



PROPERTY DISTRIBUTION MANAGEMENT AD HOC COMMITTEE
October 15, 2018 – 3:00 PM
Administration Conference Room
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

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

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Michael Niermeier, Sandra Yudice, Stacey Hamm, Chris Cowan, Jeff Ruble and Brandon Madden

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Myers called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 AM.
2. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 2, 2018** – Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to adopt the agenda as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **Presentation: Staff Recommendations for Richland County Space Use** – Dr. Yudice stated staff has prepared a presentation that will give the committee some background, will address the issues and some assumptions staff has made, and the priorities and recommendations.

Mr. Niermeier stated we have growing needs and public safety concerns. We have upcoming operation and maintenance costs that we are dealing with. Funding is prime for the capital improvements. The BAN, for the previous Renaissance Plan, was deferred. The BAN may still be viable down the road. Staff was directed to analyze the date they had and present it to the committee.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired about what we are paying on the BAN. He inquired if we are paying interest on the money.

Dr. Yudice stated we have not issued it.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the last time he asked this question, he asked it incorrectly, and the answer was that we have not drawn any money down, so we are not paying anything. Later, he found out that, in fact, when we authorized the access to the funds that we are now paying something on that debt. He stated, for clarification, that we are not paying anything because we have not drawn any money down.

Dr. Yudice stated we have not issued the BAN for the Richland Renaissance. Council did not approve that.

Ms. Hamm stated it only went to 2nd Reading.

Mr. Niermeier stated it was deferred at the June 1st meeting, along with the Renaissance.

Dr. Yudice stated the BAN that we issued was for the transportation. We issued that for \$250 million, but for Richland Renaissance we did not.

Mr. C. Jackson stated maybe that was what he was thinking.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that was a \$8 million BAN that we deferred.

Ms. Hamm stated it was a \$20 million BAN.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that it was deferred on June 1st.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was supposed to be 3rd Reading, and Council decided to defer it, along with the other piece of that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the one that Mr. Cromartie presented on, would have been?

Ms. Myers stated it was the Penny BAN.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, he thought Mr. Cromartie was presenting on these.

Dr. Yudice stated since the Richland Renaissance Plan was deferred we have not brought anything back to Council.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he must be thinking about the Penny then.

Mr. Niermeier stated the current issues we face in the County are:

- ❖ Public Safety facilities are inadequate to meet our current and future needs
- ❖ There is a lot of code compliance, operation/maintenance costs that have been programmed for roofs, HVAC, boilers across the County in different buildings.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have a ballpark number on what the proposed improvements would cost.

Mr. Niermeier stated new boiler placement for Judicial Center is \$130,000; HVAC upgrade is \$12.5 million; total upfit/replacement/renovation would \$81 million.

Dr. Yudice stated the projected cost for the new Judicial Center was \$104 million.

Mr. Niermeier stated replacement of the chiller/cooling tower for the Administration/Health Department would be \$9.5 million. The upfit for the Department of Social Services warehouse of \$3.2 million. He stated, if you look at the DSS building, there is a portion to the left that is just a warehouse they were going to upfit to make more office space. We had done preliminary drawings, but it was placed on hold last Summer.

Ms. Myers stated we have the 3-year old analysis for the Courthouse at \$81 million and the HVAC for \$12.5 million. If we only did upfit and maintenance on the Courthouse that takes us over the cost of a new building.

Mr. Niermeier stated it is pretty close.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the DSS warehouse upfit is \$3.2 million.

Mr. Niermeier stated we had architectural drawings done and the total cost that was determined was \$3.2 million to make it more of an office space because it is just a big warehouse, at the moment.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he took a tour of DSS after the last meeting, and had the new Director to take him through the building. He stated they need a building. The building is not even close to being adequate

to meet the needs. It is like the Courthouse is now. There is no privacy. There is no place to discuss with clients, just like Family Court. The other issue they have there is security. We talked about that as well, in terms of them reinstating the security they once have because the people are so fearful. The Director stated her turnover, in her opinion, is based almost exclusively on the employees feeling unsafe in the building from a structural standpoint, and security. When we are talking about DSS it is a lot more than just upfitting a building.

Mr. Niermeier stated Ms. Thompson is very grateful for whatever she can get over there. Basically, a lot of the funding that had been programmed for the operation and maintenance, and some of the projects was moved over to the Renaissance for property acquisition and programming. The other issues are outgrowth of the existing space for the workforce and deterioration of facilities. We came up with a couple assumptions. The first being, Richland County Government is committed to its Comprehensive Plan. How that applies to this is, to economically develop certain areas, which was the foundation of the previous planning efforts. Public Safety are of significant importance for future needs. We made the following assumptions: population growth (2.13% annually), administrative workforce growth (25% in the next 10 years), current Judicial Center is past its shelf life, and the need for 250 sq. ft. for each employee is the metric that was used, but does not apply to Public Safety building.

Mr. Niermeier stated the priorities we are looking at are two-fold. We have broken down into things we can do internally, and do our ourselves as a County force, and external where we need engineers, architects, construction companies, etc. The Department of Juvenile Justice has a drop dead date of December 31, 2018 to be out of the Courthouse and in new facilities. He stated we previously talked about the Human Resources Department outgrowing their space, and needing somewhere to go. There is no other space to really put them until we have discussions of how much space Mental Health needs in the building. Human Resources needs a minimum of 8,000 sq. ft. Externally, we still see the most critical need as the 911 Communication Center. Between the contract expiring, inadequate coverage for call takers and dispatchers, the location of the building not at a really hard-in facility for safety reasons. Followed closely by a new EOC/ESD. Along those lines is the new crime lab. Judicial Planning is #4 because he does not need to hire somebody. We can start the planning internally with the County and the external stakeholders.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to what Judicial Planning is. He stated all the rest are buildings.

Mr. Niermeier stated, if you recall, the catalyst for anything that was the Renaissance before was we need a new Judicial Center, and that spurred other events. If we put the Judicial Center here, then we need to move Administration/Health Department some other place. He stated we cannot make a decision in a month here, so if we can get a planning group together to help determine where, what...

Mr. C. Jackson stated the only thing he is asking is for us to be consistent. Everything else is a building, so why do you not just call it the Judicial Center.

Mr. Niermeier stated we can do that.

Ms. McBride stated we have already been provided with the supporting documents, in terms of all the costs that it would take.

Mr. Niermeier stated #5 would be Administrative and State Services, and #6 would be the Dentsville Magistrate.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, the Administrative and State Services is back to the HR and Mental Health Services.

