



Richland County Council

DEVELOPMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

October 23, 2018 – 5:00 PM

Council Chambers

2020 Hampton Street, Columbia, SC 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Pearce, Chair; Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Gwen Kennedy

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Norman Jackson, Dalhi Myers, Yvonne McBride and Bill Malinowski

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Madden, Michelle Onley, Kim Williams-Roberts, Trenia Bowers, Sandra Yudice, Stacey Hamm, Larry Smith, Stephen Staley, Shahid Khan, and Melissa Watts

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 PM.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. September 25, 2018 – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.
4. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**
 - a. Water Feasibility Study – Mr. Madden stated this item will be briefed with a PowerPoint presentation. The briefing document that was included in the agenda packet supplements the presentation.

Mr. Khan stated, at the beginning of this year, you authorized us to proceed with a water feasibility study for Richland County. You also allowed us to engage a consultant to do the study and to evaluate our options (i.e. Can we be in the water business? Can we supply the water to unincorporated Richland County?) At the end of July 2018, we hired Joel Wood & Associates. Mr. Wood has completed his study to the point where he needs our feedback and direction. We have

submitted you a briefing document. He stated that he and Mr. Wood would be making the presentation and their recommendation(s).

Mr. Wood stated he has worked on feasibility for Richland County in the past. Richland County is legally constituted to provide water and sewer services in the County, and in such, have the legal authority to expand systems and develop water supplies. The County has been doing it for a while. To guide that, the County has prepared master plans for water and sewer systems. He was the Engineer of Record for the 1995 Sewer Master Plan, and he did the engineering on the 2002 Water and Sewer Master Plan. The 2002 Water and Sewer Plan was updated AECOM in 2016. He relied heavily on the 2002 and 2016 master plans in looking at what is feasible for Richland County to consider in developing water system and water supplies. Currently, Richland County has 3 water systems. They have Hopkins Community System which has approximately 562 users; Pond Drive has 27 users; and Murray Point has 20 users. In the 2016 AECOM master plan, they developed potential areas for developed of water systems in the County. In those areas, they relied heavily on the AECOM, and looking at what they proposed, then they expanded on that to come up their recommendations and what they think is feasible. There is a great bit of difference in those areas. The first area they looked at was the Southeast Project Area. They expanded the area AECOM had designated to include a larger area. The Hopkins System (outlined in blue) has 569 customers, Pond Drive is the small blue area, and the Town of Eastover has their own water system. They looked at area, and they looked at potential water sources for the area. They think there are 3 viable water sources. The first would be to tie to the existing City of Columbia water system and make expansion from there, and do away with the Hopkins well system. They looked at utilizing the existing Hopkins well system to serve additional customers. And, if the area every reached 2,500 customers they would consider building your own water purification plant. For this area, they looked at 3 alternatives. The first alternative is the "No Action" alternative; the second is "Distribution System Expansion with the City of Columbia as the Water Source"; and the third is the "Distribution System Expansion with the Existing Wells as the Water Supply". The existing Hopkins wells lie in a very good aquafer that can produce large volumes of water, and are easily expandable. The summary of the alternatives is:

Alternative #1, which is the "No Action", there is no project, there is no additional service, and there are no potential customers, and no change in the yearly cost. They do not recommend that alternative.

Alternative #2, which is to look at the City of Columbia, as an alternate water source, that project cost is approximately \$8,740,000; you would serve 695 customers; there would be a potential of 1,094 customers; and the operating budget would increase \$678,542. To make this project feasible, at the current rates, you would need a 100% grant.

Alternative #3, which is to expand the wells, the project would \$8,529,000; it would serve the same number of customers; but the annual operating cost would be significantly different.

If you look at the projected year 2020, which is the first year of operation, with alternative #2 you would have a negative fund balance of \$305,000 and a negative fund balance of \$126,000 with alternative #3.

Development and Services

October 23, 2018

Mr. Khan stated the negative fund balance for alternative #3 is due to the low rate that we have. We are undertaking a rate study, so the rates can be level and we will be self-sustaining.

