1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   a. Regular Session: June 24, 2019 [PAGES 1-14]

3. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

4. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

   A. Presentation of First Tryon Financial Advisors

   B. S. 401 State Law Regarding Utility Cost

      (Pages 15-22)

   C. Shop Road Change Order (Pages 23-27)

   D. Pending Approvals (Page 28)

5. **ITEMS FOR ACTION**

   A. Approval of Letters of Recommending to Award Bid:

      1. Resurfacing Package Q (Pages 29-40)

      2. North Springs/Harrington Intersection

         (Pages 41-60)

      Intersection (Pages 41-60)

   B. Approval to Increase Construction Contingency amount:

      1. Koon/Farmview Sidewalk Project Project 10%

         (Page 61)

      2. Magnolia/Schoolhouse Road Project 10%

         (Page 61)
C. Approval of Penny Project Features Inside SCDOT Right of Way (Pages 62-71)
   1. Shared Use Paths
   2. Landscaped Medians
   3. Mast Arms
   4. Street Lighting

D. Approval of the Widening Memo (Pages 72-99)

E. Approval of Modified 2019-2028 Project and Cash Flow Plan (Pages 100-103)

6. **ADJOURNMENT**
1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.

2. **Approval of Minutes: April 23, 2019** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as distributed.

   In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

   The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Niermeier stated “Crane Creek Greenway Scope of Work for Design Contracts“ would need to be added to the agenda.

   Mr. Manning stated he was disheartened with another broken promise. After living through another 2-hour work session, one of the things that promised was that the Gills Creek Greenway changes would be on the agenda, and a part of this meeting.

   Mr. Jackson stated there was also a discussion about having a work session, with regard to the Greenways, which is why it not here today.

   Mr. Niermeier stated back in March/April, when one of the matters came before Council, it was decided to have work session. It was discussed, at the Pre-Ad Hoc meeting, and the matter will be addressed at the next Ad Hoc meeting.

   Mr. Jackson accepted full responsibility for making the decision, since we were not prepared to have the discussion today.

   Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to adopt the agenda as amended.
The vote in favor was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:

4. Holt #12 Service Order Modifications for Spears Creek Church Road Design – Mr. Niermeier stated this item was presented to Council in October 2018, and received 1st Reading. Based on discussions with the County Attorney, it is going to require two more readings and a Public Hearing, in order to pass. Chairman Jackson wanted to bring it back to the committee’s attention, and make sure it is on the next Council agenda.

b. 12 Dirt Road Contract Extensions – Mr. Niermeier stated there are 12 dirt road contract extensions required. There is no costs. All 12 contracts are being extended to February 2020, which is before the end of the master contract the OETs are on.

c. Pending Approvals – Mr. Niermeier stated these are the pending approvals with the County, or are in process. The Chatsworth Road Connector goes back to the Property Distribution Management Ad Hoc, when there was a parcel offered by the School District. The Chatsworth Connector runs through the larger of the two parcels that offered. He has been trying to get in touch with the Recreation Commission about that matter. The Shop Road Widening Internal funds transfer is up for signature. There are two engineering agreements the County is trying to reach with railroad, which is just a matter of the County paying the fee.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there are any anticipated problems.

Dr. Thompson responded, “No, sir.”

Mr. Manning requested a clearer understanding of trying to get in touch with the Recreation Commission.

Mr. Niermeier stated they have corresponded with email, tried different phone calls, and when he sees the Director, in person, he mentions it to her that they need to get together to discuss whether the Recreation Commission is interested in the property. Our interest is the Chatsworth Connector between the neighborhood and the main road.

Mr. Manning inquired if the Council member from that district was notified of this problem.

Mr. Niermeier stated the Council member has not been notified.

Mr. Jackson inquired if Mr. Niermeier anticipated being able to make that connection and have the issue resolved by the next Council meeting, committee meeting, etc.

Mr. Niermeier stated he would make that a priority, and, at least, have the conversation. Then, it is just a matter of willingness of the Recreation Commission and the School District.

d. Update on Blythewood/Richland County/SCDOT IGA for Blythewood SUP Maintenance – Mr. Niermeier stated they have started the process of negotiation, and are working with the PDT to link up with the SCDOT and the Town of Blythewood to hand over the agreement.
ITEMS FOR ACTION

5.

a. Approval of Scope of Work for Design Contracts

i. Projects Under the Referendum

1. Shop Road Extension
2. Blythewood Area Improvement
3. Broad River Corridor NIP
4. Trenholm Acres/Newcastle NIP
5. Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway
6. Crane Creek Greenway

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve Items 5(a)(i)(1-6).

Ms. Myers stated, from her understanding, staff is requesting to go to 70% design.

Mr. Niermeier stated the majority of these are up to 30%, which means all of the concepts were developed, and the public meeting held.

Ms. Myers stated, we were told, with doing this design work, that a subsequent engineer is not likely to use these designs because they did not have input. They will have to go back and check all of the design work, so we would be essentially redoing design work.

Mr. Niermeier stated what they have worked with Procurement on is “substantial progress”, which was determined to be 30%, where the OET that did the work would continue on the project until its logical conclusion. Since all these are at the 30%, we have met the metric of “substantial progress”; therefore, we would not be stopping it and handing it over to another firm.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, these are not the ones we are trying to move to 70% now.

Mr. Niermeier stated they have a list of all the projects, which are below 30%, and the ones that are at 30%. They are working with this metric, now, to determine which ones to move forward with, and which ones to stop.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are looking at the ones that are below 30%. She thought some of them were going to 70%.

Mr. Niermeier stated, he believes, the ones on this list are all at 30%, or greater.

Ms. Myers stated, if we are looking at projects, and taking them to 30%, because we know, at that point, a subsequent engineer could come in and accept that work and move forward, that makes sense to her. We are now looking at those that have gotten to 30%, and we are trying to move them to 70%. Her question is why we would be spending that money, knowing what we were told before, that it is not likely that much of the design is going to be accepted, by a subsequent company coming in. We know this contract will end in November.

Mr. Niermeier stated we are not doing the work again. The base contract, for the design work, ends in March. The intent is to utilize what has been done, and look at not wasting more money and have
someone redo it. If these start moving forward, they will be at the 30% or greater point, and by definition, in Procurement, that is "substantial completion". The service order, the OETs are working under, would continue. No one would have to go back and redo the work.

Mr. Jackson stated there are others that Ms. Myers’ question is relevant to, but we are not presenting those.

Mr. Niermeier stated there are others that will not make the threshold, and will either be stopped, at a certain point, or bid out differently to continue design.

Mr. Jackson stated, the understanding is, the projects that are before us have already met the threshold that would require reconsideration later on down the line. If we approve them today, and they go from 30% to 70%, that work will continue up until March.

Mr. Niermeier stated the work could continue past March because they will have reached "substantial completion".

Mr. Beaty stated a couple of these projects would go to 100% design plans. He did not want to mislead anyone.

Ms. Myers inquired if that means, at that point, we would have to bid it out to somebody else, and they would inherit design.

Mr. Beaty stated nothing changes. As Mr. Niermeier explained, we can move forward with the existing OET contracts. Some of them, are scoped to go through 70%, at which point, you may want to make changes in the final design. Some of the others are so clear that the contract is to finish the design.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

ii. **Projects Over the Referendum**

1. **Polo Road Widening**
2. **Lower Richland Boulevard Widening**

Mr. Beaty stated both projects have been designed through 30% complete plans. They are, technically, over the referendum amount, but we are still recommending that you move forward with the design. Each of these would go from 30% to 100%, with the existing OET, and no redesign would be necessary.

Ms. Myers stated, so that means, we have designed it in a way that is over the referendum, and we would be continuing with that design. Alternatively, could the design be re-scoped to be under the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland Boulevard is a very short section of road, so the only choice would be to go to 3-lanes, instead of 5-lanes. It is either all or nothing, from Garners Ferry to Rabbit Run. He would not think that Lower Richland could be redesigned to a different scope.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, Mr. Beaty presented an alternative to change the scope from 5-
lanes to 3-lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated it was included in the referendum and called out as a 5-lane road. The traffic studies warrant a 5-lane section.

Ms. Myers stated she does not disagree, but given that it is well over budget, it is a decision, and choice, that somebody has to make, to say, “Okay. It is well over the referendum amount, but the referendum called for it to be 5-lanes. To do it for 5-lanes, here is what it cost.”

Mr. Livingston inquired if the design is for 3-lanes or 5-lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland is 5-lanes. On Polo, it is 3-lanes.

Mr. Livingston inquired if it would cost us anything, if we decided to go from 5-lanes to 3-lanes, to stay within the budget.

Mr. Beaty stated, today, we have 30% plans for a 5-lane, and there would be a nominal expense to change it to a 3-lane. If you did carry it through 70% - 100%, there would be an expense to change something, but it would not be a complete redesign.

Ms. Newton stated, from her perspective, she would like for us, as body, to say this the standard that we are using for items that are over the referendum. She does not think, without that framework, she could make a decision that it needs to be 5-lanes or 3-lanes. Yes, the referendum said it needed to be 5-lanes, but before we change it, we need to have a framework that we take to the people to say this is why we are making this decision, and this is how we are moving forward. Her preference is that we address what our policy is going to be moving forward, how we are going to address the decisions that we make, and how we are going to deal with any budget shortfalls that may appear.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the referendum called for Polo Road to be 3-lanes, and the design is for 3-lanes.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jackson stated, one of the desired outcomes he had for the work session, was to address the issue that Ms. Newton raised, and identify projects that required exceptions be made. In addition, to make a decision, with regards, to how we would do that systemically, and objectively. He thinks, the “Cash Flow Plan”, Mr. Beaty attempted to present at the work session, was an attempt to identify how systemically all the projects identified would be funded. Whether we agree with that plan, or not, is open for discuss, but that is what the intent was. Unfortunately, because many of the issues we are dealing with are now 7 – 8 years old, he still has some challenges separating the mere fact because it is over the referendum it is problematic. He is certain the subject experts in this field would tell him there are some percentage of dollars that have exceeded what was anticipated 8 years ago. Actually, the study, to put it on the referendum, was conducted in 2010 – 2011. For us to singularly hang our hats on, “It is over the referendum”, so it is a no-no, he thinks we need to have a much broader discussion about where realistically, and economically, any item that placed on a budget 8 years ago would be, in terms of inflationary costs. He thinks that rather than kick the can down the road for those items that are clearly, and legitimately, over the referendum amount 8 – 9 years later, we need to have a specific conversation, sooner than later, to address the matter. It may require some individualized discussions, project by project. There are some projects, which have exceeded the referendum, for a host of different reasons, so to come up with a cookie-cutter approach, he is not sure
Ms. Newton stated the one item that she would like to see added, as part of this decision, is the people. We decide, as a body, but when we talked about the Penny, we made a promise to people. If one project is $30M over the referendum that could potentially impact another promise that we cannot keep. She thinks the right thing to do is to figure out a framework, so when we tell one person your project was changed, deferred, or denied, and someone else, your project could go $30M over budget, we have a good reason, we can justify, and the people accept.

Ms. Terracio requested an estimate of how much these projects are expected to be over the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated Lower Richland is almost within the range of their ability to estimate. The referendum amount was $6.1M, and the estimate is $6.7M. The referendum amount for Polo Road is $12.8M, and $15.3 is the estimate.

Mr. Livingston stated the decision for him, right now, is not voting on this because he is committed to going beyond the referendum. It is simply to be prepared to move forward, whichever way we decide to move forward. It may mean that a vote on Lower Richland, at this particular point, someone may find a way to fund it at $6.7M, or not, but when he gets ready to make that decision, he knows it is still moving forward. There is no decision being made about what it is going to cost, at this point.

Mr. Beaty stated it takes 2 – 3 months to negotiate with the OETs, to get to their contract value. If you chose, you could authorize staff, and the PDT, to enter into negotiations. Nothing is final until Council approves the contract. If you would allow that, then all that is happening is negotiations with the OET. Council would still approve the final contract in September. If you wait until September, to begin negotiations, it may be December.

Ms. Myers inquired if you would be negotiating, based on the current status (i.e. over the referendum amount).

Mr. Beaty responded they could, or another opinion would be, to limit any potential risk, not to take the projects to 100%, but 70%. It keeps activities moving, but it minimizes any opportunity for rework in the future.

Ms. Myers stated she wants the projects to keep moving, but she shares Ms. Newton's concern that we may be just making busy work. We are keeping it moving, but we have not made a decision as to where we should be moving. Until we make some decisions, go back to the people about those proposals, and get an ultimate answer, she does not know that it is prudent to spend the money to get into negotiating something that may never be where we are going. She would say, within the next couple weeks, we need to make a decision, as to what the guiding philosophy is on these projects. She inquired, where are our financial advisors, in terms of the recommendations they were going to bring back to us, so we could drive this decision.

Dr. Thompson stated the financial advisor would be meeting with Mr. Niermeier tomorrow morning. He stated he met with them today. They will be sharing the models with them. They have built those models, based on the PDT's cash flow information.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the financial advisors have developed some proposed recommendations that staff is vetting.
Dr. Thompson stated they would be sharing the models with Mr. Niermeier at the meeting tomorrow.

Ms. Myers inquired when those models would be brought to committee or Council.

Dr. Thompson stated he anticipates the model will come to the ad hoc committee next month.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the financial advisors used the cash flow model, presented at our work session, as the assumption.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated the model, presumed, going over some places, and under some places. To understand the assumptions, did the assumptions say, “This is the math, how can we make these recommendations work financially”, or did the advisor say, “These are the numbers of what we have spent, and what we have left, this is how we recommend making it.”

Dr. Thompson stated the only thing they are going to give you is information about how to proceed, if we need debt financing.

Ms. Myers stated, basically, we are saying to them, now that we are standing in the shoes of the PDT; tell us how to execute their plan within our budget.

Dr. Thompson stated the financial advisors will be bringing the models to Council. The models are not etched in stone, so it is very interactive. You will have an opportunity to say how we proceed with debt financing, and how we prioritize the projects.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, the financial advisors are not starting from a clean slate. They are starting from the recommendations the PDT has made, as to how this program should go forward.

Dr. Thompson stated you cannot start from a clean slate when you are looking at Clemson Road or North Main Street, for example.

Ms. Myers stated those are projects underway. There are also projects that are not underway that could be started in a different way, and this County does not have to do in the same way. We are not the PDT. We are not going to have the number of employees they have. Presuming that, boxes us in, in her opinion. Her question is have we considered there may be another, or better way.

Dr. Thompson stated, again, the financial advisor is going to show you this model next month. You will have the opportunity to be able to modify the projects, as we move forward. Based on the policy that you set forth, you will be able to determine the path forward on all projects.