Mr. Niermeier stated that is everything in the current Administration Building and next door at 2000 Hampton Street, which is all the County staff, Health Department, United Way, Department of Social Services and Probation, Pardon and Parole.

Ms. McBride inquired why the Dentsville Magistrate is on the critical list.

Mr. Niermeier stated those are the ranks of how staff sees needs of the County, as far as pinpointing buildings. Dentsville, which was originally going in one spot, was moved over to the Columbia Place. Now, it is something that is needed, and it is something the magistrate office has brought in this list of things it needs to do, as we move forward. Not as critical as a 911 Communication Center, but it still needs to be addressed.

Ms. McBride stated she is not sure about this Dentsville Magistrate. She inquired if this is the one that was supposed to be at O'Neill Court, or is this another one. She stated there are several magistrate offices, so she is not sure which one.

Mr. Niermeier stated years ago the County bought the O'Neill Court property to build a magistrate's office on, and then was found to be too expensive to retrofit.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, on #5 "Administrative and State Services" is that those services in the current buildings. He inquired about what else is included in that.

Mr. Niermeier stated pretty much everyone at 2020 and 2000 Hampton Street, the Dept. of Social Services, and Probation, Pardon and Parole. He stated he said routine because it is not a public safety issue. They currently reside in Central Court over in the Decker Center, but he knows the intent is to move them out into their own magistrate district. He believes everyone in the Solicitor's Office is going to be moved down to where they are currently located.

Ms. McBride stated, as Mr. C. Jackson mentioned, there are some public safety issues, and other things, we outlined the Judicial system and she wondered if that should not be a critical area of need.

Mr. Niermeier stated his original thinking for the Judicial Center was planning. As you recall, there was pushback from the local Bar Association that they were not included in this planning. Rather than trying to push things through, take a step back and get a committee together of the community to discuss it so everyone has their input, and then move forward. He agrees DSS is a critical piece of this. They have Medicaid over there. There are compliance issues with having Medicaid and DSS co-located without certain barriers between the two. If you had to put a ranking down, staff's recommendation is this ranking. We can move things around later.

Ms. McBride stated she would like to consider including DSS as one of the critical areas that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Niermeier stated #5 can be decomposed into separate entities, if you want to pull DSS out. County Administration and State Services were put under one bullet.

Ms. Myers stated, as a member of the Richland County Bar, let her make it clear the Bar has stated, unequivocally, they did have meetings with the Administrator. She was in 2 of those, as well as Mr. Rose. Their concern was they were inspired by Council members to ask additional questions. So, it was not just an organic set of questions. They were inspired to ask those questions. She stated she has talked to the Chief Magistrate, and he tells her getting the Dentsville Magistrate resolved is not his priority. The Chief Magistrate's priorities are with the 2 building that are underway, and as far as he understands it the Dentsville Magistrate's Office being in the current Decker Center is not a huge issue. It may be an issue for some of the Council members, but it is not his issue. When you are considering prioritization, Ms. McBride and Mr. C. Jackson raise a critical point, we have issues that are health and

safety related, and then we have issues that may be more political. We want to separate out the health and safety of employees, for whom we are responsible to provide safe spaces, from those that are layered over by what this Council believes it should be doing politically, or otherwise. She thinks it is important for this committee, at least, to have this front and center.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Chief Magistrate has other offices he wants to build down the road too.

Ms. Myers stated she actually tends to agree with both Ms. McBride and Mr. C. Jackson on the issue of the DSS facility. She would add to the safety concerns, the HIPAA concerns. She would add just how we treat children concern because if we are bringing children, who are already in emergent conditions, into that building and we are reminding them every minute that something has gone crazy wrong in their lives. There is nothing about that building that welcomes that child or creates for that child an overlay us putting them in a safe, happy state until we get their family right. She thinks we have to consider some of those things, and this Council ought to be real careful in lumping all of these things together. In her mind, she would agree with Ms. McBride that perhaps the DSS Center would belong above a Judicial Center. As bad as the Courthouse, the DSS building is scary for all of the reasons that have been outlined.

Dr. Yudice stated, for clarification, that we are going to pull DSS out of #5, and move it to critical as #3.

Mr. Livingston stated the DSS building has been a part of so many plans. Even when we did the Decker Center. Part of the plan when we started that process was to build it for DSS.

Ms. McBride stated she still goes on the record that she does not feel the urgency of the Dentsville Magistrate when she does not know what is going on with the O'Neill Court Magistrate Office, and others that are out there without the input from the Chief Magistrate.

Mr. Niermeier stated he has talked with him, but we can table that because it is not as important as everything else right now.

Mr. Niermeier stated the DJJ space is an internal matter that we can handle. The issue is the loss of its space in the Courthouse in December. We need to provide adequate space. The recommendation is to utilize the 144 O'Neill Court to be retrofitted to accommodate the DJJ offices. He stated they have looked at other options, and there is just not the type of space around here that the County owns or could fit.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if it is comparable size, and does it have opportunity for expansion.

Mr. Niermeier stated they had 6,200 sq. ft. in the Courthouse. O'Neill Court provides approximately 8,000 sq. ft. of usable space.

Ms. Myers stated that is kind of far from the Courthouse. She inquired if we have given any thought to how much time they spend in the Courthouse with their matters, and the distance. She stated part of the reason they were co-located there had to do with them literally being in a courtroom every day for family-related issues. She inquired if we had looked at space that might be more proximate to the current Courthouse.

Mr. Niermeier stated they have not because of the timeframe here. There have been discussions between the Clerk of Court, DJJ, and this organization for 2 – 3 months now. When DJJ looked at the space, they were definitely not opposed to it. They did realize there would be a time/distance issue, as far as the things they had to do.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, that DJJ had looked at the space. She inquired as to what their comments were on the space.

Mr. Niermeier stated they thought it would work really well for them.

Ms. McBride stated it is her understanding that they did not use the office daily, and that staff would come in there and would leave out again. It was not where you would sit daily, 8 hours a day. There is space there for those offices that are permanent, but these people are transitional. They come in and out of the office.

Ms. Myers inquired if half of them would remain at the Courthouse.

Mr. Niermeier stated he does not believe so.

Dr. Yudice stated she believes the Clerk of Court wants the entire DJJ operation to be out of the Courthouse. She stated Ms. McBride is correct. There are a lot of field personnel that were at the Courthouse, but they were not using the space 7.5 hours. They will come in and do whatever they needed to do, then go out into the field and come back into the office in the afternoon.

Ms. McBride stated she believes there is some space at the Courthouse for them.