Mr. Wood stated, if we look at alternative #3, which they think is the best way to expand the Hopkins System by utilizing existing wells, if you got a 100% grant, you have the potential for 695 customers, only about 30% would sign up initially, then your average monthly bill would need to increase to \$46.00, which is an approximate \$15.00 increase. If you get a 50% grant, and keep the rate the same as it is now, you would need 1,035 customers before the system would be self-sufficient. He stated that is doable because you have a large potential of customers. This does not mean that we actually do all of Phase I at one time. The summary and recommendations for the Southeast Project Area is that the system expansion would provide safe, dependable water supply. The availability of a safe and dependable water source that meets DHEC requirements, and prevents residents from relying on the individual wells that are subject to contamination. The project, as they proposed, would not have a negative impact on the environment. The recommendation for the Southeast Planning area is that the area will have a safe, dependable, and sustainable water supply that can be expanded, at a reasonable cost. The aquifer is a very reliable, and there are water systems that have 6,000 customers on that same aquifer. You have an existing customer base that can be expanded and give you a strong customer base to help you finance this project. For this project to be feasible, they think the following conditions need to be met, the County to create an ordinance that will define the County service area and restrict it from other service providers. If you are going to provide water in this area, you do not want another utility to come in and take the low hanging fruit, and then you have lost your revenue producing capabilities. You need to develop a program that promoted the water system to actively seek customers in the project area. Once you actively seek these new customers, and develop a customer, then you can refine and make a decision on where you are going to concentrate on running the lines, and what customers are going to be served. To review and adopt the rate adjustment proposed, in the ongoing rate study. They just gave you some ideas on how many customers, and what the rates would need to be to finance a particular type project. As you develop, and determine the areas you want to serve, then you develop your preliminary engineering reports and environmental assessments and your funding scenarios on how you are going to serve the Southeast Area. There is good/great potential in that area, and they think you can develop, with the work of your staff, and promote growth in that area. Another thing they recommend, is to work with the Economic Development Committee to actively assist them in providing water and sewer where you could put plants, and normally expand the system to assist economic growth.

Mr. Wood stated the other area they looked at was the North/Northwest Planning Project Area. If you go back to the 2016 report by AECOM, these are the areas they defined as potential areas. The North/Northwest Project Area has several potential water sources. They looked at the Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority, the County building their own water treatment plant on the Broad River, and to tie to the Columbia System along I-77, then extend the line into the Broad River into the North Planning Area, which you could then expand out and serve Blythewood and the other side of the County. The alternatives considered were: "No Action", "Water Distribution System Expansion with the City of Columbia as the Water Source", "Water Distribution System Expansion with Newberry County as the Water Source", "Water Distribution System Expansion with a 2 million gallons a day Water Purification Plant", and "Developer Driven System Expansion". All of these

Development and Services

October 23, 2018

create a backbone through the service area. There is a tremendous potential for customers in the area, but it has a high cost of entry because you do not have a good water supply of your own.

Alternatives:

#1: “No Action” – No costs, you serve no customers or accomplish any objectives you have on providing water

#2: “Purchase Water from the City of Columbia” – If you serve 35% of the customers in the area, you could expect to serve about 740 users; the yearly operating cost would be \$453,000.

#3: “Purchase Water from Newberry County Water and Sewer Authority” – The cost is higher because Newberry County wants the County to extend the water line from one of their large lines through their service area, and then pay impact fees. Therefore, the initial cost is higher than the City of Columbia, but if you look at the operating cost, it is somewhat less than the City of Columbia.

#4: “Build Your Own Water Treatment Plant” – Your operating costs would be highest of all, but you have a long-term potential of that cost going down, as the volume of water you produce goes up.

#5: “Development Driven” – There is no initial cost, and no change in the operating costs.

Mr. Wood stated if you look at the first year of operating costs, if you build the Phase I Project, with the City of Columbia as the source of water, you would have a \$42,000 deficit; Newberry County - \$9,000 deficit; and \$111,000 deficit if the County built their own water treatment plant. The recommended option is the “Developer Driven” development. There would be no initial capital costs, and no impact to the water operating budget for the County.