Ms. Myers stated, under that analysis, we do not need to wait for the financial advisors to give us their run rate to make the policy decision, as to what we do when we are in the position of a cost overrun. We need them to tell us what is possible, but, as far as, do we decide to re-scope when there is an overrun, or do we go forward, we do not need to wait on that.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to move forward with 70% design.

Mr. Livingston stated the votes voted for these two projects. The probability of him voting to delete those is slim, which is why he is willing to move forward with the design instead of delaying them. It is
not going to cost much, and it could be to our benefit to move forward. One of the issues we have, now, with costs, is because it has taken us so long, and those estimates are going to continue to increase. He thinks we are better off moving forward with design, and not have projects done 8–10 years from now, when the costs may be significant.

Mr. Jackson stated the only hesitation he would have is, if a project could potentially be deleted, which is not the case with these two. The question on the table, today, is not to fund the completed project, but to fund the design portion. He is certainly willing to move forward with the design, and get the information from Council on whether or not we continue with the projects, as they stand. He would like us to be able to talk, specifically, and not hypothetically, because he thinks the public gets the impression, based upon comments that have been made, there are up to a dozen projects that are over the referendum amount. There is one project, that is out there, but for the most part, with the numbers he has seen, there is less than half a dozen projects that fall in this category.

Ms. Myers stated Mr. Livingston and Mr. Jackson’s points stand for all the projects. Until we get a policy decision, all of these are projects that have been voted on, and nobody has said that we are scrapping anyone of them. Making the decision, based on that premise, is a little off. She would suggest, we need to have the conversation about all of the projects that have this problem, because none of them is slated for the chopping block. If there are only six, or so, that are over the referendum amount, it strengthens, in her mind, the need to look at the why. Either costs have gone up for all them, or they have not. If costs have skyrocketed for six projects, but we have 10 that somehow do not have skyrocketing cost, that is more of a reason that we look at it, and establish a protocol to move forward.

Mr. Livingston stated doing the design to 70% does not prohibit the discussion. He wants the discussion too, but the 70% design allows him to move forward with the project, and not put the project off.

Ms. Newton stated we are anchoring time, in a way that she is not sure is accurate, when we talk about delaying the conversation 6 months, or delaying things until September. She thinks it is perfectly reasonable to expect that these are conversations that we need to have in the next several weeks, and not months, to determine how we move forward.

Mr. Jackson stated, he thinks it is important to understand, that the conversation we are having now is not a new revelation. This conversation was being had when he arrived 3 years ago, so to suggest that we are going to address in 30–60 days what this Council has failed to address, in 3 years, is unrealistic. The issue regarding the projects, and where they stand, is absolutely a discussion we need to have, and go back to voters to make them aware that we are shortening a termini here, or changing a project there. In the meantime, while we are doing that, not to design the project, seems fool hearted. Waiting to have a conversation, and then having to do the design anyway, in September of October. Why not let the design begin now, and let it run simultaneously. Once the end results of that conversation come out, it then impacts and modifies the design. As he understands it, it has not been a waste of money; it has only been a waste of time, if we do not start the design now.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

Opposed: Myers and Newton

The vote was in favor.
b. Approval of Projects to be Advertised

i. Projects Under the Referendum

1. Greene Street Phase 2 – Available to advertise
2. Resurfacing Package R – Available to advertise
3. Dirt Road Package K – July

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve Items 5(b)(i)(1-3).

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, Manning and Livingston

ii. Projects Over the Referendum

1. Atlas Road Widening – July – Mr. Beaty stated Atlas Road, in the referendum, was $17.6M. The current estimate is approximately $42M. He stated he would recommend looking at the Widening category, as a whole. If you infuse the potential savings from the I-20 Broad River Road Interchange, you could move forward with 10 of the 14, with no changes, and then modifications to the other four. If you look at one widening, without looking at the global discussion, you are not seeing the total picture.

Ms. Myers stated the current projection for Atlas Road is a little over 2 times the referendum. We have had other roads that have come in below the referendum.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council without a recommendation.

In Favor: Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

Abstain: Jackson

The vote was in favor.

2. Polo SUP, Harrison Sidewalk – July – Mr. Beaty stated the Polo Shared-Use Path is separate from the Polo Widening Project. It is referred to as the Polo Road Sidewalk in the monthly report. It is a combination of both bikeway and sidewalk funding because the Shared-Use Path serves both purposes. The cost estimate is approximately $3M for the Polo Road SUP. The Harrison Sidewalk is estimated to be $2M.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the amount over the referendum.

Mr. Jackson stated the Polo Road Sidewalk referendum amount was $400,000, and the Harrison Road referendum amount was $600,000. Basically, it has gone from $1M to approximately $5M.

Mr. Beaty stated, with the sidewalk category, there were a number of sidewalks completed outside of the program. If you kept the sidewalk category together, you could take the underruns and apply them to other sidewalks, within that category, to make...
them whole. That is how the Polo Road and Harrison Road sidewalks have been designed, to date.

Mr. Jackson inquired, as a result of that, will any sidewalk projects be adversely affected by making those transfers.

Mr. Beaty stated no higher ranked, is how he has to answer that. They have developed the 56, in order. We could complete 50, of the 56. The last six could be negatively affected, even so, there is not enough to do all of them, so they are going to be affected. Whether this is right, wrong or indifferent, we have gone down the ranking, developed the projects. If there were savings from other sidewalks, we have applied those funds, moving down the line.

Mr. Jackson inquired if there are any that would have been done, but as a result of what Mr. Beaty described, would not be done now.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not think so. The sidewalk category had about $27M. The PDT Cash Flow Plan had proposed reducing the sidewalk program, and the bikeway program, by approximately $5M each to make the program $0, at the end of the day. We had talked about Kelly Mill and Commerce being approximately $9.5M so together that is $19.5 M. He thinks the interest rate should be closer to 2.5%, instead of the 4%. If we recognize North Main, which is constrained per an agreement with the City, then we think we can change the workflow plan to easily $20M. We could make the sidewalk category whole to the referendum, but even if we brought it back to the whole of the referendum for the sidewalk category, $27M will not build 56 sidewalks.

Mr. Jackson stated even from the onset there was not enough money to build all of the sidewalks that have been identified.

Mr. Beaty stated that is correct, and it goes beyond the sidewalks. It goes to most projects.

Mr. Jackson stated, when we have our constructive debates about what to do next, is what to do next based upon some flawed data from, at the beginning. As a result of the flawed data, now we are trying to figure out how to make it whole when it was never sufficient funding, even when the referendum was passed. That is very troubling to him. He referenced the Parsons-Brinckeroff study, as his evidence, when he went back to review that. When he reviewed that document, and looked at what was available, as a result, it is clear to him that we started out of the gate in a deficit, if we were going to try to do everything that was passed on the referendum.

Ms. Myers stated there are some things that are critically important to this discussion that she thinks we are overlooking. She stated that she appreciated the work of the PDT, and them getting the County as far down the road as they have, but there is several things that were said that trouble her. She stated it is not the PDT’s role, or right, to be shuffling money around in Penny to make anything whole or to figure out where you bring money from to get this project or that done. That is a policy decision. To the extent, that looking at these projects, you have said we could realize savings here and put it there; that too is a policy decision. This body should decide all those things. The reason that moving forward with design, and pushing this in a way that we do not make these hard decisions is a hard problem, is because it is a de facto decision. When we get the point where we
have said design it, and construct it...well we cannot do these 6 on the bottom. They were not high priorities anyway. We were never going to be able to do them all, so we will just kick them down the road. Her concern with that is that is not what we are telling the public. What we are telling the public is that we are working to rationalize the program, but all the while, we are just moving along the list. We have de facto given the PDT the right to be the policy maker because they are coming to use and saying this is what we have done to rationalize it. That is what Council is supposed to be doing, with public involvement. There are six sidewalks on the bottom of a 56-sidewalk list, which we knew from day one we did was not have enough money to do. There is 600 roads on the dirt road paving list, which cost $500,000 each to pave. We have $45M; therefore, you can pave 90 roads, so pick your 90. Her issue with that is who is picking the 90. Now that we have told the public that their sidewalks are going to be paved over in this area, and theirs in this area too, but they are all on lists. The public is not watching the list. They just know what the promise was. Before we lop off the end of it, we have to make a decision and present that decision to the public, and take the heat. We have to have a honest discussion about it, and not just move the needle and keep going along for the sake of keeping the project moving. What projects are moving? And, who has decided on the priority? Who has decided, if we realize savings over here, we should put them there? Council has not, and that is the core of their responsibility. She is concerned that because it is easier to do it the other way, that we are de facto doing it that way, and there is going to come a day of reckoning and we are all going to be responsible for not having not done exactly what is the harder thing. She wants these projects to keep going too. We need, as a group, to be saying the same thing. We do not need to be falling into doing something de facto to keep the program moving.

Mr. Manning stated, with all due respect, in his years here, before 2012, and with the PDT coming on, he has been on and off this committee, but consistently on Council, and his impression is that the PDT has never been making any policy decisions. They have come to this committee, Council Retreats, and Council meetings. Many times with thoughts, opinions, options, suggestions, and recommendations. Between this committee, work sessions, Council meetings, and Council Retreats, that decision have been made and continue, even today, with what is being brought before us in the agenda and support materials. Ultimately, Council has been the one to make the decisions.

Mr. Livingston stated his comments are similar to Mr. Manning’s comments. He thanked Mr. Beaty for his recommendations and professional opinion regarding this matter. It helps him to make decision, as a Council member, no matter who he gets the information from. He does not see it as making decisions for Council. He sees it as making recommendations for us to consider, and that is what he expects. He thinks Mr. Beaty makes those recommendations as consistent, as possible, with the referendum. That helps him to engage in an honest discussion. He wants the same thing from staff, or anybody else.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to proceed with advertising the project.

Ms. Myers stated, for the record, we are going $4M over the referendum amount advertising for sidewalks, without a discussion of whether or not we ought to be looking at this a different way. All that we ask is that we postpone this because it is over the referendum amount. A $400,000 sidewalk, at the referendum, that is now a $2.9M sidewalk, in her opinion, Council should be asking a lot of questions, as to why it is that
far over. Are all the other ones that far over? If there are some that have come in under, as Mr. Beaty said, how did they come in well under, and we cannot re-scope this one to get it well under. She thinks moving forward this way, advertising for construction, does not make a lot of sense.

Ms. Newton commended the great work, with the Penny Program, thus far. The work has been so great, and so well done, that the people in her district have a lot of questions about it when it comes to what is being done in their areas. What remains to be spent, and how we are going to move forward. She wants us to fulfill our promise to the taxpayers of Richland County. She wants us to move forward and not have undue delay. Again, what she is asking for to take an account, and have us, as a body, make decisions, in terms of this is how we are going to move forward, when things are above the referendum. The fact of the matter is, she has gotten more calls and complaints about proposed cutting of $5M. It is really hard for her to move forward, saying it is okay to go $40M, $30M, etc. over. She is not advocating for undue delay. She is advocating for us to put all our cards on the table, take a look at these numbers and say this is how it makes sense to move forward. Advertising for projects that are far over budget, sounds and feels, the same way as saying, “We approve this going that far over budget.” That is where we need to have a conversation. Not just as body, from a policy making prospective, but with the constituents. The fact is the roads we build will need to be maintained. There will come a time when we will have to go before our constituents again, and potentially ask for another penny. When that time comes, she wants to be able to say that she duties. She did the best she could to make sure that we came to you and kept you informed.

Ms. Terracio stated, looking at this project, it seems they are pretty long projects. We are calling them sidewalks, but it looks like the Polo Road one is a Shared-Use Path. She requested additional information about that project.

Mr. Beaty stated a lot of the bikeways and sidewalks had the same road included in both categories. This piece of Polo, from Alpine to Mallet Hill, was identified as both a bikeway and a sidewalk. By constructing a 10-ft. Shared-Use Path you accommodate both.

Mr. Livingston withdrew his motion.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward this to Council without a recommendation.

Mr. Jackson stated he thinks this process has been painful, and has been difficult for him, as a Council member, and as a citizen. He was almost late to the meeting today because of the Clemson Road one-lane traffic. It has been painful for Administration, PDT, and the public. He wished there was an easy way to resolve it. Charleston County, unlike Richland County, recognized that they were not going to be able to get it all done, so they did not go for a 5-year referendum, they did a 3-year referendum and came back for a 2nd one. Now that he thinks about it, he sees the logic in that. They got a lot of work done, and told the public, “If you want to get the rest of this done, you are going to pass another referendum.” As opposed, to going over the referendum, to try to get it done.

Mr. Manning stated he will be voting “No” out of principle and frustration. He thinks part of the responsibility committees have is to do the work.
In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

c. **Penny Projects Inside SCDOT Rights-of-Way Maintenance Cost Impacts** – Ms. Steele stated the street lighting cost estimate was updated, and added additional attachments. Staff is requesting guidance from Council on whether to proceed with this. If we proceed, and take on this responsibility, Public Works will likely have to request additional funding for the maintenance. On pp. 63 – 64 of the agenda, is a breakdown of the items that will require maintenance; p. 65 is the updated cost estimates for lighting. Bear in mind, the estimates are based on a cost estimate that was received for the Decker/Woodfield project. This is being broadly applied to the countywide look at lighting. The two scenarios are for a 15-year period. The first scenario is if you were to pay a lump sum amount down for the installation and maintenance fees, with a monthly energy fee. Over a 15-year timeframe, for a 4 or 5-lane roadway, it would be $578,600. The second scenario is if you do not pay any money up front. The monthly fee would include the installation, maintenance and energy fees, which would equate to $738,000 over a 15-year period.

Ms. Myers inquired if there is a theory under which we would do the lighting we are all contemplating that needs to be done and get a volume discount, or is this going to be a multiplier on every road.

Ms. Steele stated it is hard to get a good figure for this, if the lighting was done countywide. We took the cost estimate and assumed that most of the County’s roads are 2-laned, not 4-laned, so we cut the estimate in half. If you broadly assume we install lighting on every County-maintained road, which is where the figure of $232,837,319 (Scenario 1) or $296,982,270 (Scenario 2) come from. Many subdivisions already have lighting installed and maintained by HOAs. The installation costs could decrease, but you could have the HOAs that have lighting to come to the County and say, “You installing and maintaining over here. We want you to take over our costs.”

Ms. Myers stated that is over $200M, over 15 years, so the taxpayers may not be able to sustain a universally lit county.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we could pay for the installation of lighting on Penny-funded roads.

Ms. Steele stated, she believes, that is a question they plan to ask SCDOR, when they have their audit meeting with them.