Ms. Myers stated the recommendation is to move DJJ to 144 O'Neill Court.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, this is the same building that would not accommodate the small magistrate office. The parking is not really the best, but she understands we are trying to utilize the office space we have. She questions the use of it for DJJ, but yet it could not be used for that magistrate office.

Mr. Niermeier stated a lot of it had to do with the parking up front and ingress and egress. For our purposes, you have staff parking in the back. You have adequate parking for people coming and going. He stated he does not know where the bus stop is for people that need public transportation.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it is on the corner.

Ms. McBride stated that is a good bus stop.

Mr. Niermeier stated, again, they were more than happy with the amount of room.

Ms. McBride stated we have to make use of a bad purchase. She stated, in the future, we need to really look at how we purchase property. She is concerned about people just purchasing property, and she does not know the reason for purchasing.

Mr. Livingston stated it is on Council to develop an ordinance to guide that process.

Ms. Myers stated the distinction would be, if you were using it for a magistrate court space, you have to have one big open room, as opposed to 10 small offices. So, maybe the adjustment for the space comes because smaller offices do not require as much as a grand room. You would have to have on the back hall offices and access that is different from the public access and a place to put detainees that you do not have to have with just an office building.

Mr. Niermeier stated his understanding is not perfect here, but it had to do with the demolition and refitting of the building to accommodate the ingress and egress of it. It just made it a lot more expensive than the building was worth.

Mr. Niermeier stated we talked earlier about the HRD space needs, the issues of continued growth and inadequate space for proper employees, which impacts employee morale and service. They also have a need for supervision of the employee health clinic. HRD will be running that project. We have 8,000 sq.

ft. of space next to the planned health clinic at 2000 Hampton Street, which is where Mental Health is currently located. The Sheriff's Department had brought up some security concerns to Council, and the County is not obligated to provide space. Recommendations is an open discussion with Mental Health about what they may actually need of the 8,700 sq. ft. of space. Also, to clearly establish who is going to provide safety and protection for the mental health visitors and State and County employees during incidents involving mental health clients. We are not going to push anybody out, but the discussion needs to be raised.

Ms. Myers stated the current HR Department has people living on top of each other doing people's most intimate work. She inquired if Mr. Hanna had raised any concerns with privacy issues. You have all of those people who may not need to have access to certain information, and it is almost like Mr. C. Jackson was pointing to with the DSS building, no way to avoid that.

Mr. Niermeier stated Mr. Hanna is very resourceful, but it gets to a point where you are just trying too hard to do your job.

Ms. McBride stated currently Mental Health is not paying. These are State employees and they are located here. The County is letting them have it free, so they pay nothing for the facility. She inquired if we accept funds from any other State agency that is using County property.

Dr. Yudice stated not to her knowledge. By statute the County has to provide the space for those agencies.

Ms. McBride inquired if we are charging any State agency that we are not statutorily responsible.

Mr. Niermeier stated there is a Federal law or State ordinance that states up to 66% of operations and maintenance costs will get paid to the County.

Mr. Madden stated he is not sure if any people outside of those who we are statutorily mandated to provide space for provides any funding.

Mr. Niermeier stated DSS is one that would pay some operations and maintenance costs.

Ms. McBride stated she was just wondering about the Mental Health; in terms of the costs the State would have to pay.

Ms. Hamm stated we get a little bit for DSS, but they just cut back what they are reimbursing. They are changing the way they are doing that. It does not matter what you submit you are only going to "X" amount of dollars, no matter how much you spent.

Ms. McBride stated she is wondering about Mental Health being that it is a State entity too. She wondered if the State is responsible for paying a certain amount.

Mr. Niermeier stated he does not know if they even pay their own electric.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Pearce provided her with some background. There was a gentleman's agreement, and they were not required to pay anything and they are sort of an agency unto themselves. Nobody else is like them.

Ms. McBride stated it is not in writing.

Mr. Niermeier stated he has a lease, which Mr. Rush signed.

Ms. McBride stated she knows the State is always not giving the counties what they need, but she is a mental health advocate.

Mr. Niermeier stated the first critical need is the 911 Communications Center. The current location is 1800 Laurel Street, which encompasses approximately 7,000 sq. ft. on the 1st floor of the building. He does not believe the operations floor is that large. He stated there is no way to grow. They need positions, but there is no place more positions. It does not meet a lot of the current public safety standards and inadequate for the future functioning when Richland County Sheriff's Department takes over. He stated outside of developing and building a new facility, we have property that we believe can meet the needs for 911 Communications Center, as far as security, building design, and space. The recommendation is to authorize staff to do an engineering evaluation of the County's Burlington/JC Penney property over at Columbia Place Mall to ensure that it meets adequate facility standards dictated by the Federal government for a 911 Communication Center. Essentially meaning security, survivability for wind, and seismically. He stated there are 2 floors; they are proposing to place the 911 Communications Center slightly unground. It is can be cordoned off from the public entrance. The Sheriff has identified a space needs 40,000 – 50,000 sq. ft. Based on some information he received from a seminar he just went to there is a lot of features that they put forth in their requirements that are consistent with current designs of 911 Communications Center. Obviously it is a public safety building. It is not meant to have flags everywhere and ferris wheel, but in the same vein he wants to bring the field trip in to take a look at it, and when dignitaries and people from other places come in, we need a space to accommodate that, as well as critical needs data security. If we can meet the seismic, wind, fire protection and security standards, it would be a good location. As far as backup, even though he just toured a facility in Florida that had a communications center on one floor and EOC on the other, and was designed appropriately, our current EOC located at a separate location could act as a backup for the 911 Communications Center in case one of them went down.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, the proposal we are discussing now is to have the EOC on one floor and on a separate floor, in the same location the 911.

Mr. Niermeier apologized for jumbled that. He stated he toured a facility the other week in Florida that had a set up like that. We are just proposing the bottom floor for the 911 Communications Center, and a separate location for an EOC.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to what would go on top of that then due to the sensitivity of what they do on the ground floor.

Mr. Niermeier stated what we are proposing is to utilize the 2nd floor, with the garage, for the Crime Lab the Sheriff is looking to build.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it was JC Penney before it was Burlington.

Mr. Niermeier stated when it was JC Penney it had an active garage with their automotive shop.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if that will take up all of the available space, or will we have unused space upstairs for the Crime Lab.

Mr. Niermeier stated the requirements the Sheriff has put forward come out to about 50,000 sq. ft. with ballistic testing ability. The warehouse piece is approximately 20,000 sq. ft. for proper evidence storage. Automotive exploration, which will lend well to the previous garage. They would pretty much fill up the entire 2nd floor. The building is about 132,000 sq. ft. Of the 3 buildings, it is the smallest.