Mr. Wood stated the project would ensure safe and dependable water supply. The project as defined should not have any adverse impact on the environment. You only have one small water system in the North Planning Area, and it only has 20 customers. In the Southeast, you have a large existing customer base, which can be easily expanded. The cost of entry is very high, either with a water plant or with purchasing water from an existing utility, because you are out of the coastal plain area where wells are not a viable option. In their opinion, a water system is not feasible within the area, at this time. He is not excluding that a project is not feasible under certain conditions. Those conditions are as follows: Create an ordinance that would refine the County’s service area and restrict it from other service providers. They think that is important, even though the County has the right to serve all of the unincorporated areas, they feel it is important to make the statement and make it perfectly clear the County has the right to do that. The ordinance would require all utility infrastructure constructed within this planning area be approved and dedicated to Richland County utilities. The ordinance will require that a caveat be put in that, if there is no way to make this work for a particular area, the County could release that area to another utility, but the County would charge an impact fee or a separation fee to the subdivision, industry, etc. Then, the fee would be used, at the discretion of the County, to either cover expansion costs of water distribution systems or as the County sees fit. Richland County utilities would develop bulk purchase contracts with the City of Columbia and/or Newberry County to provide water services in that area, and serve those

Development and Services

October 23, 2018

customers in that area. In doing their feasibility study, they made general inquiries and general contact with these utilities, but they certainly did not have the authority to negotiate on behalf of the County to try to get the most favorable rate. The current rates that are being offered are a great deal higher than you might see as the State average for bulk purchase. If this alternative would be followed, it would be important that staff worked to develop favorable contracts. RCU would conduct a rate study, or finish the rate study that is in progress, to determine the adequate charges to cover operating costs. There would be no debt retirement, if it is developer driven project. The County should develop a program to promote the water system and to actively seek new customers in the project area. The other thing that always needs to be in the back of your mind is that when you meet that magic mark of around 2,500 customers, which could be easily obtained within 5 – 10 years, you consider building your own water treatment plant. The current cost is \$10.2 million, and we have 3 – 4 of that size in operation in South Carolina, with a water production rate of \$2.80/1,000 gallons. They also recommend that you work, as we did in the Southeast area, that you work with your Economic Development Administration to identify properties in that area to be the utility provider for any new industries or new industrial parks that might be coming into this part of the County.

Mr. Khan stated, in a nutshell, what he is hearing is that we have viable water source in the Southeast. We can easily expand our system, at a relatively viable cost, and be able to serve our customers/constituents. As for the North/Northeast, the reality is that having bigger players like the City of Columbia and Newberry County, and buying bulk from them on their terms is not viable. Essentially, it all boils back to the terms we can negotiate with them. The fact is, if you buy from the City of Columbia, their rates are much higher for unincorporated Richland County. The only option in the North/Northeast is we negotiate our terms, and should they choose to continue serving in our area, and should you allow them to do so, then there should be an impact, which is Mr. Woods' recommendation. The impact fee would be put in place and allow us, in the future, to build a backbone of the system that will serve our constituents.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the borders for the Southeast.

Mr. Khan stated the basis of the previous studies is the areas that not currently being served. In essence, where there is no existing infrastructure, which is below Lower Richland Boulevard/Garners Ferry all the way to the Southeast County line, and along Bluff Road near Hwy. 77.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about Leesburg Road down toward 601.

Mr. Khan stated that would be our area. Wherever the water lines are nonexistent, that should be designated.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if the amounts shown covers a specific area.

Mr. Khan stated the amounts that were shown are building the backbone of the system. They are not going into every single street or home. It goes back to the concept of the backbone. We will have a backbone, which can be expanded to all parts of the Lower Richland County, in future years.

Mr. N. Jackson stated a well alone cannot supply the entire area.

Mr. Wood stated it can.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, when he saw the plan, it showed Air Base Road was the cutoff. It did not show extending the water. The figures they gave him, showed a certain area. It did not show the entire area. He is not saying go down every street, but you gave figures for a certain area. The figures should represent the Southeast.