Ms. Myers inquired if we have investigated solar lighting.

Ms. Steele stated she does not believe so.

Ms. Myers suggested, if that is an option, that might get us to a more energy efficient, and achieve the goal across the county.

Mr. Manning inquired if Mr. Jackson has a list of things that are going to be brought to SCDOR.

Mr. Jackson stated he does not.
Mr. Manning stated, as a member of this committee, he thinks Mr. Jackson should have a current list of what will be brought up in the SCDOR meeting, ahead of time, so he is aware of what the items will be, and if there are ones he has heard brought up during the meeting process, that are not on the list, they can be added. Secondly, on p. 67, it talks about animals and the effects of lighting. If we are going to move forward with lighting, and it is going to affect bird migration, it would be helpful for us to learn as much as we can about that issue. It would seem, if we put the lighting up at one time of the year, it would keep them in the South, or, if we put it up at another time of the year, it would keep them in the North.

Ms. Newton stated, with whatever lighting options that we consider, there is significant research that goes into lighting that decreases light pollution, and focuses the light on the things we want to protect (i.e. people and property). She stated she feels like she is being presented with a binary choice, and she wants to make sure she does not miss it. The choices are we do not do the lighting or we do the lighting for a few hundred thousand dollars up to hundreds of millions of dollars, depending on how we go across the County. She inquired if these are the only two options we have explored or are there others that are appropriate for us to look at.

Mr. Jackson stated Ms. Myers mentioned solar lighting, so we should definitely should explore other options. His understanding is, the will of the committee is, to take another look at what possible options are available and see if there are any other options in neighboring counties or counties of comparable size.

Ms. Newton stated, the way she understands this is, that we are looking at this lighting, in totality. To give staff the opportunity to provide guidance on, “these are some places you should absolutely consider it” or “these are some places where it might be more optional” so we are looking at tiered choices.

Ms. Steele stated the reason this came about was they located a paragraph in the ordinance that said, “If you are going to proceed with lighting, on some projects, you have to look at it countywide.”

Ms. Terracio inquired if every road, the County maintains, would have lighting or if they were more focused on business center areas.

Mr. Livingston stated one of the most significant thing, as it relates to the program, is the realignment of the program. He would like to urge staff to come up with a plan and/or give us significant feedback, in terms of their thoughts, about what is being recommended by the PDT.

Mr. Jackson stated, if ultimately the decision is going to be ours to make, he thinks many of us have a grasp of the challenges we are facing now, and in the few months to come, he would suggest Council weigh in on the recommendations/options.

6. **Adjourn** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:32 PM.
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THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND PUBLIC WORKS

To whom was referred a Bill (S. 401) to amend Article 5, Chapter 5, Title 57 of the 1976 Code, relating to the construction of the state highway system, by adding Section 57-5-880, etc., respectfully

REPORT:

That they have duly and carefully considered the same and recommend that the same do pass:

MERITA A. ALLISON for Committee.

STATEMENT OF ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT

Explanation of Fiscal Impact

Amended by the Senate on March 27, 2019

State Expenditure

This bill requires an entity that undertakes a transportation improvement project to bear the costs related to relocating water and sewer lines, up to four percent of the original construction bid amount for a large public water utility or large public sewer utility. In addition, DOT must include metrics on utility relocation in its annual accountability report.

DOT indicates that the bill could increase recurring other funds expenses by $12,900,000 annually, beginning in FY 2019-20. This estimate is based upon project costs for future projects. Further, DOT indicates that expenses will depend upon the actual projects for which the agency is able to contract in a given year.

Local Expenditure

The Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office surveyed twenty-three county governments regarding the expenditure impact of this
amendment. We received responses from three county
governments.

Florence County does not own a water or sewer system. Therefore, this bill will have no expenditure impact on Florence County.

Lancaster County indicates that most of its road projects are limited to resurfacing or initial paving, and the county usually does not participate in widening projects where a utility line may have to be relocated. Therefore, the bill will have no expenditure impact on Lancaster County.

Charleston County references ten featured projects and an estimate of unallocated money for the next eleven years to which this bill would apply. The value of the ten projects is approximately $678,000,000, and the percentage of the unallocated money that will be allocated to Charleston County road projects is estimated to be $62,370,000. The county indicates that the four percent threshold applies to these ten projects. Therefore, the expenditure impact of these projects is estimated to be approximately $29,614,800 to the county.

In addition, Charleston County has an additional ongoing project that will not cost the full four percent authorized by this bill. From the $725,000,000 project total, the expenditure impact will be approximately $10,000,000 to $12,000,000, bringing the total expenditure impact to the county to between $39,614,800 and $41,614,800.

Due to the various combination of parties that may be affected, the expenditure impact of this bill on local governments cannot be estimated. Determination of the expenditure impact is further complicated, because increased costs and savings depend upon the specific project plans and their costs as well as the existence of prior rights.

Introduced on January 22, 2019

State Expenditure

This bill requires an entity that undertakes a transportation improvement project to bear the costs related to relocating water and sewer lines, up to four percent of the original construction bid amount for a large public water utility or large public sewer utility.

DOT indicates that the bill could increase recurring other funds expenses by $12,900,000 annually, beginning in FY 2019-20. This estimate is based upon project costs for future projects. Further, DOT indicates that expenses will depend upon the actual projects for which the agency is able to contract in a given year.
Local Expenditure

The Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office surveyed twenty-three county governments regarding the expenditure impact of this amendment. We received responses from three county governments. Florence County does not own a water or sewer system. Therefore, this bill will have no expenditure impact on Florence County.

Lancaster County indicates that most of its road projects are limited to resurfacing or initial paving, and the county usually does not participate in widening projects where a utility line may have to be relocated. Therefore, the bill will have no expenditure impact on Lancaster County.

Charleston County references ten featured projects and an estimate of unallocated money for the next eleven years to which this bill would apply. The value of the ten projects is approximately $678,000,000, and the percentage of the unallocated money that will be allocated to Charleston County road projects is estimated to be $62,370,000. The county indicates that the four percent threshold applies to these ten projects. Therefore, the expenditure impact of these projects is estimated to be approximately $29,614,800 to the county.

In addition, Charleston County has an additional ongoing project that will not cost the full four percent authorized by this bill. From the $725,000,000 project total, the expenditure impact will be approximately $10,000,000 to $12,000,000, bringing the total expenditure impact to the county to between $39,614,800 and $41,614,800.

Due to the various combination of parties that may be affected, the expenditure impact of this bill on local governments cannot be estimated. Determination of the expenditure impact is further complicated, because increased costs and savings depend upon the specific project plans and their costs as well as the existence of prior rights.

Frank A. Rainwater, Executive Director
Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office
A BILL

TO AMEND ARTICLE 5, CHAPTER 5, TITLE 57 OF THE 1976 CODE, RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM, BY ADDING SECTION 57-5-880, TO PROVIDE THAT AN ENTITY UNDERTAKING A TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT SHALL BEAR THE COSTS RELATED TO RELOCATING WATER AND SEWER LINES, TO PROVIDE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR UTILITIES TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR RELOCATION PAYMENTS, AND TO DEFINE NECESSARY TERMS.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. Article 5, Chapter 5, Title 57 of the 1976 Code is amended by adding:

“Section 57-5-880. (A) For the purposes of this section:
(1) ‘Betterment’ means any upgrade to a facility being relocated that is made solely for the benefit of the public water system and that is not attributable to the improvement, construction, reconstruction, or alteration of roads, streets, or highways undertaken by the department.
(2) ‘Costs related to relocating water and sewer lines’ means the amount attributable to the relocation, less the amount of any betterment made to the system. Costs related to relocating water and sewer lines include, but are not limited to, right-of-way acquisition to accommodate the relocated utility, if in the best interests of the transportation improvement project, design, engineering, permitting, removal, installation, inspection, materials, and labor costs.
(3) ‘Large public sewer utility’ means a public sewer utility that does not meet the definition of a small public sewer utility.
(4) ‘Large public water utility’ means a public water utility that does not meet the definition of a small public water utility.

(5) ‘Public highway system’ means:
   (a) the state highway system as defined in Section 57-5-10;
   (b) roads, streets, and highways under the jurisdiction of a county or municipality; and
   (c) bridges, tunnels, overpasses, underpasses, interchanges, and other similar facilities located throughout the State.

(6) ‘Public sewer system’ means a sewer system that provides sewer services to the public and that is publicly owned or owned by a private, not-for-profit entity as defined in Title 33, Chapter 31.

(7) ‘Public water system’ means, for the purposes of this chapter, any publicly owned or privately owned not-for-profit, as defined in Chapter 31, Title 33, waterworks system that provides water, whether piped or delivered through some other conveyance, for human consumption, including the source of supply, whether the source of supply is of surface or subsurface origin.

(8) ‘Relocating’ or ‘relocated’ means an adjustment necessitated by a transportation improvement project of a public water system or public sewer system facility by removing and reinstalling the facility; a move, rearrangement, or change of the type of existing facilities; necessary safety and protective measures; or the construction of a replacement facility that is both functionally equivalent to, but not including any betterment of, the existing facility that is necessary for the continuous operation of the system’s service.

(9) ‘Small public sewer utility’ means a public sewer utility that has ten thousand or fewer sewer connections and that serves a population of thirty thousand or less. In determining whether a public utility offering water or sewer services qualifies as a small utility, the number of water taps and sewer connections shall be counted separately and shall not be combined.

(10) ‘Small public water utility’ means a public water utility that has ten thousand or fewer water taps and that serves a population of thirty thousand or less. In determining whether a public utility offering water or sewer services qualifies as a small utility, the number of water taps and sewer connections shall be counted separately and shall not be combined.

(11) ‘Transportation improvement project’ or ‘project’ means a permanent improvement, construction, reconstruction, or alteration to the public highway system undertaken by a state or local government entity, or a political subdivision.
(B)(1) Notwithstanding any encroachment permit conditions to the contrary, an entity undertaking a transportation improvement project must bear the costs, according to the schedule prescribed in subsections (C) and (D), related to relocating water and sewer lines:

(a) that are maintained and operated by a public water system or a public sewer system and are located within the rights-of-way for a transportation improvement project; and

(b) that must be relocated to undertake the project.

(2) To be eligible for payment of the relocation costs, the relocation must be placed under the control of the general contractor for the transportation improvement project, unless the public water or public sewer system opts out of placing the relocation under the control of the general contractor according to subsection (F).

(3) To be eligible for payment of the relocation, the public water or public sewer utility must meet the bidding and construction schedule established by the entity undertaking the transportation improvement project, such as design conferences and submittal of all relocation drawings and bid documents. All documents necessary for inclusion in the transportation improvement project must be provided by the utility at least one hundred eighty days prior to the receipt of bids for the project. However, if the transportation improvement project is under an accelerated schedule, then the entity undertaking the project shall notify the utility of the date by which the documents must be provided. Failure to meet the bidding and construction schedule requirements shall result in the utility having to bear all relocation costs, except if the delay is due to an event beyond the control of the utility.

(C) For a small public water utility or a small public sewer utility, the transportation improvement project shall bear all of the relocation costs, including design costs.

(D) Subject to subsection (E), for a large public water utility or a large public sewer utility, the transportation improvement project shall bear all of the relocation costs, including design costs, up to four percent of the original construction bid amount of the transportation improvement project. Should more than one large public water utility or large public sewer utility be required to relocate by a single transportation improvement project, the total cost share of up to four percent under this section shall be divided pro rata among the large public water or public sewer utilities required to relocate under the project.

(E) For a transportation improvement project that impacts both a large public utility and a small public utility, the entity undertaking the transportation improvement must pay all of the small public
utility’s relocation costs, without limitation. The entity must also pay up to four and one-half percent, minus the costs of the small public utility’s relocation costs, of the original construction bid amount of the transportation improvement project toward the large public utility’s relocation costs.

(F) A large public water utility or a large public sewer utility may choose not to have the relocation placed under the control of the general contractor. A decision by a large public water utility or large public sewer utility to not have the relocations placed under the control of the general contractor must be communicated in writing to the entity undertaking the transportation improvement project one hundred eighty days prior to the receipt of bids for the project. Failure to meet the project contract requirements and construction schedule shall result in the utility having to bear all relocation costs.

(G) Nothing herein shall prohibit or limit payment by a transportation improvement project for the relocation of public water or public sewer lines necessary for the transportation improvement project if a public utility has a prior right to situate the water or sewer lines in their present location.

(H) The department shall include metrics on utility relocation under this section in its annual accountability report.”

SECTION  2. The requirements of Section 57-5-880, as added by this act, expire on July 1, 2026, unless otherwise extended by the General Assembly.

SECTION  3. This act takes effect upon approval by the Governor.
**Change Order**

RICHLAND COUNTY  
Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 192  
2020 Hampton St.  
Columbia, S.C. 29001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Delete</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Contract Increase</th>
<th>Contract Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Borrow Excavation</td>
<td>65464.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$981,560.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Borrow Excavation was needed to replace on site material, that was originally intended to be used by the design team, that did not meet SCDOT specifications for borrow.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>$981,560.45</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Contract Increase/Decrease</td>
<td>$981,560.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHANGE TO CONTRACT VALUE:

Original Contract Price: $24,539,262.95

Current Contract Price adjusted by previous Change Orders: $25,101,713.95

The Contract Price due to this Change Order will be increased by: $981,960.45

decreased by: $0.00

The new Contract Price (including this Change Order) will be: $26,083,674.40

---

CHANGE TO CONTRACT TIME:

The Contract Time for will be increased by: 0 Calendar Days

The new date for the intermediate completion of segment 1 will be: N/A

The new date for completion of all work will be: 2/28/2019

---

Requested By:
McClam & Associates, Inc.
1642 Holy Trinity Church Rd
Little Mountain, SC 29075

Accepted By:
Richland County PDT
201 Arbor Lake Drive
Columbia, SC 29223

Accepted By:
Richland County
2020 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29204

Date: 6/21/19

Date: 6/24/19

Date:
Michael,

I'm fine with this change order after Kim provided her comments below.

ALLISON STEELE, PE
Assistant Director
Transportation Department
803-766-5610
Steele.Allison@richlandcountysc.gov

From: Kimberly Toney
Sent: Friday, July 05, 2019 11:35 AM
To: Allison Steele <Steele.Allison@richlandcountysc.gov>
Cc: Nathaniel Miller <Miller.Nathaniel@richlandcountysc.gov>; 'Chanel Wallace' <cwallace@richlandpenny.com>; bking@richlandpenny.com; Jamie Kendall <jkendall@richlandpenny.com>; Michael Niermeier <Niermeier.Michael@richlandcountysc.gov>
Subject: RE: Shop Road Extension Phase #1 Change Order #7

Allison,

At best, this is the responses to your questions concerning Change Order #7. RC Transportation previously approved the borrow excavation overrun and a change order was signed concerning the blending of the material which included the need for additional borrow material.