Ms. McBride stated she definitely support working with the Sheriff and trying to do whatever we can with the 911 Communications Center and location. However, she wants to be able to make sure the space that is available at Columbia Mall will also be able to address the critical needs for DSS. When we

look at an architectural and engineering firm coming in, we need to be able to define the needs of DSS, as well as the 911 Communications Center to determine the best needs of the facilities that we have available because we are looking at critical needs in both areas. Also, we need to determine how we fit, should we choose to move all of the governmental services there. How does all of that fit into the plan? Is there adequate space to address all of the critical needs for the County, inclusive of 911, at the mall?

Mr. Niermeier stated, based on what they have looked at, if they put a Crime Lab and a 911 Call Center, it would fit well in Burlington. If you look at what they currently DSS has, they have about 61,000 sq. ft. The County Administration building is 115,000 sq. ft., of which only about 80,000 sq. ft. is usable. And next door is about 110,000 sq. ft. If you look at the Sears property, it has about 200,000 sq. ft. and the Dillard's property has 183,000 sq. ft. So, not only could you build in the current needs, but you have room for growth. Plus, rather than having these channelized public access spaces, you would have a real service waiting area similar to the DMV. In addition, separate entrances for security reasons.

Ms. McBride inquired if Mr. Niermeier was referring to the current of DSS or the current needs of all the governmental entities.

Mr. Niermeier responded all of the governmental entities, including Probation, Pardon and Parole, which is another 1960s building that is deteriorating. It is tough to be one of those officers over there. There is about 20,000 sq. ft. in that building.

Ms. Myers stated it sounds like Ms. McBride's question is, if we take an action to authorize the staff to contract for an engineering evaluation of the Burlington property, she would also like some high level analysis of what that does to the other spaces, and how those needs could be met if we took this decision because that will impact...

Ms. McBride stated that will actually address the critical needs that have been identified and we would be treating them with the importance they all deserve.

Ms. Myers inquired if that was clear to Mr. Niermeier.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was not clear to him.

Ms. Myers stated Ms. McBride's issue is, and she and Mr. C. Jackson agree, that we love what Mr. Niermeier is doing with the 911 Center, and we think if he is recommending that it is likely to turn out to be an excellent option, we want to be sure that moving forward with that as the option does not do damage to the ability to come back and say we have these other needs that come out to 300,000 sq. ft., but we have taken all of this square footage, that could have been a critical piece of that, out of commission before making a full analysis. In looking at the Burlington question, they would also like you to look at other critical path needs like DSS, and by definition that is also going to mean that you look at Probation, Pardon and Parole because it is a puzzle, so we would need a recommendation to make the puzzle look our picture, and not just get this one thing done, even though we love this.

Mr. Niermeier stated those are things we have discussed, and the rough numbers we are able to develop, we feel that certain entities fit better in one building than the other. To a degree, we have done that, but we can refine it.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, staff wants to hire an engineering firm to do an assessment for the 911. She is recommending that we do the same thing for DSS.

Mr. Niermeier stated in a perfect world he would like to contract for all 3 of the buildings. The committee is asking for some real numbers. He stated 40-year old buildings have issues.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks we are agreeing with you, but she does not know that we should slow down one or the other. We do not want it to take the next 6 months.

Mr. Livingston stated the staff is identifying a specific location to do the continue work for 911. If we are going to apply the same thing to DSS, then you have to have a particular location.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks later on in the agenda they have some recommendations.

Mr. Livingston stated so wherever that location is, we will be looking at evaluating for DSS.

Mr. Niermeier stated staff has always thought that Sears was a good location.

Ms. McBride stated Mr. Niermeier is exactly addressing her concern because if we give Sears to DSS, even though it does not appear they will need, and DSS needs Burlington, it is going to be an issue.

Mr. Niermeier stated the #2 priority is ESD Facility/EOC. As you know, they are on the ground floor of the County Administration/Health Department parking garage on an 8.5-acre parcel that is congested and borders the train tracks. There is 19,475 sq. ft. utilized by EOC, which is inadequate for future growth and functionality. There is a 14-acre property that was purchased in 2013 to place a new Emergency Services Division and an Emergency Operation Center. There was a professional spatial needs assessment for the sit to determine that it was good for its needs. The recommendation is to reconsider the Cushman Drive location for ESD. A lot of the hazards associated with its current location are mitigated off Two Notch and Cushman. There is a phased approach that was put forth on how to best go into this with whatever funding is available. The current location has one way in, and one way out. Fighting sometimes with both the public traffic, as well as staff.

Ms. McBride stated she went by there one-day last week to look at the property. She was concerned about the request we got from the housing development firms. She was concerned about the number of units and traffic there. She thinks if we have land that we could possibly use, she would prefer using the land that we have instead of trying to purchase. She does not think we need to purchase any more property unless it is absolutely necessary.

Dr. Yudice stated the recommendation is to use this property for the ESD Facility.

Ms. Myers stated, if we were to take staff's recommendation, when we look at this as the home for EMS, what would be the outpost for ambulances across the County. When you factor in the time it now to get areas that do not have adequate EMS service, taking it all the way to Cushman Drive adds 20 minutes to that. We would also need a simultaneous plan for decentralized stationing of ambulances.

Mr. Niermeier stated we have discussed that briefly. This would be the central garage and central parking. Currently ambulances are farmed out to different fire stations around the County. Eastover has its own separate EMS facility next to a clinic. Mr. Byrd still intends to keep several assets in the general area where we are currently. Mr. Byrd is a thoughtful guy and has been doing this a long time, and without being able to speak for him, Mr. Niermeier is certain he has thought this through completely.

Ms. Myers stated, for her, any recommendation to accept this needs to have a concomitant recommendation for how we speak to the very important health needs around this County that are already stressed by moving ambulances further away. Does it mean we are going to double what we have at current fire stations? She thinks that needs to ride along with this discussion.

Ms. McBride stated she thinks this is kind of misleading because this is actually on Two Notch Road.

Ms. Myers stated it is still 15 minutes from here, which means it is an additional 20 minutes from Hopkins. She said if you are driving from Two Notch Road it does add 10 – 17 minutes to the driving time, depending on traffic.

Mr. Niermeier stated it is a large EOC Facility, but that would also house administrative spaces, and would allow for community and meeting rooms. The way the architects developed this program, it was phased from what is most important, which is administration and power plant. A lot of the points they brought up at the seminar was County's critical data needs.