Mr. Wood stated he tried to make this point, but probably missed it. They took a general chunk of pipe, in a general area, and did a customer count to get a feasibility. They did not, and he tried to convey, that is feasible to serve in that area, but to do that you need to do a period of customer solicitation to develop and determine who wants the service, then develop the product to meet that need. It can be done because you have a good existing water supply that can be easily expanded. There are systems in South Carolina that serve between 7,000 – 10,000 on a similar system.

Mr. N. Jackson stated it is good to find out who wants it, but what you presented was not that. He has seen people, down in the 601 area, who have to test their wells several times because there are a bunch of dump sites in the area. He inquired about how you choose the area, or do you the study you described, and you get a better idea of what is needed for the area. When the citizens see the Southeast Plan, all the citizens in the Southeast, from his understanding, want water. A lot of them have problems with their wells. There are so many problems with dump sites, the lines breaking, and contamination in the water.

Mr. Khan stated it is doable. The information that was given to Council is to give them an assessment of technical and financial viability of water supply, and wherever we choose to do so in Lower Richland County. The projects are to calculate the numbers and give you a sense of where we need to be. The other reason, when the motion that was passed, which brought us to this conversation today, was to do a feasibility study for water supply to Lower Richland area, in conjunction with the Lower Richland Project. That is another reason why the example we have created is more aligned with that motion.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he understands, but when you are saying for the Southeast area, and you pick a chunk out, it is still not representing the entire Southeast area. When you say a \$100,000+ in the negative, that does not reflect a true figure to Council because you are saying, "Okay, it is only this much." If the other people in area said they want water also, that figure would change dramatically because that area was not included. So when send something to the Southeast area, representing Southeast. If you said Hopkins, that is different, because that is what you showed us and that is what it represents. If you said the Southeast area, he is thinking the Southeast area, and it should be more comprehensive study to say what the true figure would be.

Ms. Myers inquired about the capacity of the existing well you are serving the 605 customers on today.

Mr. Woods stated you could serve up to about 1,100 customers, without having to expand the water supply.

Mr. Khan stated the current wells are rated for a certain level of production. The current well, that we have, is approved by DHEC to produce up to approximately 1 million gallons per day. We can produce a 1 million gallons per day; however, the current storage capacity we have is close to 350,000 gallons per day. The goal is to take from there, and expand it to a level where we are almost at capacity with the existing well. The business does not stop there. When we get closer to that, we have a master plan that has identified other sources to get another 1 million gallons per day to expand the system.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, we would expand that particular well with a booster, or would you drill a new well.

Mr. Woods stated you would drill a new well. It might not be in that particular area. Compared to a water treatment plant, they are nothing to drill. It would cost approximately \$150,000 to drill a million gallons a day. That is very doable and easily done in a short time. The whole key to anything is that you have to have a customer base. As you grow, it is easy to grow in that area, because you have an aquifer that can easily be developed.

Ms. Myers stated, to the extent, that you are drilling to the aquifer, then where the demand takes you, in harmony with what Mr. N. Jackson is asking, you clearly have the ability to drill to the aquifer to expand, as needed, and quickly.

Mr. Khan stated he thinks that is exactly right.

Ms. Myers stated with the sample you have done, which is just a feasibility study, and a sample for that study, you would concede that it may well be that the numbers you have, in that small sample, in terms of customer base, and analyzing costs per customer, may rapidly change given demand. It would make all of us gleeful to have that problem. To the extent, that you have not extrapolated from that sample because it is just a feasibility study, can we do it, would there be a customer base, how long would it take, and how much would it cost. Adding in the factors that Mr. N. Jackson has raised, would favorably improve the analysis.

Mr. Khan stated it would make it much better.

Mr. Pearce inquired where the grant that was mentioned came from.

Mr. Khan stated we need \$8 million to start the project. There are multiple sources to fund it. We have to get the financial advisor involved to see where we do, but Mr. Woods being in the consulting business, his recommendation is that we pursue some low or no interest grants, and funding sources through Rural Water, and other agencies, which would serve more favorably down the rate, if we get that.

Ms. Myers stated she thinks it is great, and thanked Mr. Khan.