1. Why was the on-site material not tested before now to determine whether or not it was suitable? The material was initially tested as part of the geotechnical report for the design however it was classified using the unified classification system. Once it was tested as per AASHTO standards it was discovered that the material was A-7 material, which doesn’t meet the SCDOT specifications for borrow in Richland County. At that time the Richland County Construction Manager, Shawn Salley, and I negotiated with the contractor to modify this soil by mixing it with suitable material to produce an acceptable borrow material.

2. Why was this change order not submitted for approval before work was actually done? At this time, until further information is provided, I cannot recommend approval. I believe that since there was a line item for borrow excavation, it would be handled as an overrun. During construction it is difficult to accurately quantify the exact amount of borrow material used. The borrow pit would need to be surveyed at the end as well as using the actual borrow material delivery tickets. At the time since there was already a bid price for the borrow material, and it would be difficult to quantify what volume would be ultimately be needed to construct the project it was agreed that a change order would be processed once the final amount was known. This quantity is documented through material delivery tickets in addition to the final survey of the borrow pit.

The pay application for the month of June is dependent upon the change order. Your guidance is appreciated.
Thanks,

Kimberly G. Toney
Construction Engineering Manager
Richland County Government
Transportation
Toney.kimberly@richlandcountysc.gov

P 803-766-5609

2009 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29202
Richlandcountysc.gov

201 Arbor Lake Drive
Columbia, SC 29223
P 1-844-RC-PENNY

From: Allison Steele
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 1:17 PM
To: Kimberly Toney <Toney.Kimberly@richlandcountysc.gov>
Cc: Nathaniel Miller <Miller.Nathaniel@richlandcountysc.gov>; 'Chanel Wallace' <cwallace@richlandpenny.com>; bking@richlandpenny.com; Jamie Kendall <jkendall@richlandpenny.com>; Michael Niermeier <Niermeier.Michael@richlandcountysc.gov>
Subject: RE: Shop Road Extension Phase #1 Change Order #7

Kim,

I have a couple issues with this.

1. Why was the on-site material not tested before now to determine whether or not it was suitable?
2. Why was this change order not submitted for approval before work was actually done? At this time, until further information is provided, I cannot recommend approval.

ALLISON STEELE, PE
Assistant Director
Transportation Department
803-766-5610
Steele.Allison@richlandcountysc.gov

From: Kimberly Toney
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 12:54 PM
To: Allison Steele <Steele.Allison@richlandcountysc.gov>
Cc: Nathaniel Miller <Miller.Nathaniel@richlandcountysc.gov>; 'Chanel Wallace' <cwallace@richlandpenny.com>; bking@richlandpenny.com; Jamie Kendall <jkendall@richlandpenny.com>
Subject: Shop Road Extension Phase #1 Change Order #7

Allison and Nathaniel,
Attached is the Change Order #7 for Shop Road Extension #7 to increase the Borrow Excavation quantity. This line item was needed to replace onsite material; however, it did not meet SCDOT borrow material specifications. The contract amount will increase and does not exceed the construction contingency amount. Approval of this change order affects the May 2019 pay application approval and submittal. Once this change order is approved, the May 2019 pay application can be processed.

If you have any questions, let me know.

Thank you,

Kimberly G. Toney
Construction Engineering Manager
Richland County Government
Transportation
Toney.kimberly@richlandcountysc.gov

P 803-766-5609

2009 Hampton Street
Columbia, SC 29202
Richlandcountysc.gov

201 Arbor Lake Drive
Columbia, SC 29223
P 1-844-RC-PENNY
Pending Approvals

- Atlas Road – Authorization to Proceed to Construction – SCDOT
- Bull/Elmwood - Authorization to Proceed to Construction – SCDOT
- Blythewood Widening Phase 1 Condemnations – County legal staff
- Advertisement of Greene Street Phase 2 and Resurfacing Package R – County staff
- Design of Shop Road Phase 2 and Blythewood Area Improvements – County staff
- Maintenance Responsibility of Chatsworth Connector as part of Decker/Woodfield NIP – County staff/RCRC
June 27, 2019

Mr. Michael Niermeier
Director of Transportation
Richland County Government
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Re: Resurfacing Package Q
PDT-770-IFB-2019

Dear Mr. Niermeier:

A bid opening was held at 2:00 PM on Wednesday, June 26, 2019 at the Richland County Office of Procurement at 2020 Hampton Street for the Resurfacing Package Q Project. The Richland Program Development Team has reviewed the five (5) submitted bids for Resurfacing Package Q which were submitted via Bid Express and found no discrepancies. The bids received were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIDDER</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,294,813.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Construction</td>
<td>$4,858,606.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurovia Atlantic Coast LLC, dba Blythe</td>
<td>$4,993,967.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.R. Jackson, Inc.</td>
<td>$4,979,344.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynches River Contracting, Inc.</td>
<td>$5,797,782.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further review shows that the Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc. is duly licensed in South Carolina to perform this work. A copy of their license is attached.

A Mandatory Pre-Bid Conference was held at 10:00 AM on June 5, 2019 during which attendees gained information and bidding directives for the project. Sign-In Sheets for the Pre-Bid Meeting are attached indicating interested firms that were in attendance.

Attached is a final bid tab sheet for your reference which indicates Palmetto Corporation of Conway’s bid to be 29.6% below the Engineer’s Estimate of $6,096,388.53 for the project. In accordance with the recommendation of the County’s OSBO Office there was no SLBE participation requirement associated with this project.
Richland PDT recommends that a contract be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Incorporated. It is further recommended that the approval of the award also include a 10% contingency of $429,481.39. We will schedule the pre-construction conference once we have been notified by you that Council has approved the contract.

Sincerely,

Dale Collier
Procurement Manager
Richland PDT, A Joint Venture

Cc: Dr. John Thompson, Richland County Acting County Administrator
Jennifer Wladischkin, Richland County Procurement Manager
Erica Wade, Richland County OSBO Manager
Taylor Neely, Richland PDT

ATTACHMENTS:

Certified Bid Tab
Bid Form – Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.
Bid Comparison to Engineering Estimate
Pre-Bid Sign In Sheets
Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc. License Confirmation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR Jackson, inc.</td>
<td>4,979,344.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurowine Atlantic Coast LLC dba Blythe</td>
<td>4,933,967.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynches River Contracting Inc.</td>
<td>5,797,782.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Construction</td>
<td>4,858,606.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Corp &amp; Co. Inc.</td>
<td>4,394,813.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certified by: [Signature]
BIDDER INFORMATION

COMPANY NAME *
Palmetto Corp of Conway, Inc

COMPANY PHONE NUMBER *
(843) 365-2150

COMPANY ADDRESS *
3873 Hwy 701 North, Conway, SC 29526

EMAIL ADDRESS *
klevy@palmettocorp.com

CONTRACTOR LICENSE NUMBER *
G14514

SC SALES TAX NUMBER *
026 27679 8

FEDERAL TAX ID NUMBER *
57-0851898

AUTHORIZED AGENT NAME *
Shawn Godwin

AUTHORIZED AGENT TITLE *
President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1031000</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071000</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050800</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION STAKES, LINES AND GRADES</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>51.0000</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012060</td>
<td>FULL DEPTH ASPHALT PAVEMENT PATCHING (6&quot; UNIF.)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>21,958.1111</td>
<td>$47.15</td>
<td>$1,035,324.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4013990</td>
<td>MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (VARIABLE)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>110,721.049</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$276,802.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE - TYPE C</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>22,902.3950</td>
<td>$94.30</td>
<td>$2,159,695.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6051120</td>
<td>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,824.0000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$9,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241010</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (PVT. EDGE LINES) - PERM.PVMT.MARKING</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>48.0000</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES) - PERM.PVMT.MARKING</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,632.000</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$13,056.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES) - FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,632.000</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$4,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) - FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241031</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) PERM.PVMT.MARKING</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$1,680.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $3,707,447.41
## DECKER BLVD RESURFACING WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1031000</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071000</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012060</td>
<td>FULL DEPTH ASPHALT PAVEMENT PATCHING (6&quot; UNIF.)</td>
<td>465.4553</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$64.50</td>
<td>$30,021.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4013200</td>
<td>MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (2&quot;)</td>
<td>38,429.2222</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$61,486.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE - TYPE B</td>
<td>3,842.8482</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$94.35</td>
<td>$362,572.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6023055</td>
<td>TEMPORARY YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR.-4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>236.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$2,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6051120</td>
<td>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)</td>
<td>1,024.0000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250005</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE BROKEN LINES (GAPS EXCLUDED) FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>3,627.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$435.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250015</td>
<td>8&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (CROSSWALK LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>1,810.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2,262.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>600.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>30.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250035</td>
<td>WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot; FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250040</td>
<td>WHITE COMBO ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250110</td>
<td>4&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES (PVT.EDGE LINES) FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>16,378.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$1,965.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271005</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE BROKEN LINES (GAPS EXCLUDED). THERMO. 90 MIL</td>
<td>3,627.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$3,627.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271015</td>
<td>8&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (CROSSWALK LINES). THERMO. 90 MIL</td>
<td>1,810.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5,430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES) THERMO. 125 MIL</td>
<td>600.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$5,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $587,366.46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6271030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) THERMO. 125 MIL</td>
<td>30.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271035</td>
<td>WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot; THERMO. 125 MIL</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271040</td>
<td>WHITE COMBO ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) THERMO. 125 MIL</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271074</td>
<td>4&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES(PVT.EDGE LINES) THERMO. 90 MIL</td>
<td>16,378.00</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$8,189.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301005</td>
<td>PERMANENT CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS MONO-4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>272.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$1,496.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301100</td>
<td>PERMANENT YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR.-4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>236.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$1,298.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6770413</td>
<td>FURNISH &amp; INSTALL NO. 14 COOPER WIRE</td>
<td>16,720.00</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$5,852.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6780495</td>
<td>SAWCUT FOR LOOP DETECTOR</td>
<td>4,180.000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$25,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> $587,366.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>UNITS</td>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061090</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$1,061.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071650</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$1,071.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055990</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION SToops, LINES AND SPACES</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>$12,828.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4051490</td>
<td>FULL DEPTH ASPHALT PAVEMENT PAVING: ASP(11)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>185,911</td>
<td>$47,146.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4019366</td>
<td>MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (VARIABLE)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>10,723.00</td>
<td>$251,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4060140</td>
<td>RETAR ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE, TYPE C</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>22,910.00</td>
<td>$56,024.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051230</td>
<td>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,824.00</td>
<td>$3,648.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5041450</td>
<td>F WHITE SOLID LINES (PVT, EDGE LINES, PEDESTRIAN MARKING)</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>46.000</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5014135</td>
<td>H WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/STAND LINES) PERMANENT MARKING</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,824.00</td>
<td>$1,824.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025020</td>
<td>D WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/STAND LINES) PERMANENT PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,824.00</td>
<td>$1,379.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS LT, STRAIGHT, ITS FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241000</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS LT, STRAIGHT, RT/PERM/PV/DRY MARKING</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014111</td>
<td>REPAIR RESURFACING WORKSHEET</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$1,071.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

$5,146,533.50 | $4,294,013.50 | $4,056,496.50 | $3,935,367.55 | $3,873,543.50 | $3,747,782.50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/Business</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Neely</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tneely@ricelandpenny.com">tneely@ricelandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>843-550-0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jard@pswsllc.com">jard@pswsllc.com</a></td>
<td>803-750-6070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.J. Jackson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjackson@ckjackson.com">kjackson@ckjackson.com</a></td>
<td>803-750-6070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.I. Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GI@slrc.com">GI@slrc.com</a></td>
<td>803-764-2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbra Construction &amp; Design</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carbra@carbra.com">carbra@carbra.com</a></td>
<td>803-260-6162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Edwards</td>
<td>edwardspesloane.net</td>
<td>803-600-1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp Owings</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tripp.owings@eurovia.us">tripp.owings@eurovia.us</a></td>
<td>803-726-6151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Walker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:qwalker@ricelandpenny.com">qwalker@ricelandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>803-726-6151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Flynn</td>
<td>sierra <a href="mailto:Flynn@riclandcountrypc.gov">Flynn@riclandcountrypc.gov</a></td>
<td>803-445-9760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Edwards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HEdwards@pswsllc.com">HEdwards@pswsllc.com</a></td>
<td>803-445-9780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sign in Sheet

**Project:** Resurfacing Package Q  
**Date:** June 5, 2019  
**Meeting Time:** 10:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/Business</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian King</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bkng@richlandpenny.com">bkng@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>803-351-5289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wladishein</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wladja@richlandcountysc.gov">wladja@richlandcountysc.gov</a></td>
<td>576-2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Collier / PDT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcollier@richlandpenny.com">dcollier@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>803-917-6258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PALMETTO CORP OF CONWAY
3873 HWY 701 N
CONWAY, SC 29526
(843)365-2156

License number: 14514
License type: GENERAL CONTRACTOR
Status: ACTIVE
Expiration: 10/31/2020
First Issuance Date: 03/02/1992
Classification: GDG WLS AP5 CP5 WP5
Qualified By: Financial Statement
President / Owner: A SHAWN GODWIN

Click here for Classification definitions and licensee's contract dollar limit

Supervised By
GODWIN ANTHONY (COG)
ATKINSON KENNETH (COG)

File a Complaint against this licensee

Board Public Action History:
View Orders View Other License for this Person
No Orders Found
CURRENT CLASSIFICATION ABBREVIATIONS and PROJECT/DOLLAR LIMITATIONS

The two-letters on a license indicates the designated classification(s) of work (i.e. **BD**); the number behind the letters indicates their designated dollar limit per contract (i.e. BD3); see classifications & project/dollar limits below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTOR classifications</th>
<th>MECHANICAL CONTRACTOR classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving ....................AP</td>
<td>Air Conditioning ....................AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Installation ..............BL</td>
<td>Electrical ...........................EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring &amp; Tunneling (no technical exam) ....BT</td>
<td>Heating ..........................HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges ..........................BR</td>
<td>Lighting Protection ..............LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building (BD, LB, UB) * .......BD</td>
<td>Packaged Equipment ..............PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete ........................CT</td>
<td>Plumbing ..........................PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Paving ..................CP</td>
<td>Pressure and Process Piping **** ..1P/2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Roofing ................GR</td>
<td>Refrigeration ..................RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass &amp; Glazing ..............GG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading ..........................GD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway ** .......................HY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Incidental (no technical exam) ..HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation (no technical exam) ..IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine ........................MR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry (no technical exam) ..MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines ........................PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engineered Metal Buildings ....MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Electrical Utility *** ...1U/2U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad (no technical exam) ...RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Roofing ...............SR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Framing ................SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Shapes (no technical exam) ....SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools ..................SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Lines ..............WL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Plants ............WP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Frame Structures ...........WF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Building (BD): includes GR, IR, MB, MS, SS, WF.
"LB" - qualifier took Limited Building exam - can only apply as Group #1, #2, or #3; cannot work over 3 stories.
"UB" - qualifier took Unlimited Building exam.