Mr. Niermeier stated the #3 priority is the Crime Lab. There is currently 1,400 sq. ft. at the Shakespeare Road location. Richland County Sheriff has indicated they do a lot of work for other agencies. His requirements would increase the capabilities they currently have. The recommendation is to authorize an evaluation of the Burlington property to meet standards that are required for a crime lab, determine the upfit costs, and if it is suitable to use the top floor for building a new crime lab. We discussed earlier that it has approximately 60,000 sq. ft. on each floor. There is a former garage facility that could be used for the automotive exploration.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if the increase in space will allow the Sheriff Department to consolidate things that are decentralized, or create something that does not exist now.

Chief Cowan stated the evidence and property section is scattered around the County. Some of it is in Conex trailers on Powell Road. Some is in Conex trailers behind headquarters. Then we have an overrun evidence room in the building.

Mr. C. Jackson stated it currently looks like you have 1,900 sq. ft.

Chief Cowan stated we presently have approximately 14,000 sq. ft. The ballistics tank is outside, so they have to carry evidence from inside of headquarters to the outside, which is an issue if it is raining or snowing. He stated 20,000 sq. ft. of the 50,000 sq. ft. at the Burlington property would be utilized for evidence storage.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if we are using all the space at Burlington, are we freeing up any space anywhere we can use for something else.

Chief Cowan stated a lot of it would be Conex trailers that we would no longer be heating and cooling. Some of the laboratory space at headquarters would be freed up.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the answer to his question is that it does not free up any real space.

Chief Cowan stated a lot of it closets and canteen areas that were being used before.

Ms. Myers inquired if this means if we approve this proposal, and it goes forward, that we are going to hear from the Sheriff's Department next year for new office space. She inquired where this puts the Sheriff's Department, in terms of their needs, because we are looking at 20 – 30 years, not 1 – 2 years. Is there something more that we are missing or should be overlaid on this? She believes that Mr. Livingston and Mr. C. Jackson raised the right points. We need to be able to answer those questions because this is long term planning. This is not just for next year.

Chief Cowan stated they are not going to come back to the table and say we need "X, Y, Z". We were planning for 20 – 30, 20 – 50. The goal was to be planning out years in advance, so we do not come back. This gives us the ability to have the growth that the County is seeing.

Mr. Niermeier stated the #4 priority is the Judicial Center Planning. He stated the current Judicial Center was commissioned in 1980 and cannot meet the future needs of the growing county, as pointed out in the study that was conducted last year. The estimated renovation costs for everything it would need is in excess of \$80 million, plus it would severely disrupt current services. Once the Renaissance was deferred, the planning for a new facility was also deferred. We do have the facility needs assessment that was completed and there is accurate data, as far as interviews with stakeholders, of what exactly is needed. Projected needs were based on the population growth for 2025. The recommendation is to constitute a "Blue Ribbon" type of advisory committee of individuals and organizations Council feels appropriate to take up this matter, and determine the best location for a new facility. The nice thing about the planning that was done, and the renderings that were completed by MGA Partners, you could essentially take the building and put it almost anywhere. To Mr. Pearce's statement, do not waste what we have done already.

Ms. Myers inquired if the advisory committee would be free to say, "Go buy another piece of property somewhere?" and waste all of the space we already have.

Mr. Niermeier stated he would not want to waste anything.

Ms. Myers stated that is her concern with setting up a committee, and saying free rein go figure out anything.

Mr. Niermeier stated the advisory committee would make recommendations to this committee to move forward to Council.

Ms. McBride stated, based on her past experience on Council for almost 2 years, and serving on various committees, it is very disheartening to sit on a committee, work hard, give your time, and then have all your ideas thrown out as if you never existed. She knows there was a committee for this because this did not just drop out of the sky. A committee worked on this, for 8 months, and what you have is what you seem to think is a pretty good plan that could be placed almost anyplace. She is just concerned about having a new committee to go over all of the things that have already been done. She does not know why, and she does not have a suggestion on how to address it, that we could not have the existing committee. She stated she has been on a committee before where we had experts and resource staff come in and gave their opinions and/or recommendations to the committee. If we excluded anybody, they would have the opportunity to come into that existing committee. She is concerned about wasting the time of those people that had already dedicated themselves to work on this committee for 8 months.

Ms. Myers stated 4 of the committee members were judges, 2 of whom were a part of the Richland County Bar, 1 of whom was the past President of the Bar. There were these stakeholders at the table. The concerns were not raised by that committee, and, to the extent, that there are concerns on behalf of the Richland County Bar, she is fortunate to be law partners with the incoming Chair of the Bar, who has said to her repeatedly, "They are happy to work with us. Whatever confines we have established. This got out of hand. It is not the tempest in the teapot that it has been made to seem." She stated as a member of the Bar, she does not want it to be represented publicly anymore that the Bar has said that Richland County ignored them. That is not the message from the Bar. The message from the Bar is, that if this is the plan going forward, they at least want to be able to say to their membership, "Here is what we contributed. Here are our thoughts, as reflected by Richland County. And, here is what we think is a good plan going forward." That night at the Council meeting when those comments were brought forward, and she will distribute the email if you want. She got an email before those comments were brought forward to say, "This is not to say we are kicking the plan over."

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if it was the Trial Lawyers that Council got the letter from.

Ms. Myers stated it was the Richland County Bar.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he agrees with what Ms. Myers and Ms. McBride said. He is trying to figure out a path forward without having to reconstitute a whole new committee. He inquired if it was feasible to reconvene the former committee, and open it up for anyone to come speak to that former committee on the plan they have already adopted.

Ms. Myers stated they would be glad to come.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he thinks that would limit what was raised earlier about somebody coming in and just throwing everything out and start over from scratch. If you had the people that had dedicated themselves for 8 months on this plan, come back together, and then opening it up to anyone who wanted to come in and speak for or against the plan, or to offer suggestions, it might be a more controlled environment.

Ms. Myers stated a good moderating way forward, if they come and they raise issues why the whole thing should be scrapped she does not think anybody with half a brain who would say those are all bad reasons just because we are dug in. But, if the issue is just who has had input, that is different.

Mr. C. Jackson stated this would give the members an opportunity.

Mr. Niermeier stated he believes all the stakeholders he interviewed for the space needs assessment are all published in the study. He knew there was an existing committee.

Dr. Yudice stated that was the Courthouse Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Niermeier stated whatever work they had done could be brought back up, and start up where they left off.