Development and Services

October 23, 2018

Mr. C. Jackson inquired about how many years the average monthly rate, for the customer, would stay constant.

Mr. Khan stated he could not speak for the inflation because it is all costs driven, but typically it is consistent for a couple of years, and there is a minor inflation to adjust it. He stated he would be uncomfortable stating any numbers.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he lives in an area where the rates have doubled. He is certain no one anticipated them doubling during that period of time. He would certainly hate for us to even go down the road, with the Southeast customers, for whom many are satisfied with what they have, offering a rate that would double in a short period of time. His concern is whatever rate is quoted, when we get to that point, that there be some level of assurance there is some stability in that rate, and it does not double in the very near future, to many people's surprise.

Mr. Khan stated, if, and when, you allow us to move forward, his plan will be to give you an expanded 10-year plan. Water, at time, is used as a revenue source. He cannot speak for other utility providers, and sellers, but many times people in his role do not try enough to get your attention, and have you dedicate enough funds, so that we build our infrastructure in a gradual manner. When it comes to breaking down, we come to you and say, "By the way, I'm dying, I need help." The cost model will double or triple your rates in one jump, as opposed to gradually moving, as it should be. That could you be the case in Mr. C. Jackson's area.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, if he joined a system, he has no choice in the rate that is already in place. If he is not a part of a system, and you are introducing a new system to him, and he may have some choice in the matter, that is a different conversation. He is speaking to the extent that you are asking people to become a part of a system they are not a part of. The system he has, he had to endure the increased costs. He had no option. If he wanted to have a house there, he had to buy that system. In this case, people have an option, and that is what he is trying to say. When you go to them and propose they buy into this concept, that you keep in mind that it is different than someone who is moving to an established system where they have not been shorted.

Mr. Khan stated, if, and when, he is allowed to do this, he will give you 10 year's projection, and have you look into, and buy into it. They will be accountable for the deliverance unless an extenuating situation comes around.

Mr. Malinowski stated his question was, in going through the maps, charts, and the slide presentation, in one area of the Northwest it showed a tie in point with the City of Columbia, if one of these options were selected. How want that tie in point decided?

Mr. Woods stated they had multiple meetings with the City of Columbia, and we just picked one. If you look at the slide, there are several potential points. The City of Columbia indicated, in their initial conversation, they would provide multiple tie points.

Mr. Malinowski stated it is hard to tell from this small scale map, but they have that big tower just outside of Irmo. Then, they also have the plant over at the lake. He inquired if this is one of their existing locations.

Mr. Woods stated it is off of one of their existing 12 or 16-inch water lines. Again, he painted with a big brush, and we will get the minute details when we start negotiating a favorable rate.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, Mr. Woods said Newberry County was not feasible. Is that something that we have to put down the lines ourselves, and have them ready to hook up with them, or how does that work.

Mr. Woods stated, in the main report, there is a map they sent along where they wanted us to extend the water line from. They never got to the point of asking some serious questions about whether we get to enjoy revenue or tap fees off of the line, which are a part of a contract negotiation. They gave us their general "What we would do for everybody else?" He stated, he did not have Council's blessing to negotiate the contract.

Mr. Malinowski stated, no matter where we go, be it North or South, there will be tap fees associated with this for anybody that would want to hook on.

Mr. Khan stated we would have a rate structure established across the board for the customers. Typically, there are tap fees, and with Council's approval, he will recommend tap fees. What that number would be, he could not speak to today.

Ms. Dickerson stated, with the potential of the City of Columbia, if we do not act, and if they decide to start consuming and annexing all of these properties, or annexing most of Richland County, what effect would that have on these areas that are underserved, at this point and time. She inquired about what options the customers, who are not tapped in now, have.

Mr. Khan stated the existing customers, including himself, have no option on the City of Columbia. If they are there, my only option is to tap onto their system, pay what they ask me, sign what they choose for me to sign, and walk away from that. If we do not act, soon all of Richland County will have no other option.

Mr. Pearce moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to divide the question (Southeast and North/Northwest) and forward to Council, for consideration, the recommendations, outlined in the PowerPoint presentation by Mr. Khan.