** Highway (HY): includes AP, CP, BR, GD, HI.

*** Public Electrical Utility (1U/2U): "1U" given to those licensed prior to 4/1/99 and can engage in stadium lighting work. "2U" given to those licensed after 4/1/99 and cannot engage in stadium lighting work.

**** Pressure and Process Piping (1P/2P): "1P" given to those licensed prior to 4/1/99 and can engage in boiler work; "2P" given to those licensed after 4/1/99 and cannot engage in boiler work.

*** DOLLAR LIMITATIONS AND NET WORTH/SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTORS</th>
<th>MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group #</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ Limit per Contract</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #3</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #4</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #5</td>
<td>$Unlimited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 06/2018
July 18, 2019

Mr. Michael Niermeier
Director of Transportation
Richland County Government
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Re: North Springs and Harrington Road Intersection
PDT-301-IFB-2019

Dear Mr. Niermeier:

A bid opening was held at 2:00 PM on Wednesday, July 17, 2019 at the Richland County Office of Procurement at 2020 Hampton Street for the North Springs and Harrington Road Intersection Project. The Richland Program Development Team has reviewed the four (4) submitted bids for North Springs and Harrington Road Intersection which were submitted via Bid Express and found no discrepancies. The bids received were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIDDER</th>
<th>SUBMITTED BID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.</td>
<td>$960,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.R. Jackson, Inc.</td>
<td>$997,721.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS Specialty Contractors, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,101,860.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,121,810.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further review shows that the Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc. is duly licensed in South Carolina to perform this work. A copy of their license is attached.

A Mandatory Pre-Bid Conference was held at 2:00 PM on June 19, 2019 during which attendees gained information and bidding directives for the project. Sign-In Sheets for the Pre-Bid Meeting are attached indicating interested firms that were in attendance.

Attached is a final bid tab sheet for your reference which indicates Palmetto Corporation of Conway’s bid to be within 10% of the Engineer’s Estimate of $923,423.02 for the project. A review of the low bid also shows a commitment of 15% utilization of Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE) companies which equals the 15% goal for this project.
Richland PDT recommends that a contract be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Incorporated. It is further recommended that the approval of the award also include a 10% contingency of $96,093.10. We will schedule the pre-construction conference once we have been notified by you that Council has approved the contract.

Sincerely,

Dale Collier
Procurement Manager
Richland PDT, A Joint Venture

Cc: Dr. John Thompson, Richland County Acting County Administrator
    Jennifer Wladischkin, Richland County Procurement Manager
    Erica Wade, Richland County OSBO Manager
    Taylor Neely, Richland PDT

ATTACHMENTS:

Certified Bid Tab
Bid Form – Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc.
Bid Comparison to Engineering Estimate
Pre-Bid Sign In Sheets
Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc. License Confirmation
Palmetto Corporation of Conway, Inc. SLBE Participation Sheet
## BID TABULATION SHEET

**Project Number:** PDT-301-IFB-2019  
**Date:** July 17, 2019 – 2:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Total Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR Jackson, Inc</td>
<td>$997,721.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS Specialty Contractors, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,161,860.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Corp of Conway, Inc.</td>
<td>$966,981.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,121,810.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certified By:**

[Signature]

---
BIDDER INFORMATION

COMPANY NAME *
Palmetto Corp of Conway, Inc

COMPANY PHONE NUMBER *
(843) 365-2156

COMPANY ADDRESS *
3873 Hwy 701 North, Conway, SC 29526

EMAIL ADDRESS *
lalmonte@palmettocorp.com

CONTRACTOR LICENSE NUMBER *
G14514

SC SALES TAX NUMBER *
02627679-8U

FEDERAL TAX ID NUMBER *
57-0851898

AUTHORIZED AGENT NAME *
Shawn Godwin

AUTHORIZED AGENT TITLE *
President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1031000</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032010</td>
<td>BONDS AND INSURANCE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050800</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION STAKES, LINES &amp; GRADES</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062100</td>
<td>UTILITY COORDINATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071000</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080300</td>
<td>CPM PROGRESS SCHEDULE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011000</td>
<td>CLEARING &amp; GRUBBING WITHIN RIGHT OF WAY</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$75,500.00</td>
<td>$75,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021005</td>
<td>REMOVAL &amp; DISPOSAL OF EXISTING CATCH BASIN</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>$2,790.00</td>
<td>$8,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023000</td>
<td>REMOVAL &amp; DISPOSAL OF EXISTING PAVEMENT</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>890.0000</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$28,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027801</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF EXISTING GUARDRAIL</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>162.5000</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$162.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031000</td>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>350.0000</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033000</td>
<td>BORROW EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>541.0000</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$18,394.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081001</td>
<td>FINE GRADING</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2,970.0000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$5,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2091000</td>
<td>SELECT MATERIAL FOR SHOULDERS &amp; SLOPES</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>202.0000</td>
<td>$45.50</td>
<td>$9,191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2103000</td>
<td>FLOWABLE FILL</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>$196.00</td>
<td>$1,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3069900</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE STONE</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>138.0000</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$8,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100310</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT BASE COURSE - TYPE A</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>693.0000</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$49,896.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011004</td>
<td>LIQUID ASPHALT BINDER PG64-22</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>166.0000</td>
<td>$625.00</td>
<td>$103,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4013990</td>
<td>MILLING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (VARIABLE)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>390.0000</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$5,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>1,762.0000</td>
<td>$67.00</td>
<td>$118,054.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>800.0000</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$59,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6021120</td>
<td>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>372.0000</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
<td>$2,511.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6092100</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS MONO-DIR.-4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6092155</td>
<td>TEMPORARY YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR.-4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>32.0000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250005</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE BROKEN LINES -(GAPS EXCLUDED)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>894.0000</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$268.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250010</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (PVT. EDGE LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,741.0000</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$411.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAGONAL LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>52.0000</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROW (LEFT, STRAIGHT, RIGHT)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250035</td>
<td>WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot;-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250040</td>
<td>WHITE COMBINATION ARROW(STR. &amp; RT.OR STR. &amp; LT.)FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250110</td>
<td>4&quot;YELLOW SOLID LINE(PVT.EDGE&amp;NO PASSING ZONE)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,225.0000</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$333.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250115</td>
<td>24&quot;YELLOW DIAGONAL LINES-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>110.0000</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271005</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE BROKEN LINES(GAPS EXCL.)THERMOPLASTIC-90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>894.0000</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
<td>$804.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271010</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (PVT. EDGE LINES) THERMO - 90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,741.0000</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$1,233.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271015</td>
<td>8&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES - THERMO - 90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>252.0000</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAG LINES)-THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>52.0000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271030</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRGHT, RT) THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271035</td>
<td>WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot; -THERMOPLASTIC - 125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271040</td>
<td>WHITE COMBINATION ARROW(STR &amp; RT.OR STR &amp; LT.)THERMO - 125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271074</td>
<td>4&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES(PVT EDGE LINES) THERMO-90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5,413,000</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$2,435.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271080</td>
<td>24&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES-THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300005</td>
<td>PERMANENT CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS- MONO-DIR.- 4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>9.0000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6301100</td>
<td>PERMANENT YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR.- 4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>32.0000</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6510105</td>
<td>FLAT SHEET, TYPE III, FIXED SIZE &amp; MSG. SIGN</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>38.0000</td>
<td>$16.20</td>
<td>$615.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6531210</td>
<td>U-SECTION POST FOR SIGN SUPPORTS - 3P</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
<td>$9.25</td>
<td>$907.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7143618</td>
<td>18&quot; SMOOTH WALL PIPE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>64.0000</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$5,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7149999</td>
<td>CLEANING EXISTING PIPE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7191605</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 16</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$5,400.00</td>
<td>$5,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7191625</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 17</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>$13,300.00</td>
<td>$53,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7196151</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 9 (TOP ONLY)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
<td>$5,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7198470</td>
<td>MANHOLE-CONVERT CB T-9</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203100</td>
<td>CONCRETE C &amp; G (16&quot;) VERTICAL FACE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>$2,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203210</td>
<td>CONCRETE C &amp; G (20&quot;) VERTICAL FACE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>120.0000</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$4,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204100</td>
<td>CONCRETE SIDEWALK (4&quot; UNIFORM)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$40,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204900</td>
<td>DETECTABLE WARNING MATERIAL</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>$2,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7209000</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN RAMP CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8051151</td>
<td>MT3 LEADING EDGE TREATMENT TL3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$3,659.00</td>
<td>$3,659.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8051710</td>
<td>MB TRAILING END TREATMENT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8052100</td>
<td>MGS3 GR STANDARD SHOULDER</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>200.0000</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8071000</td>
<td>RESET FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>38.0000</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8072000</td>
<td>RESET CHAIN LINK FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>35.0000</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8081000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM # 1 (MAILBOX)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8081000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM # 2 (RESET SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091010</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>29.0000</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$1,885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091050</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100200</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104005</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (NITROGEN)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104010</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (PHOSPHORIC ACID)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104015</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (POTASH)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105005</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000.000</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8109050</td>
<td>SELECTIVE WATERING</td>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>54,300.000</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8109901</td>
<td>MOWING</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8151110</td>
<td>TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL BLANKET (ECB)</td>
<td>MSY</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
<td>$1,976.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8152004</td>
<td>INLET STRUCTURE FILTER - TYPE F (WEIGHTED)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>144.0000</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$1,728.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8153000</td>
<td>SILT FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,340.000</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$4,914.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8153090</td>
<td>REPLACE/REPAIR SILT FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>234.0000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8154050</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF SILT RETAINED BY SILT FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>585.0000</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2,632.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8156219</td>
<td>INLET STRUCTURE FILTER - TYPE A</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8156490</td>
<td>STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>550.0000</td>
<td>$12.40</td>
<td>$6,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8990546</td>
<td>PERMANENT GROUND MOUNTED SIGNS (RICHLAND PENNY)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>54.0000</td>
<td>$19.10</td>
<td>$1,031.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $971,804.00
## UTILITY RELOCATION NO. 1 WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WS-01</td>
<td>POTHOLE (EARLY DETERMINATION OF UTILITY VERTICLE DEPTH)</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$2,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-02</td>
<td>12&quot; WATER LINE VERTICAL OFFSET WITH BYPASS - (INCLUDES LINE TAPS, LINE STOP, VALVES, FITTINGS, CONCRETE BLOCKING)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-03</td>
<td>12&quot; DUCTILE IRON PIPE CL 350 (RESTRAINED JOINT)</td>
<td>150.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$123.34</td>
<td>$18,501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-04</td>
<td>FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY (TEE, VALVE, HYDRANT, RJ PIPING, ETC.)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-05</td>
<td>REMOVE EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-06</td>
<td>ADJUST SEWER MANHOLE (RAISE TO FINISH SURFACE)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $89,127.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Engineer's Estimate</th>
<th>Patrono Corp. of Conway</th>
<th>C.R. Jackson</th>
<th>AOS Specialty Contractors</th>
<th>Cherokee, Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103100</td>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$105,875.00</td>
<td>$55,749.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103200</td>
<td>BONDS AND INSURANCE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
<td>$34,260.00</td>
<td>$17,229.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105800</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION STAKES, LINES &amp; GRADES</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105200</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION #1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$89,127.00</td>
<td>$89,127.00</td>
<td>$178,254.00</td>
<td>$99,994.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105210</td>
<td>UTILITY COORDINATION</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107100</td>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108320</td>
<td>CPM PROGRESS SCHEDULE</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201100</td>
<td>CLEARING &amp; GRUBBING WITHIN RIGHT OF WAY</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,500.00</td>
<td>$75,500.00</td>
<td>$151,000.00</td>
<td>$75,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202100</td>
<td>REMOVAL &amp; DISPOSAL OF EXISTING CATCH BASIN</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$5,400.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202300</td>
<td>REMOVAL &amp; DISPOSAL OF EXISTING PAVEMENT</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>890,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$28,480.00</td>
<td>$56,960.00</td>
<td>$28,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202700</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF EXISTING SHALLOW</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>163,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$162.95</td>
<td>$325.90</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203100</td>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203200</td>
<td>BOUFFROG EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>541,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$18,394.00</td>
<td>$36,788.00</td>
<td>$18,394.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26801</td>
<td>PINE GRADING</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2,870,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$5,740.00</td>
<td>$11,480.00</td>
<td>$5,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269100</td>
<td>SELECT MATERIAL FOR SHOULDERS &amp; SLOPES</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.50</td>
<td>$10,505.00</td>
<td>$21,010.00</td>
<td>$10,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210300</td>
<td>FLOWABLE FILT</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$196.00</td>
<td>$1,960.00</td>
<td>$3,920.00</td>
<td>$1,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306900</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE STONE</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$8,280.00</td>
<td>$16,560.00</td>
<td>$8,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310300</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT BASE COURSE - TYPE A</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>693,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$49,992.00</td>
<td>$99,984.00</td>
<td>$49,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401004</td>
<td>LIQUID ASPHALT BINDER PIG 22</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$625.00</td>
<td>$65,750.00</td>
<td>$131,500.00</td>
<td>$65,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401300</td>
<td>MELTING EXISTING ASPHALT PAVEMENT (VARIEABLE)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402500</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$100,544.00</td>
<td>$201,088.00</td>
<td>$100,544.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403500</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$58,800.00</td>
<td>$117,600.00</td>
<td>$58,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405100</td>
<td>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION SIGNS (GROUND MOUNTED)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.75</td>
<td>$2,511.00</td>
<td>$5,022.00</td>
<td>$2,511.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409210</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS MONO DR - 4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.95</td>
<td>$79,500.00</td>
<td>$159,000.00</td>
<td>$79,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409215</td>
<td>TEMPORARY YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR - 4&quot;X4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>$468.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405000</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE BROWN&quot; LINES (OAP'S EXCLUDED)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>694,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$208.20</td>
<td>$416.40</td>
<td>$208.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250001</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE SOLID LINES (PVT, EDGE LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,714,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$411.15</td>
<td>$822.30</td>
<td>$411.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250002</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DIAGONAL LINES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$15,600.00</td>
<td>$31,200.00</td>
<td>$15,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250003</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE SINGLE ARROW (LEFT, STRAIGHT, RIGHT)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
<td>$4,900.00</td>
<td>$2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250004</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot;-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
<td>$2,100.00</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250005</td>
<td>&quot;WHITE COMBINATION ARROW/VEH RT OR STR &amp; LT)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425110</td>
<td>YELLOW SOLID LINES (PVT, ESDAĽNO PASSING ZONES)-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$337.50</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>$337.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425115</td>
<td>&quot;YELLOW DIAGONAL LINES-FAST DRY PAINT</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271035</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE BROKEN LINES/ (GAPS EXC)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>884,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271039</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (PTD. EDGE LINES)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,741,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271031</td>
<td>4&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES - THERMO- 90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271025</td>
<td>24&quot; WHITE SOLID LINES (STOP/DAG LINES) - THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271020</td>
<td>WHITE SINGLE ARROWS (LT, STRAIGHT, RT) THERMO- 125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271035</td>
<td>WHITE WORD MESSAGE &quot;ONLY&quot; - THERMOPLASTIC - 125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271040</td>
<td>WHITE COMBINATION ARROWS (STR &amp; RT, DR &amp; STR &amp; LT) THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271074</td>
<td>4&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES (PTD. EDGE LINES) THERMO-90 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>5,413,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271080</td>
<td>24&quot; YELLOW SOLID LINES-THERMO-125 MIL.</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630005</td>
<td>PERMANENT CLEAR PAVEMENT MARKERS - MONO-DIR - 4&quot; X 4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630110</td>
<td>PERMANENT YELLOW PAVEMENT MARKERS BI-DIR - 4&quot; X 4&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651010</td>
<td>FLAT SHEET, TYPE III, FIXED SIZE &amp; MSG. SIGN</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651210</td>
<td>S-SECTION POST FOR SIGN SUPPORTS - 3P</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7140318</td>
<td>&quot;S&quot; SMOOTH WALL PIPE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7149998</td>
<td>CLEANING EXISTING PIPE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7191805</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 16</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7191265</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 17</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719651</td>
<td>CATCH BASIN - TYPE 5 (TOP ONLY)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719670</td>
<td>MANHOLE-COVER 06 T-9</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203100</td>
<td>CONCRETE C &amp; G (10&quot;) VERTICAL FACE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203510</td>
<td>CONCRETE C &amp; G (20&quot;) VERTICAL FACE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204010</td>
<td>CONCRETE SIDEWALK 14&quot; UNIFORM</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204000</td>
<td>DETECTABLE WARNING MATERIAL</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7209000</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN RAMPS CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800115</td>
<td>VTS LEADING EDGE TREATMENT TJ3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8051715</td>
<td>MS TRAILING END TREATMENT</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8052100</td>
<td>MISS GR STANDARD SHOULDER</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8071000</td>
<td>REACT FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8072000</td>
<td>S/B REACT FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8081000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 1 (MAILBOX)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8082000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 2 (REACT SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091000</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091500</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104050</td>
<td>FERTILIZER NITROGEN</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104100</td>
<td>FERTILIZER PHOSPHORIC ACID</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104150</td>
<td>FERTILIZER POTASH</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105050</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8082000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 2 (REACT SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091000</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091500</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104050</td>
<td>FERTILIZER NITROGEN</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104100</td>
<td>FERTILIZER PHOSPHORIC ACID</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104150</td>
<td>FERTILIZER POTASH</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105050</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8082000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 2 (REACT SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091000</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091500</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104050</td>
<td>FERTILIZER NITROGEN</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104100</td>
<td>FERTILIZER PHOSPHORIC ACID</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104150</td>
<td>FERTILIZER POTASH</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105050</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8082000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 2 (REACT SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091000</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091500</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104050</td>
<td>FERTILIZER NITROGEN</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104100</td>
<td>FERTILIZER PHOSPHORIC ACID</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104150</td>
<td>FERTILIZER POTASH</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105050</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8082000</td>
<td>MOVE ITEM 2 (REACT SIGN)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091000</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY MARKER (REBAR &amp; CAP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8091500</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104050</td>
<td>FERTILIZER NITROGEN</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104100</td>
<td>FERTILIZER PHOSPHORIC ACID</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8104150</td>
<td>FERTILIZER POTASH</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105050</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECTIVE WATERING</td>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>$2.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOWING</td>
<td>AC/PE</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>$509.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL BLANKET (ECB)</td>
<td>MSY</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>$1,272.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INLET STRUCTURE FILTER - TYPE F (WEIGHTED)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>144.800</td>
<td>$1,728.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>$4,660.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPLACE/REPAIR Silt Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>234.800</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMOVAL OF Silt RETAINED BY Silt Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>505.800</td>
<td>$2,632.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INLET STRUCTURE FILTER - TYPE A</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>500.800</td>
<td>$12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT GROUND MOUNTED SIGNS (RICHLAND PENNY)</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>54.800</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## N. SPRINGS RD & HARRINGTON RD INTERSECTION - PDT-301-IFB-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WS-01</td>
<td>POTHOLE (EARLY DETERMINATION OF UTILITY VERTICLE DEPTH)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$2,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-02</td>
<td>1/2&quot; WATER LINE VERTICAL OFFSET WITH BYPASS - (INCLUDES LINE TAPS, LINE B)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-03</td>
<td>1/2&quot; DUCTILE IRON PIPE CL 350 (RESTRAINED JOINT)</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$123.34</td>
<td>$12,334.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-04</td>
<td>FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY (TEE, VALVE, HYDRANT, RJ PIPING, ETC.)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-05</td>
<td>REMOVE EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-06</td>
<td>ADJUST SEWER MANHOLE (Raise to Finish Surface)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine's Estimate</th>
<th>Palmetto Corp. of Conway</th>
<th>C.R. Jackson</th>
<th>AOS Specialty Contractors</th>
<th>Cherokee, Inc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$42,250.00</td>
<td>$89,127.00</td>
<td>$75,126.00</td>
<td>$106,327.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July 17, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/Business</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Weedy / PD +</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tnelley@richlandpenny.com">tnelley@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Jackson / K. R. Jackson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjackson@rrjackson.com">kjackson@rrjackson.com</a></td>
<td>757-4070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Anderson / Palmetto Corp</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kandersen@palmettocoop.com">kandersen@palmettocoop.com</a></td>
<td>843-365-2156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker Driessen / Cherokee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.driessen@cherokee-sc.com">d.driessen@cherokee-sc.com</a></td>
<td>670-330-9251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lewis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blewis@richlandpenny.com">blewis@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>726-3614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Plante</td>
<td><a href="mailto:estimating@aozsc.org">estimating@aozsc.org</a>, <a href="mailto:jane@aozsc.org">jane@aozsc.org</a></td>
<td>796-360-8606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Nelson / Frank Mitchell, Orion Construction</td>
<td>orionmtnconstr.com</td>
<td>(803) 252-1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian King</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bking@richlandpenny.com">bking@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>(803) 851-5281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Atkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matkins@coxanddavis.com">matkins@coxanddavis.com</a></td>
<td>261-6935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Toole / Richland County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexander@richlandcounty.gov">alexander@richlandcounty.gov</a></td>
<td>843-343-9458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME/Business</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasheed Hameed / RC Transporta.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muwakkil.rasheed@richlandcounty.sc.gov">muwakkil.rasheed@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>803-586-8830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Connell / Richland PDT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reconnelly@richlandpenny.com">reconnelly@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>803-605-6989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beal / PDT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbeal@richlandpenny.com">dbeal@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>726-6159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Al-Tofan / Richland County Gov.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:al-tofan.mohammed@richlandcounty.sc.gov">al-tofan.mohammed@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>803-359-0209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Rosenthal / RC DSBD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosenthal.michelle@richlandcounty.sc.gov">rosenthal.michelle@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>803-576-1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Cook / RC 0560</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cook.cheryl@richlandcounty.sc.gov">cook.cheryl@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>570-675-3460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquet Jones / RC 0560</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jones.marquet@richlandcounty.sc.gov">jones.marquet@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>576-1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Terney / RC Transp.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terney.kimberly@richlandcounty.sc.gov">terney.kimberly@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>(803) 766-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Flynn / RC Procurement</td>
<td><a href="mailto:flynn.sierra@richlandcounty.sc.gov">flynn.sierra@richlandcounty.sc.gov</a></td>
<td>(803) 766-2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Collier / Richland PDT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcollier@richlandpenny.com">dcollier@richlandpenny.com</a></td>
<td>(803) 917-6258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board: Commercial Contractors