Ms. Myers stated the 3rd month she was on Council she was vehemently against being on the Courthouse Ad Hoc Committee. She was vehemently against us considering building a new courthouse, and she was cajoled and convinced by her colleagues, 2 of them who have been on Council much longer than her, and who saw this as a legacy project that was critically important. And, we got down the road, and down the road, and down the road, and the month this thing was presented, which was a 1 ½ into her tenure on Council, the committee got disbanded for no reason that she understands to this day. She agrees with Ms. McBride that there has to be some commitment to respecting the work that is getting done and not whimsically going off. Remember we flew people in, and wasted a lot of their time too over the course of 13 - 14 months to go and interview stakeholders and talk to community members, and bring back information. She stated there is a lot of work that has been done. She would agree with Mr. C. Jackson and Ms. McBride, as well as, the Clerk of Court because she spent a lot of time on this too. She would agree that throwing out what we have and starting from scratch might not be the best way forward. It would also send a message to any new committee, to not dedicate too much time to this because this group will throw out your work, and move on to something else if they decide they do not like it. And, that is not a good message either.

Ms. McBride inquired about how much money we have already expended on the design with these consultants.

Mr. Niermeier stated it was just for the design study, so approximately \$75,000.

Dr. Yudice stated it was less than \$100,000.

Mr. Madden stated it was between \$75,000 - \$100,000.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was for the architect to come conduct the interviews and provide the product.

Ms. McBride stated we have to look at the costs that has already been put in. She relied on Mr. Niermeier's expertise in saying that it is a good product.

Mr. Niermeier stated it is very good product. It gives plenty of options with the most viable option. It addresses the growth and the need for 14 courtrooms now and 17 courtrooms by 2025.

Dr. Yudice stated it was also comprehensive and looked at the growth for the next 40 – 50 years.

Mr. Niermeier stated the #5 priority is the Administrative and State services. County staff, Voter Registration, Treasurer and Auditor staff are currently housed at 2020 Hampton Street. There is an expectation of adding an additional 100 employees in the next 10 years. They interviewed approximately 98% of everybody. The current space is inadequate to meet the growing needs. Other facilities such as DSS and PPP are deteriorating. The budget for the upgrades and if DSS were moved to support Renaissance, although not immediately critical, the buildings continue to deteriorate, experience system failures and overcrowding does not improve employee morale. He stated, as a recent experience, we had 3 major leaks in the conference room we are in. Last week DSS had plumbing problems. They had to put dryers out to soak all that up. The Sheriff's Department had leaks all over their headquarters. If the wind blows just right at the Judicial Center, you get sideways flow into the building and down the columns. One of the recommendations is to do an engineering assessment of the Sears and Dillard's properties to determine upfit costs. If those costs are acceptable, to start relocating County Administrative and State agencies to those 2 properties. The other option would be to look at Sears and Dillard's properties to determine fit costs. If acceptable, relocate all State agencies to the mall, and expand County office next door into the Hampton/Harden property. The final recommendation would be to authorize staff to contracting a consulting firm to analyze both the Columbia Place Mall and Hampton/Harden properties to determine the best use for each property.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he thinks it is important to have a comprehensive, finite list of who the tenants that are in play for relocation. He does not want there to be this generic terminology and us not be able to specifically say there are "X" number of people, which need "X" amount of space. There are "X" number of people, with regards to DSS, that need "X" amount of space, etc. He is assuming that is what is going to be necessary for any type of evaluation to be determined about the acceptability of Sears and/or Dillard's. He stated they could do an engineering evaluation of the conditions of the building, but in terms of the availability of usable space, how will they be able to do that unless we come up with this comprehensive list of tenants.

Mr. Niermeier stated we do have that. That was the foundation of the original RFQ. All of the organizations that would be relocating were identified.

Dr. Yudice stated with the number of employees.

Ms. Myers requested the information be provided to the committee.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, he is wondering, if that changes a little bit with our conversation about DSS.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was originally a part of it. He stated DSS and PPP were always in the plan. The only one that came in afterward was the magistrate.

Mr. Livingston stated the original intent was for all the current space being used here at 2020 would to the Dillard's property, correct.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston stated, to him, with that being said then it might help to try to put the courthouse and this building by themselves because they are the 2 that is going to affect what happens, in terms of the

chain reaction. If you are going to use Sears for these other functions, and State agencies, you can do all of that. The real problem you have, to him, is simply what you are going to do with the courthouse and this building. It does not impact as much on the other stuff.

Mr. Niermeier stated when we started the recommendations, a few meetings ago, we struggled with the chain reaction. So, what is the first move? That either creates Options A, B or C or limits you to Options A and B. Going forward, if we use these 2 buildings for County staff, then it takes this property off the table for a courthouse. So, then what? Where does the courthouse go, if we are going to go with a courthouse? If we move everybody here to the mall, then it creates another option as a property that could be used. We have thought through a lot of that, so we just need to take that first step so it gives us what we can do next.

Mr. Livingston stated he thinks you could make a whole lot of decisions about those other things, with the exception of the courthouse and this facility.

Mr. Niermeier stated he agrees. They could all pick up and move over there easier than this here.

Ms. McBride stated she believes that is part of what they were trying to do in our beginning discussion, in terms of DSS because it was separate from this facility. And, getting the Sheriff's 911 because it was separate. Those 2 still stand out as priorities, even those this is too, but they are separated from this. She does not want you to leave out DSS.

Mr. Niermeier stated they are not the critical path. The Judicial Center could stay put, and we could move the other 2. One is not dependent on the other one.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, we would handle the Judicial Center separate. Then we will handle Administrative offices separate.

Mr. Livingston stated the point he is trying to make is, obviously what happens with the Judicial Center is going to impact the Dillard's building. Not the others so much because of what we are talking about. We can go ahead and do what we need to do with those other buildings.

Ms. McBride stated that is where her issue came in before because if we do not do the engineering and architectural study then we will be in a jam when we get ready to move because we would have said we have already used that space, so we cannot use it now. That is why she was really concerned, as to be careful in our designs, so that we will not put ourselves in a situation where the facilities are no longer available.

Mr. Livingston stated his point is you do not use that space because this building is going to move into Dillard's, so you are not going to do anything with the Dillard's space.

Ms. McBride stated she was concerned about what was going on with the 911 and DSS.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what exactly has been said.

Ms. Myers inquired as to what the engineering request is that Mr. Niermeier is planning to make, if it is approved.

Mr. Niermeier stated, he thinks, what the committee suggested, beyond what he was looking at, is to have a planning come in. We have the conditions of the buildings. We know what type of upgrades may be required to convert it from mercantile space to a business/office space. However, now we have a programmer from an architecture firm to come in and say this would be the best use for this because you require this many meeting spaces, and this many large and small offices, similar to what we did with the EOC Facility and the Judicial Center.

Ms. Myers stated to be sure not to prejudge for them what space should be used for what thing, so that what we get back is a tainted report.