Mr. Malinowski stated from what our attorney mentioned last time, and Mr. Khan during the presentation today and a previous meeting, that the recommendations that are on the last page of this slide presentation, that the committee could also begin the process to create an ordinance to define our service area. Maybe another motion could be for the Legal Department to draft the ordinance.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to direct staff to start creating an ordinance, for consideration, outlining the boundaries of the districts.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce, and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Private Pond Outfall Silt Removal Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) – Ms. Synithia Williams stated what we have in front of you is an update to the current policy. County Council adopted the private pond maintenance policy in 2005. This policy has been updated to clarify what the intent of the original 2005 policy was for. That is what the name was changed to the “Private Pond Outfall Silt Removal Policy”. The goal of this policy is clarify that, if it is a public drainage system, that is outfalling into a private pond, off of a public road, that we will use County employees to remove the sediment from the outfall discharging into that pond. If our pipe, on our road, is going into that private pond, we will remove that sediment around that outfall, and maintain our outfall going into that private pond.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about County property, with SCDOT.

Ms. Williams stated this one is just referencing if it is a County pipe, off of a County road system, so not SCDOT roads.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we have addressed any because they have complaining about SCDOT silt going through streams that in County areas. He stated it is affecting streams and the ponds.

Ms. Williams stated they have excluded SCDOT roads in this update to the policy. Currently, if we receive complaints about silt from a SCDOT road, we are referring...

Mr. N. Jackson stated the County is fixing a lot of the problem along Mountainbrook, but SCDOT silt is causing the problem.

Ms. Williams stated they currently have easements on the stretch of ditch they are doing the project on, so it is already our conveyance system that we are doing the update to, to stabilize it.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we are addressing Sunnyside Lake.

Ms. Williams stated she will have to look back at Sunnyside Lake.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the revisions and renaming of the Private Pond Outfall Silt Removal SOP.

In Favor: C. Jackson, Pearce and Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. County Council is requested to provide guidance on whether to allow private entities/individuals/associations to install flashing speed limit radar signs with County Rights-of-Way – Mr. Ozbek stated what is front of you is a request from Summit Homeowners’ Association. In certain SCDOT roads, they do operations. They put flashing speeds...

POINT OF ORDER – Mr. Malinowski stated he thought this Council had made rules that motions are what gets items on committees. If we have every HOA go to a staff member, or department head, and ask them to put this on the committee agenda to be discussed, then we could have enormous agenda every time. It seems like whoever is at the Summit should have contacted their Council representative, and a motion been made to put this here.

Mr. Pearce inquired if this item is properly before the committee. He stated, according to the Parliamentarian, this item is not properly before the committee, so it will not be taken up.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, in response to Mr. Malinowski's comment, as one of the representatives in the Summit, it was certainly not brought to his attention.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Ozbek to explain to the people that they need to go through their Council representative.

- d. City of Columbia's Request for permission to Survey, Soil Testing, Geotechnical Services & Environmental (Wetland) Inspection – Mr. Madden stated in the agenda packet there are 2 letters that were received by staff, from the City of Columbia, requesting to enter onto County-owned property to do geo testing. The first property is the Rowing Club off of Broad River Road, and then there is a tract of land off of Farrow Road, that the County owns. They are requesting, to allow people, to come on to the County-owned property to conduct testing.

Mr. Pearce inquired as to what staff's recommendation was.

Mr. Madden stated staff's initial recommendation was granting permission, but we would ask that be contingent upon receiving information from the City on exactly what they are testing for.

Mr. Manning stated the same question on the other issue. If this did not come from a Council member, and go through the motion process, why would the last one not be able to get to us from staff, but this one does come to us from staff.

Mr. Smith stated he believes the rule is the same. He does not know how it got on the committee agenda.

Mr. Pearce requested Mr. Madden to have the Assistant County Administrator present it at the next Council meeting.

5. **ITEMS PENDING ANALYSIS: NO ACTION REQUIRED:**

- a. Council Motion: State and/or Federal law prohibitions against a county plastic bag ordinance [MALINOWSKI and N. JACKSON] – No action was taken.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:58 PM.