PALMETTO CORP OF CONWAY
3873 HWY 701 N
CONWAY, SC 29526
(843)365-2156

License number: 14514
License type: GENERAL CONTRACTOR
Status: ACTIVE
Expiration: 10/31/2020
First Issuance Date: 03/02/1992
Classification: GS5 WL5 AP5 CP5 WP5
Qualified By: Financial Statement
President / Owner: A SHAWN GODWIN

Click here for Classification definitions and licensee's contract dollar limit

Supervised By
GODWIN ANTHONY (COG)
ATKINSON KENNETH (COG)

File a Complaint against this licensee

Board Public Action History:
View Orders View Other License for this Person
No Orders Found
CURRENT CLASSIFICATION ABBREVIATIONS and PROJECT/DOLLAR LIMITATIONS

The two-letters on a license indicates the designated classification(s) of work (i.e. BD3); the number behind the letters indicates their designated dollar limit per contract (i.e. BD3); see classifications & project/dollar limits below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTOR classifications</th>
<th>MECHANICAL CONTRACTOR classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving....................AP</td>
<td>Air Conditioning.....................AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiler Installation.................BL</td>
<td>Electrical............................EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring &amp; Tunneling (no technical exam) BT</td>
<td>Heating................................HT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges..................................BR</td>
<td>Lightning Protection................LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building (BD, LB, UB) *............BD</td>
<td>Packaged Equipment...................PK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete...............................CT</td>
<td>Plumbing..............................PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Paving....................CP</td>
<td>Pressure and Process Piping ****.....1P/2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Roofing...................GR</td>
<td>Refrigeration........................RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass &amp; Glazing.....................GG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading..............................GD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway **.............................HY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Incidental (no technical exam) HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation (no technical exam) IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine................................MR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry (no technical exam)..........MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines............................PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engineered Metal Buildings........MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Electrical Utility ***.......1U/2U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad (no technical exam).........RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Roofing................SR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Framing................SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Shapes (no technical exam) SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools.....................SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Lines................WL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Plants..............WP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Frame Structures...............WF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Building (BD): includes GR, IR, MB, MS, SS, WF.
  "LB" - qualifier took Limited Building exam - can only apply as Group #1, #2, or #3; cannot work over 3 stories.
  "UB" - qualifier took Unlimited Building exam.

** Highway (HY): includes AP, CP, BR, GD, HI.

*** Public Electrical Utility (1U/2U): "1U" given to those licensed prior to 4/1/99 and can engage in stadium lighting work. "2U" given to those licensed after 4/1/99 and cannot engage in stadium lighting work.

**** Pressure and Process Piping (1P/2P): "1P" given to those licensed prior to 4/1/99 and can engage in boiler work; "2P" given to those licensed after 4/1/99 and cannot engage in boiler work.

*** DOLLAR LIMITATIONS AND NET WORTH/SURETY BOND REQUIREMENTS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL CONTRACTORS</th>
<th>MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ Limit per Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #3</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #4</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #5</td>
<td>$Unlimited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     | $ Limit per Contract  | Net Worth/Total Equity | Surety Bond Amount |
| Group #1            | $17,500                | $3,500                  | $7,000             |
| Group #2            | $50,000                | $10,000                 | $20,000            |
| Group #3            | $100,000               | $20,000                 | $40,000            |
| Group #4            | $200,000               | $40,000                 | $80,000            |
| Group #5            | $Unlimited             | $200,000                | $400,000           |

Revised 06/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLBE Name</th>
<th>SLBE Address</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-01</td>
<td>POTHOLE (EARLY DETERMINATION OF UTILITY VERTICLE DEPTH)</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$2,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-02</td>
<td>12&quot; WATER LINE VERTICAL OFFSET WITH BYPASS - (INCLUDES LINE TAPS, LINE STOPS, VALVES, FITTINGS, CONCRETE BLOCKING)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
<td>$61,426.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-03</td>
<td>12&quot; DUCTILE IRON PIPE CL 350 (RESTRAINED JOINT)</td>
<td>150.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$123.34</td>
<td>$18,501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-04</td>
<td>FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY (TEE, VALVE, HYDRANT, RJ PIPING, ETC.)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
<td>$5,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-05</td>
<td>REMOVE EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove Construction, LLC</td>
<td>1079 West Shady Grove Rd., Irmo, SC 29063</td>
<td>WS-06</td>
<td>ADJUST SEWER MANHOLE (Raise to Finish Surface)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>2011000</td>
<td>Clearing &amp; Grubbing Within Right of Way</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$19,750.00</td>
<td>$19,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscaping &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8100100</td>
<td>PERMANENT COVER</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's</td>
<td>2300 Cedar</td>
<td>8100200</td>
<td>TEMPORARY COVER</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLBE Name</td>
<td>SLBE Address</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8104005</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (NITROGEN)</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8104010</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (PHOSPHORIC ACID)</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8104015</td>
<td>FERTILIZER (POTASH)</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8105005</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL GRANULAR LIME</td>
<td>1000.0000</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8109050</td>
<td>SELECTIVE WATERING</td>
<td>54300.000</td>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8109901</td>
<td>MOWING</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8151110</td>
<td>TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL BLANKET (ECB)</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
<td>MSY</td>
<td>$1,550.00</td>
<td>$1,976.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8154050</td>
<td>REMOVAL OF SILT RETAINED BY SILT FENCE</td>
<td>565.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2,632.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscape &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8153000</td>
<td>SILT FENCE</td>
<td>2340.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$4,914.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLBE Name</th>
<th>SLBE Address</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green's Landscaping &amp; Lawn Service</td>
<td>2300 Cedar Creek Road, Blythewood, SC 29016</td>
<td>8153090</td>
<td>REPLACE/REPAIR SILT FENCE</td>
<td>234.0000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>8156490</td>
<td>Stabilized Construction Entrance</td>
<td>550.0000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$3.18</td>
<td>$1,749.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>4030320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT SURFACE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>800.0000</td>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>$2.18</td>
<td>$1,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>3069900</td>
<td>Maintenance Stone</td>
<td>138.0000</td>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>$12.60</td>
<td>$1,738.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>2031000</td>
<td>Unclassified Excavation</td>
<td>350.0000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>3100310</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt Base Course - Type A</td>
<td>693.0000</td>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>$3.78</td>
<td>$2,619.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>2023000</td>
<td>REMOVAL &amp; DISPOSAL OF EXISTING PAVEMENT</td>
<td>890.0000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.94</td>
<td>$2,616.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Brothers Construction Co., Inc.</td>
<td>2201 Atlas Road, Columbia, SC 29209</td>
<td>4020320</td>
<td>HOT MIX ASPHALT INTERMEDIATE COURSE TYPE B</td>
<td>1762.0000</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$3.97</td>
<td>$6,995.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $144,263.33
Construction Contingency

These increases are beyond the originally Council-approved amounts of 10% due to changed site conditions in the field and modifications to the projects to minimize impacts to utilities. The increase requested for Koon/Farmview Sidewalk Project is $20,140.00 and the increase for Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk Project is $58,968.00. It should be noted that both of these projects came in under the original Engineer’s Estimate. These additional funds will come from the Sidewalk Category of funds, and both of these requests are below the 2012 Referendum amounts. These approvals are time sensitive as both project are nearing completion and with the next potential Transportation Ad Hoc Committee being September, staff wishes to ensure no delays in processing these construction invoices.
Agenda Briefing

To: Chair of the Committee and the Honorable Members of the Committee
Prepared by: Allison Steele, P.E. Deputy Director
Department: Richland County Transportation
Date Prepared: July 11, 2019
Meeting Date: July 23, 2019

Background Information:

Many projects included in the Penny Program fall within South Carolina Department of Transportation’s (SCDOT) Rights-Of-Way. Projects in two of the major categories, Neighborhood Improvement Projects and Sidewalks, propose the installation of certain features that SCDOT has stated they will not maintain, meaning the County would be responsible for maintenance within SCDOT’s ROW in perpetuity.

