.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to accept staff's recommendation. The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:42 PM