Dr. Yudice stated, if you go back to p. 38 of the agenda to the 3 recommendations, if you were to ask her personally which one she would go with the 3rd recommendation because she thinks that will address what we all are saying.

Mr. Niermeier stated that would be concurrent with the architectural and engineering evaluation to get the real numbers of how much we need to fit the building.

Ms. Myers inquired if the committee would like to ask any questions about recommendations #1 and #2, or have we looked at #3 as subsuming #1 and #2. It would seem to her that #3 subsumes both #1 and #2. That you have to have an answer to #1 and #2 to get #3. You would not get to #3, if you did #1 or #2 though because you would be looking specifically at particular properties for particular space.

Mr. Livingston stated you do not want to simply analyze the properties. You want to know how certain things will fit into those properties that we are talking about.

Ms. Myers stated that #3 does that by definition.

Mr. Niermeier stated we are going to change #3 to include architectural and engineering evaluation.

Ms. Myers requested that we highlight that we are not looking just at generic feasibility, but an analysis of the current Burlington space because we have already said that is what we want to do in its feasibility for the Richland County Sheriff's Department Crime Lab and 911 Center. And, then looking at whether or not one of those building, probably the Sears building, is adequate space, and acceptable space, for relocation of all consolidated State agencies. Then, would the Dillard's property remain adequate for relocation of the 2020 Hampton, if we later decided to do that, or would we have done exactly what Ms. McBride is saying and small ourselves out of the ability to move there. Ms. McBride's fear is that once we go and look at these boxes and say let's put this there, this there, that what we get to 6 months from now is having to start over because there is not adequate space. The analysis needs to make sure that we do not small ourselves out of something.

Ms. McBride stated she just does not want DSS to get lost in the shuffle because she knows what happens when we look at something so big. It is going to take so much time for this particular area, and this one is gone or moving on the fast track.

Ms. Myers stated we have 2 State agencies that have got to have some answer pretty quick, DJJ and DSS.

Ms. McBride stated DJJ is something, but she does not think it is as major because we can easily fix DJJ. But, DSS is much large. DJJ is a small area that we are dealing with.

Mr. Livingston stated that is why he made his statement earlier. There is no question about it, the Administration building and courthouse are going to take some time. That is why he was saying we needed to separate them out like we are talking about, so we can go ahead and take care of those instead of waiting until we go through this long-range process.

Ms. McBride stated in the comprehensive plan, that was just laid out, DSS was thrown into this big administrative area, and she did not want it to get lost. We took 911 out, but we threw DSS into the whole Administrative plan.

Mr. Niermeier stated what is nice about the Sears and Dillard's property is there are 3 separate entrances. Sears has top level entrance and ground level entrance. Dillard's entrance is only on the ground level. He stated Dillard's is a 13-acre site with 183,000 sq. ft.; Sears is a 18-acre site with

200,000+ sq. ft. Probation, Pardon and Parole is currently on Gregg St. with a 18,300 sq. ft. property. Department of Social Services property is 61,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Dentsville Magistrate is currently in the Decker Center. Judge Edmond told him that he definitely wants to move them out of Decker Center to some other facility. We discussed the planning and repurpose of the O'Neill Court property, and how expensive that could be. The recommendation is to accept the property being donated by the Richland School District Two, and start moving forward with planning.

Ms. McBride stated we talked about accepting the property, but it seemed like there was a liability if we do not do anything with the property. There are other magistrate offices that we have not decided what to do, particularly the one that was supposed to go on O'Neill Court. She stated we are acquiring property, that is free, but is it something that we actually need right now. And, what is this going to cost us in the end with all these new facilities, magistrate offices, the Renaissance, etc. Because that was never really resolved, to her, in the last meeting.

Mr. Livingston stated he is not going to necessarily say we have to accept it, but he would like for us to start with a recommendation from the Chief Magistrate, and decide where to go from there, opposed to trying to figure it out.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Chief Magistrate was not opposed to the property when he spoke with him last week.

Mr. Livingston stated, so it is clear, who said what to whom, let the Chief Magistrate give us a written recommendation on what he recommends.

Ms. McBride stated, if Mr. Niermeier meets with the Chief Magistrate, she would like to sit in on the meeting so she can hear.

Mr. Madden inquired if the committee would like to request something in writing from the Magistrate.

Ms. Myers stated, if that is the way we are going, then we would hold off on performing the due diligence, and investing in it, because we need some direction from him before we authorize expending any funds. If it is a diminutive cost, she does not care, but if it is a real cost we need information from him first. If this is not driven by him, she would like for staff's time to be spent on stuff that we actually need doing.

Mr. Niermeier stated you had requested an estimate. If we did an environmental assessment, it is \$2,900. He does not know if we need one because it is untouched property. It is woods, and has not been used for anything before.

Dr. Yudice stated there are 2 properties. We recommend accepting just one, not the other one.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to invite the judge to give us his recommendation. He could have the opportunity to come and sit just like the Sheriff's Office has.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he wanted to be clear that this recommendation from the Chief Magistrate does not impact the acceptance of the property. He believes they are mutually exclusive because he knows where the property is in relationship to the school, and he knows from past experiences some of the reasons they would want to be rid of it, in terms of not being able to manage it and the students going in there, and other issues. For purposes of acquiring that as a County-owned piece of property, he would not want us to say we are not going to do it if the Chief Magistrate says he is not interested in doing another magistrate office there. He thinks there are so many other uses for the property.

Ms. McBride stated her concern is that the property is a liability for the school right now, why make it a liability for the County. If we do not have real use for it, and right now she is concern about, even if it is being given to us, what we would do with the property, and the liability issues.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the liability is different though because the school has the liability because it would be their children on there. If it becomes our property and we put up "No Trespassing" signs, they would be trespassers. The school cannot put "No Trespassing" signs on the property for their children going to that property to school. That is difference. The people walking on there now are students at Richland Northeast High School. Richland School District Two is never going to say, your students cannot walk on this property, but if we got the property we have absolutely can put up "No Trespassing" signs, and they would be trespassing like any other person in the community.

Ms. McBride stated she has concerns with, if the schools do not want the kids trespassing, why would we want the kids on the property because they are going...

Ms. Myers requested that we separate these 2 conversations. We would still need what we need from Judge Edmond, based on her motion.

Mr. C. Jackson stated initially he thought it was mutually exclusive. That is why he said in his opening comments, he wanted to make sure this vote is exclusive, whether or not we accept the property.