Some of these features are landscaped medians, street lighting, mast arm traffic lights, and shared use paths (SUPs). Council has already approved the installation of SUPs in several locations, which would be a shared maintenance responsibility between the County and SCDOT (see attachment 1Clemson Rd. Maintenance Agreement as an example.)

Further, County Ordinance Section 21-12 states that the County shall not install street lighting until funds are appropriated to provide that service countywide (see attachment 2). The funding required would be for the installation, maintenance and monthly electric bill.

Recommended Action:

Staff requests Council to provide guidance on whether or not to continue with the design and construction of the items listed below.

A. Shared Use Paths
B. Landscaped Medians
C. Mast Arms
D. Street Lighting

Motion Requested:

Option 1; Move that Council approve removing one or more of the items listed in recommended actions for current and future designs of Penny Projects.

Option 2: Move that Council do not approve removing one or more of the items listed in recommended actions for current and future designs of Penny Projects.

Request for Council Reconsideration: □Yes
Fiscal Impact:

1. SUP\Vegetated Buffer Maintenance (Labor and Materials) – approximately $11,100\text{\$/mile} - annually
2. Mast Arm Signals (Labor and Materials) – approximately $26,000 to replace
3. Landscaped Medians (Labor Only) – approximately $5,460\text{\$/quarter mile} – annually
4. Street Lighting (Including Energy & Maintenance) – approximately $49,200\text{\$/mile} – annually

Estimates are derived from Public Works Roads & Drainage labor and materials costs, City of Columbia labor costs and from PDT research.

Motion of Origin:

This request did not result from a Council motion. This was a request for information originating out of the Dirt Road Ad Hoc Committee and Transportation Ad Hoc Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Member</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

Maintaining these items in SCDOT’s ROW would mean the County would incur the maintenance costs, but it also means the County shares in the liability for any incidents that may arise involving these project features.

To incur these maintenance responsibilities, an increase in the Public Works Roads & Drainage budget would be necessary.

Attachments:

1. Clemson Rd. Maintenance Agreement
2. Maintenance Items By Project
3. Street Lighting Ordinance Section 21-12
4. Updated Street Lighting Cost Estimates
5. Staff responses to Committee’s questions posed on 5/28/19
APPENDIX 1 – MAINTENANCE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT
2/17/00

THIS AGREEMENT is entered this 15th day of June, 2000 by and between Richland County, hereinafter referred to as County, and the South Carolina Department of Transportation, hereinafter referred to as SCDOT.

WHEREAS, in accordance with Sections 57-3-110 (1) and (10), 57-3-650, 57-23-10, 57-23-800(E), 57-25-140, and the SCDOT's Policy of Vegetation Preservation on SC Highways, SCDOT is authorized to allow landscaping and beautification efforts on SCDOT right of ways;

WHEREAS, the County has previously obtained a Cooperative Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for the coordination of the Richland County Sales Tax Transportation Program to access SCDOT's right of way for construction and/or improvement of transportation facilities. Said IGA is described as follows:

IGA Number: 25-14 Date Issued: February 7, 2014

Location: Clemson Road from Old Clemson Road to Sparkleberry Crossing Road;

WHEREAS, SCDOT and the County are desirous of entering into this Agreement to grant a continuous license to the County to enter the SCDOT’s right of way to conduct routine maintenance of landscaping, beautification and/or enhancements permitted by the aforesaid IGA;

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of mutual promises, SCDOT and the County agree to the following:

1) SCDOT grants the County a license to enter onto the SCDOT right of way at the area defined by the intergovernmental agreement. The purpose of the license to enter is limited to routine maintenance of the intergovernmental agreement area. Such entry will be limited to the scope of the work identified in the intergovernmental agreement. No additional encroachment beyond that contemplated by the original intergovernmental agreement is allowed. If additional maintenance, enhancement and/or beautification efforts, different from the original scope of work identified in the intergovernmental agreement, is requested, the County will be required to submit a new intergovernmental agreement identifying the new scope of work. Entry onto SCDOT right of way pursuant to this agreement may be without notice to the SCDOT.

2) The County agrees to post all necessary traffic control devices and take all necessary precautions in conformance with SCDOT traffic control standards and as required by the SCDOT, along the SCDOT right of way prior to and during the performance of any routine maintenance, enhancement and/or beautification efforts.

3) SCDOT agrees to accept maintenance responsibilities for the shared use path concrete structure not to include cleaning or hazardous weather maintenance of the surface.

4) The County agrees to accept maintenance responsibilities for maintenance of the shared use path's surface to include cleaning and hazardous weather maintenance of the surface.

5) The County agrees to maintain the vegetation zone located between the edge of roadway and the shared use path as well as the vegetation zone on the outside shoulder of the path. This maintenance includes, but is not limited to, mowing and clearing/limbing vegetation management.

6) The County agrees to be responsible for all claims or damages arising from the work performed by the County, its employees or agents, but only within the limits of the SC Tort Claims Act. In addition, should the County use a contractor for performance of the work, the County shall insert a hold harmless and indemnification clause in its contract with all contractors and subcontractors which requires the contractor and subcontractor to indemnify and hold.
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harmless the County and the State of South Carolina, specifically the SCDOT, from any liability, claims or damages which may arise from the performance of the work on SCDOT right of way. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to expand County liability for its actions in SCDOT’s right of way beyond the limits of the S. C. Tort Claims Act. Further, the County agrees that they are subject to S. C. Code Section 57-5-140, which provides that SCDOT shall not be liable for damages to property or injuries to persons, as otherwise provided for in the Torts Claims Act, as a consequence of the negligence by a municipality in performing such work within the State highway right of way.

7) This Agreement shall not be modified, amended or altered except upon written consent of the parties. Neither party shall assign, sublet, or transfer its interest in this Agreement without the written consent of the other.

8) This Agreement may be terminated upon thirty days' written notice to the other party; however, in cases where the County is not performing in accordance with this Agreement, SCDOT shall give written notice to the County of the failure in performance and, if the County does not correct or cure the performance within three days of receipt of the notice, SCDOT shall have the option to terminate this license immediately, and shall, thereafter, give written notice of such termination to the County.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, the above parties have hereunto set their hands and seals.

SOUTHCAROLINADEPARTMENTOFTRANSPORTATION
By: ________________________________
Its: ________________________________
Recommended by: ________________________________

RICHLANDCOUNTY
By: ________________________________
Its: ________________________________
Sandra Jacobs, Ph.D
Assistant County Administrator

Richland County Attorney’s Office

Approved As To LEGAL Form Only.
No Opinion Rendered As To Content.
Maintenance Items by Project

June 7, 2019

Existing Maintenance Agreements

1. Clemson Road Widening – Shared Use Path (Existing Agreement)  Sparkleberry Crossing to Old Clemson Road – both sides of road and along Earth Road to Peach Grove Ct – one side of road = 3.722 miles

2. Southeast Richland Neighborhood Improvements – Shared Use Path (Existing Agreement) Garners Ferry Road to Rabbit Run, Rabbit Run to Lower Richland Blvd and Lower Richland Blvd to Lower Richland High School – one side of road = 1.634 miles

3. Polo Road Sidewalk – Shared Use Path (Existing Agreement) Alpine Road to Mallet Hill Road – one side of road = 1.701 miles

Maintenance to be Performed by Others

1. North Main Street Widening – Landscape Median, Mast Arms, Lighting (City to Maintain)

2. Blythewood Road Widening – Shared Use Path (Town of Blythewood to Maintain)  I-77 to Syrup Mill Road – both sides of road = 1.665 miles

3. Blythewood Road Phase 2 (Creech Connector) – Shared Use Path (Town of Blythewood to Maintain, to be confirmed during design)  Current Concept from Blythewood Road to Main Street – one side of road = 0.440 miles

Maintenance Under Consideration for Richland County

1. Bluff Road Phase II Improvements – Shared Use Path  Berea Road to Blair Road – both sides of road = 2.519 miles

2. Lower Richland Boulevard Widening – Shared Use Path  Garners Ferry Road to Lower Richland High School – both sides of road = 0.384 miles

3. Pineview Road Improvements – Shared Use Path  Bluff Road to Garners Ferry Road – one side of road = 2.811 miles

4. Polo Road Widening – Shared Use Path  Two Notch Road to Mallet Hill Road – one side of road = 1.884 miles

5. Shop Road Widening – Shared Use Path  George Rogers Blvd to Mauney Drive – both sides of road = 4.061 miles

6. Clemson Road/Sparkleberry Lane Intersection – Shared Use Path  Clemson Road from I-20 to Sparkleberry Crossing – both sides of road, Sparkleberry Lane from Mallet Hill Road to Sparkleberry Crossing – one side of road, and Sparkleberry Crossing to Clemson Road – both sides of road = 1.144 miles
7. Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood Improvements – Shared Use Path *Chatsworth Pedestrian Connector* = 0.133 miles, Landscaped Medians *Decker Blvd* = 0.424 miles, Lighting Chatsworth Pedestrian Connector, *Brookfield Road Sidewalk from Decker Blvd to Richland NE High School* and *Decker Blvd Streetscape from Trenholm Road to Percival Road* = 2.680 miles, Mast Arms 8

8. Bull Street/Elmwood Avenue Intersection – Mast Arms 4

9. Broad River Corridor Neighborhood Improvements – Mast Arms 10, Landscaped Medians *Broad River Road and intersections with Greystone Blvd, Bush River Road and St. Andrews Road* = 0.500 miles

10. Crane Creek Neighborhood Improvements – Landscaped Medians along Monticello Road 0.500 miles

11. Trenholm Acres/Newcastle Neighborhood Improvements – Landscaped Medians *Fontaine Road, Two Notch Road and Parklane Road* = Conceptual 1000’ to 2.650 miles

12. Spears Creek Church Road Widening – Unknown
§ 21-11

Richland County Code

(c) The developer of any new subdivision constructed within the jurisdiction and authority of the county is responsible for the initial installation of all necessary traffic control devices in accordance with an approved signage plan. The department of public works shall maintain the devices after acceptance of the streets.
(Code 1976, § 8-1005; Ord. No. 005-03HR, § I, 1-21-03; Ord. No. 052-05HR, § I, 7-12-05; Ord. No. 046-07HR, § I, 5-15-05)

Sec. 21-12. Street lighting.

The county shall not provide street lighting on any highway, street or road until such time as sufficient funds are appropriated to provide that service county-wide. Homeowners or homeowner’s associations may obtain street lighting through contractual arrangements with the electric utility serving their area.
(Ord. No. 005-03HR, § I, 1-21-03)

Sec. 21-13. Emergency maintenance of roads.

(a) No work may be performed on any roadway not already maintained by the county unless the county administrator determines that access to such roadway is necessary for the performance of one or more public functions, and the following conditions exist:

1. Such a roadway is the only access for one (1) or more property owners or residences, and

2. Emergency medical services, sheriff department vehicles and other county vehicles cannot, in the lawful performance of their duties, gain full and immediate access to at least one (1) residence unless road scraping is performed, and

3. At least one (1) of the properties to be accessed is used as a primary residence.

(b) Any work pursuant to this section will be done on a one-time basis only. In such cases, the county department of public works is limited to the minimum improvements that will allow full and immediate access to the affected residences. Crusher-run, gravel, pipe or other materials will not be routinely provided.
(Code 1976, § 8-1007; Ord. No. 1846-89, § I, 3-21-89; Ord. No. 2372-93, § I, 11-16-93; Ord. No. 005-03HR, § I, 1-21-03; Ord. No. 032-13HR, § I, 7-2-13)

Sec. 21-14. Abandonment of public roads and right-of-ways.

(a) Any person or organization wishing to close an existing public street, road, or highway in the county to public traffic shall petition a court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with section 57-9-10, et seq. of the state code of laws. The petition shall name the county as a respondent (unless the county is the petitioner). The county attorney shall advise the court with regard to the county’s concurrence or opposition after consultation with the county’s planning, public works, and emergency services departments, and after consideration by county council. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to physically close the roadway if a petition is successful. The county attorney may submit such petition on behalf of the county if so directed by county council.

(b) Any person or organization wishing the county to abandon maintenance on an existing county-maintained street, road or highway shall submit to the public works department a petition to do so signed by the owners of all property adjoining the road and by the owners of all property who use the road as their only means of ingress/egress to their property. The petition shall state that the property owners release and indemnify the county from any duty to maintain the road. At the recommendation of the county engineer, the county administrator shall have the authority to act on a petition that involves a dead-end road; county council shall have the authority to approve petitions
**Lighting Cost Estimate**

The estimates assume a 15-year lease from Dominion Energy. Dominion Energy will install and maintain the lighting. These estimates were based on information from Dominion Energy for the Decker Blvd. / Woodfield Park Neighborhood Improvement Project.