Ms. Myers inquired if Ms. McBride is okay with that because she would like to move the motion forward on a vote, and then have a discussion on the property separately. She restated the motion is a motion to solicit information from Chief Magistrate Edmond as to his needs for the Dentsville Magistrate's Office.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated now we can backtrack and finish that.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he just wanted to make sure whatever we hear from the Chief Magistrate does not determine whether we do or do not take the property.

Ms. Myers inquired if we want to have a discussion about the property because acceptance or rejection of the property was a part of Executive Session.

Mr. Niermeier stated we do have a very derelict property, which we talk about more in Executive Session in regard to the Richland Library. The Haverty's and a list of properties that were attended to be divested at one point.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he believes this is exactly what we were looking for before. Staff has provided substitutive information, with backup material, to allow us to have a meaningful conversation and to take action. The only thing he wants to ask is do we need to make a motion, or take action, with regards to the issue dealing with the DJJ having to be evacuated by December 31st. Do we need to direct staff to do something, and then that needs to go to Council?

Ms. Myers stated DJJ, Mental Health and the 911 Center. She stated we do need several motions, and we will go back and take them in order. The first one that did come up was DJJ issue.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to authorize staff to do whatever is necessary to begin the process to find space that is suitable, by the deadline of December 31st.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated staff is instructed to open discussions with DJJ to look at suitable sites for a pending move. The 2nd issue that arose, and for which we need action, is Mental Health.

Ms. McBride inquired as to what the recommendation was.

Ms. Myers stated the recommendation was to open discussions with the Mental Health group so that we can get an adequate analysis of what they have, what they need, and where they might need to be.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to instruct staff to contact Mental Health and have discussions regarding the use of their property, and the allocation that is needed for the property.

Ms. Myers inquired if that motion will get Dr. Yudice and Mr. Niermeier where they need to be.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated staff has been instructed to begin discussion with the Mental Health team, next door to get an analysis of their space needs, and how we can help them meet their ongoing issues.

Dr. Yudice stated we need action on the 911 Center.

Ms. Myers stated she thought we took that action, but let's take vote on it just to be sure.

Mr. Niermeier stated he was not sure what the conclusion was.

Ms. Myers stated that was the one with the Sheriff's Department and the need to get an engineering team to come in and give an analysis of the suitability of the building for the Sheriff's needs.

Mr. Niermeier inquired if we want to bundle that in for all 3 buildings, or just Burlington/JcPenney property initially.

Ms. Myers stated Ms. McBride's concerns are well-stated, and that we want to take them separately. We do not want to bundle DJJ. We do not want to bundle the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. McBride stated she thought we were dealing with the Sheriff and DSS.

Ms. Myers stated she meant DSS. She misspoke.

Mr. Niermeier stated we are looking at 2 of the buildings initially. He stated what we can do though is go ahead and give an option for 3, and see what kind of pricing looks like, so we have that data.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to allow staff to move forward with the process of identifying the needs for the 911 Center and DSS, and contact the appropriate authorities outside of the County to get that ball rolling.

Ms. Myers requested a friendly amendment to specify that we asking them to look at the Burlington space, as adequate or inadequate for the Sheriff's needs, and ascertain whether or not the Sears building would be adequate for DSS needs.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to authorize staff to get an engineering evaluation for the remaining space at the Columbia Place Mall to ascertain its appropriateness for the uses recommended by staff.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there were any decisions needed to be made about the Cushman Road property.

Mr. Niermeier stated staff recommends not selling the property.

Ms. Myers stated that is an item for Executive Session.

Dr. Yudice stated the proposal for the developer is in Executive Session.

5. **Pending Items:**

- a. Memorandum from COMET- Proposal for Columbia Place Mall Connection – Dr. Yudice stated we received a request from the COMET. They want to build a transfer station, for 3 routes in the Columbia Place Mall, that would be ADA compliant. They are asking for permission to build the station. They will bear the costs of improving the asphalt. Because of the weight of the buses, the parking lot asphalt is not conducive.

Mr. Niermeier stated months ago they met with the COMET and walked the ground out there. They have an off-site location for the bus currently. It is not optimal for their passengers. They were real excited when they learned the County had purchased these properties. We walked out by the Dillard's property, and looked at the terrain. They came back with a proposal for relocating the bus stops closer to the Dillard's property, which allows them to meet their time needs coming and going off of Parklane/Two Notch Road.

Ms. Myers inquired if that was frontage property.

Mr. Niermeier stated we are looking at the front of Dillard's. They are proposing some island bus stop coming in from in Parklane. Previously the mall would not allow them on mall property. They feel they would better serve their clients, as opposed to hanging them out here by Virginia College. Based on their study, and their proposal, they think that is the most optimal location. They want to build out this bus stop similar to the one out near the Columbiana Mall Wal-Mart/Sam's. He stated he was out there with Randy Pruitt and the COMET. He told them we do not know exactly what we are doing with the property yet. The answer is not "No" but we do not know when and what. He does not think a decision has to be made right now. It could be tabled until we further develop the site, and see what it is actually going to be used for. He does not think they want to build it, and the us not use the property.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the only thing he would ask is, whatever is decided, the protective covering is built there is identical to what has been built on Forest Drive, and nothing less. The quality, the integrity, and the look.

Mr. Niermeier stated that was the intent, he thinks, as well as providing digital borders for information, that both the County and the COMET could capitalize on.

Mr. C. Jackson stated there is a different clientele who goes in and out of Columbia Place Mall, and he wants to make sure that when the COMET is deciding what to put for them, that the look is reflective of the look they put out for the clientele on Forest Drive.

Ms. Myers stated she would like to add that she is not opposed to the COMET being there. She would just like to know what we are going to do before we welcome the COMET to a space that might ultimately not be optimal for our needs once we have put them down.

Dr. Yudice stated maybe what we can do is include this for the firm that is going to do the study.

Ms. Myers inquired if the Chair had weighed in at all on this since she is on the Board.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Director has had a conversation with her, but he was not privy to what the conversation was.

Mr. C. Jackson moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to support staff's recommendation to include this in the analysis of the mall properties.

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Myers stated we will instruct staff to include an analysis of the COMET in its engineering analysis.

- b. Request from the Richland Library to use the Old Antique Mall parking lot – Dr. Yudice stated we received
- c. Executive Session:

**The committee went into Executive Session at approximately 12:44 PM
and came out at approximately 12:57 PM.**

- I. Report on the party interested in purchasing the Cushman Road Property
 - II. Purchase of the Best Buy on Two Notch Road
 - III. Report back on the proposed sale of 26.5-acre tract at the north end of Paso Fino Drive
 - IV. Inquiry from party about the willingness of County to sell the Dillards and/or Sears Property
6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:01 PM.