### Scenario 1: Money Down with Monthly Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrian Path¹</th>
<th>4 or 5-lane Roadway²</th>
<th>Total for 15-year Period (Cost / Mile)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Down</td>
<td>$408,000.00</td>
<td>$485,000.00</td>
<td>$444,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Fee</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>$578,600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes Acorn-style LED lighting with new poles
2. Assumes Acorn-style LED lighting with new poles and Cobrahead LED lighting mounted on existing wood poles.
3. Total Cost/Mile for 15-Year Lease Period = Money Down + Monthly Fee * 12 months / year * 15 years

### Scenario 2: Zero Money Down / Monthly Fee Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrian Path¹</th>
<th>4 or 5-lane Roadway²</th>
<th>Total for 15-year Period (Cost / Mile)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Down</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$570,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Fee</td>
<td>$3,170.00</td>
<td>$4,100.00</td>
<td>$738,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes Acorn-style LED lighting with new poles
2. Assumes Acorn-style LED lighting with new poles and Cobrahead LED lighting mounted on existing wood poles.
3. Total Cost/Mile for 15-Year Lease Period = Money Down + Monthly Fee * 12 months / year * 15 years
Maintenance Items
Questions from Transportation Committee Meeting Held On 5/28/19

1. How many miles of Shared Use Paths (SUPs) and Landscaped Medians (LMs) are proposed to be maintained by the County? Approximately 20 miles of SUPs and 4 miles of LMs
2. How many mast arms are proposed to be maintained by the County? 22
3. If a driver were to run into and damage a County-maintained mast arm, would the County require that driver or his insurance company to pay for repair or replacement? Risk Management would attempt to go after them for indemnification but there would be no guarantee that the driver even has insurance or that RM would be successful in recovering any costs. Also if damage were done to the mast arm for some other reason (i.e. tornado, tree down, etc.) the County would be responsible for its repair. If the mast arm goes down and causes damage to property such as a car, the County could also be liable for that property damage. If a traditional signal is installed, all of this responsibility would fall to SCDOT.
4. Are any beautification organizations willing to assist with maintaining landscaped medians? Keep The Midlands Beautiful was contacted, and they responded that they only focus on litter and recycling efforts. Quinton Epps with the Conservation Division was contacted, and he was unaware of any organizations that would be interested in maintaining LMs.
5. Lighting Cost Chart – An updated lighting chart has been provided with two options: pre-pay the full amount of installation and maintenance and then just have a monthly electric bill or pay zero up front and have a monthly bill that includes electric and installation or maintenance.
6. What would be the cost to provide street lighting Countywide? The following is the mileage of roadways that the County currently maintains:
   a. Paved – 591.92
   b. Unpaved – 212.91
   c. Total – 804.83
   The cost estimates provided by the PDT are for 4\5 lane roadways and were based specifically on the Decker\Woodfield project. Almost all of the County’s current roads are two-lane, so just to get a very rough estimate to provide street lighting Countywide we would assume half the costs listed in the attachment which provides the numbers below:
      a. Scenario 1 15-year cost – $232,837,319
      b. Scenario 2 15-year cost - $296,982,270
7. Are there any alternatives to traditional street lighting? Yes, you can use solar lighting with two options. With solar lighting, the upfront cost of installation is greater than traditional installation; however, you will save funds over time with the reduction or removal of monthly energy bill
      a. On grid – The lights are actually connected to the power company’s grid so that if the panels produce more than they use, energy credits can be obtained
      b. Off grid – The lights are completely self-sufficient through the use of batteries
8. IGA between SCDOT and County for maintenance of SUPs in the Town of Blythewood. Staff was directed to change this IGA to be an agreement between SCDOT and Blythewood. County staff is currently working to update the IGA to reflect Blythewood instead of the County.
9. The Committee requested the three IGAs that have already been executed between the County and SCDOT be re-evaluated to see if they should be changed as well.
a. Clemson Rd IGA – A portion of the proposed SUP falls within unincorporated County and a portion within the City of Columbia. Create an IGA between the City and SCDOT for the portion within the City’s limits?

b. Southeast Richland Neighborhood Improvements (SERN) IGA – This entire project falls within unincorporated County.

c. Polo Rd. IGA - This entire project falls within unincorporated County.

10. Light pollution\impacts to wildlife (Picture 1)

a. Animals - Artificial light can disrupt the nighttime environment of nocturnal animals, impact wetland habitats, and affect bird migration that relies on moonlight\starlight navigation

b. Humans – Blue light has been shown in some studies to negatively impact humans such as vision and sleep disruption; however, this is related more to interior lighting and electronics. Glare appears to be the biggest issue with outdoor lighting.

c. Sky Glow - Brightness of the night sky in a built-up area as a result of light pollution. This can best be understood by observing the two photos on the following page.

Picture (1): Before and during the 2003 Northeast blackout, a massive power outage that affected 55 million people. Photo by of Todd Carlson
**Agenda Briefing**

**To:** Chairman and the Honorable Members of Council  
**Prepared by:** Michael A. Niermeier  
**Department:** Transportation  
**Date Prepared:** 7/19/2019  
**Meeting Date:** 7/18/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Review</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Review</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Review</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Review:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approved for Council consideration:**

**Subject:** Widening Program Funding Options

**Recommended Action:**

Staff recommends approving Widening Program Funding Option 3

**Motion Requested:**

Move to approve the Penny Program Widening Funding Option 3 as presented in Exhibit C

**Request for Council Reconsideration:** Yes

**Fiscal Impact:**

All options presented involve the same money available and proposed cash flow plan.

**Motion of Origin:**

NA

**Council Member**

**Meeting**

**Date**

**Discussion:**

At the Transportation work session on July 18, the Widening Memo from March of 2018 was discussed as a way to achieve alignment of those projects with the funding available. During discussion, three approaches were debated. These approaches are shown in Exhibits A, B, and C (attached). Of note Exhibit B: Constrained differs, from the March 2018 memo as this option was directly taken from the work session on July 18.

**Attachments:**

1. March 2018 Widening Memo  
2. 20190723 Widening Program Funding Scenarios
3. Exhibit A: Referendum
4. Exhibit B: Constrained
5. Exhibit C: Recommended Improvements
Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Farrow Rd and Lake Carolina Blvd

Referendum = $29,860.800
Current Estimate = $29,860,800
CLEMSON ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Chimney Ridge Dr and Old Clemson Rd

Referendum = $23,400,000
Current Estimate = $15,898,417

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
Referendum Scope:

*Construct 5-lane widening between Fairmont Rd and Lower Richland Blvd*

*Referendum = $4,000,000*
*Current Estimate = $4,000,000*
NORTH MAIN STREET WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Anthony Ave and Fuller Ave

Referendum = $35,400,00
Current Estimate = $62,663,573

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
Referendum Scope:

**Construct 5-lane widening between Rosewood Dr and S. Beltline Blvd.**

*Referendum = $16,700,000*

*Bluff Phase 1 Cost = $9,552,708*

*Bluff Phase 2 Current Estimate = $40,203,471*

*Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project*
SHOP ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between George Rogers Blvd and S. Beltline Blvd

Referendum = $33,100,000
Current Estimate = $46,461,812

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
ATLAS ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 3-lane widening between Bluff Rd and Shop Rd
Construct 5-lane widening between Shop Rd and Garners Ferry Rd

Referendum = $17,600,000
Current Estimate = $41,919,470

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
**PINEVIEW ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)**

**Referendum Scope:**

*Construct 3-lane widening between Bluff Rd and Shop Rd*  
*Construct 5-lane widening between Shop Rd and Garners Ferry Rd*

**Referendum = $18,200,000**  
**Current Estimate = $40,032,789**
BLYTHEWOOD ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Syrup Mill Rd & I-77 Ramps

Referendum = $8,000,000
Current Estimate = $13,348,823

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Royal Tower Rd and Dutch Fork Rd
Construct 3-lane widening between Dutch Fork Rd and I-26 Ramps

Referendum = $29,000,000
Current Estimate = $41,168,865
Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Two Notch Rd and Percival Rd

Referendum = $26,600,000
Current Estimate = $49,502,831
LOWER RICHLAND BOULEVARD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 5-lane widening between Garners Ferry Rd and Rabbit Run Rd

Referendum = $6,100,000
Current Estimate = $6,708,092

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
POLO ROAD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:

Construct 3-lane widening between Mallet Hill Rd and Two Notch Rd

Referendum = $12,800,000
Current Estimate = $15,309,142
BLYTHEWOOD RD WIDENING (REFERENDUM)

Referendum Scope:
A. Blythewood Rd Widening - 5-lane widening from Syrup Mill Rd to Winnsboro Rd

Per Town of Blythewood, project changed to include (5) priority projects;
1. McNulty St Improvements : 3-lane widening
2. Creech Rd Extension : 3-lane widening / new location
3. Blythewood Rd Widening (I-77 to Main): 5-lane widening
4. Blythewood Rd Widening (Fulmer Rd to Syrup Mill Rd): 5-lane widening
5. Roundabout at Blythewood Rd / Creech Rd / McNulty St

Referendum = $21,000,000
Current Estimate = $21,000,000

Exhibit A: 2012 Referendum Defined Project
Options for improvements within referendum: $8,947,292

Construct shared-use paths, both sides of roadway, between National Guard Rd and S. Beltline Blvd (no widening)
SHOP ROAD WIDENING

Options for improvements within referendum: $33,100,000

Construct 5-lane widening between George Rogers Blvd and Andrews Rd

Exhibit B: Improvements Constrained to Referendum Amount
ATLAS ROAD WIDENING

Options for improvements within referendum: $17,600,000

Construct intersection improvements at Bluff Rd, Shop Rd & Garners Ferry Rd

Exhibit B: Improvements Constrained to Referendum Amount
Options for improvements within referendum: $18,200,000

Construct 3-lane widening (instead of 5-lane widening) between Shop Rd and Garners Ferry Rd, including intersection improvements at Garners Ferry Rd
Options for improvements within referendum: $8,000,000

Construct 3-lane widening (instead of 5-lane widening) between Syrup Mill Rd and I-77 Ramps

Exhibit B: Improvements Constrained to Referendum Amount
BROAD RIVER ROAD WIDENING

Options for improvements within referendum: $29,000,000

Construct 5-lane widening between Royal Tower Rd and Koon Rd

Exhibit B: Improvements Constrained to Referendum Amount
SPEARS CREEK CHURCH ROAD WIDENING

Options for improvements within referendum: $26,600,000

Construct 5-lane widening between Two Notch Rd and Earth Rd

Exhibit B: Improvements Constrained to Referendum Amount
Options for improvements within referendum: $6,100,000

Construct 5-lane widening between Garners Ferry Rd and Rabbit Run Rd; remove shared-use path from western side or road, retain shared use path on east side
Options for improvements within referendum: $12,800,000

Construct shared-use path along west side of Polo Rd, including intersection improvements at Two Notch Rd, Miles Rd and Running Fox Rd
Recommended improvements (Phase 2)
Current Estimate = $8,696,437

Construct shared-use paths, both sides of roadway and resurfacing.
Recommended improvements
Current Estimate = $8,074,166

Construct shared-use paths (EB side between Bluff Rd and Shop Rd, WB side between Shop Rd and Garners Ferry Rd) and resurfacing.
Recommended improvements
Current Estimate = $33,079,141

Construct 5-lane widening between Two Notch Rd I-77 Ramps
Agenda Briefing

To: Chairman and the Honorable Members of Council
Prepared by: Michael A. Niermeier
Department: Transportation
Date Prepared: 7/19/2019
Meeting Date: 7/18/2019

| Legal Review | Date: |
| Budget Review | Date: |
| Finance Review | Date: |
| Other Review: | Date: |

Approved for Council consideration:

Subject: Cash Flow Plan

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends approving the cash flow plan as presented

Motion Requested:

Move to approve the cash flow plan as shown in attachment 01.

Request for Council Reconsideration: Yes

Fiscal Impact:

This plan provides a fiscally responsible way ahead based on current projects prioritization, outside funding sources, data from the County’s Financial Advisors, and projected revenue.

Motion of Origin:

NA

Council Member
Meeting
Date

Discussion:

This plan was originally presented at the June 18, 2019 Transportation Work Session and updated by staff working with the County’s Financial Advisors. Interest earnings and debt amortization are included. This plan will be reviewed annually. Note that Kelly Mill and Commerce Drive are now added back as well as the $5 Million each for the Bikeway and Sidewalk Programs such that they are both fully funded to their original Referendum amounts.

Attachments:

1. Cash Flow Plan
## RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PENNY PROGRAM

### Project and Cash Flow Plan Summary 2019 to 2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROADWAY PROJECTS</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardscrabble Road Widening</td>
<td>27,751</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Road Widening</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>6,619</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leesburg Road Widening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street Widening</td>
<td>38,962</td>
<td>16,902</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road Widening Phase 1</td>
<td>9,511</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road Improvements Phase 2</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>5,202</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Road Widening</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,471</td>
<td>13,019</td>
<td>11,799</td>
<td>6,324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Road Widening</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>6,034</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>15,509</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineview Road Improvements</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythewood Road Widening</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Widening</td>
<td>92,829</td>
<td>39,072</td>
<td>49,377</td>
<td>50,320</td>
<td>25,526</td>
<td>30,512</td>
<td>29,221</td>
<td>21,334</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>357,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbanks Zoo</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovista Ph. 1 Greene St</td>
<td>17,862</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovista Ph. 2 Greene St</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>10,838</td>
<td>9,691</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovista Ph. 3 Williams St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Road Extension (Ph. I)</td>
<td>28,783</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Road Extension (Ph. II)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>9,692</td>
<td>13,369</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mill Rd.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Drive Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Richland Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad River Neighborhood</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker Boulevard Neighborhood</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlewood Neighborhood</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Creek Neighborhood</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>14,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenholm Acres / Newcastle Neighborhood</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad River Corridor Neighborhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>11,322</td>
<td>20,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special</td>
<td>56,338</td>
<td>19,191</td>
<td>31,323</td>
<td>20,378</td>
<td>11,221</td>
<td>21,045</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>4,751</td>
<td>17,818</td>
<td>16,876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>201,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hardscrabble Rd. /Rheimer Rd./North Springs Rd. | 3,624 | 420   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 4,044  |
| North Springs Rd. and Risdon Way            | 1,798 | 143   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 1,941  |
| Farrow Rd. and Pisgah Church Rd.             | 1,809 | 416   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 2,224  |
| Broad River Rd. and Rushmore Rd.             | 1,188 | 28    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 1,216  |
| Kennerly Rd. and Coogler Rd./Steeple Ridge Rd.| 2,504 | 228   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 2,732  |
| Summit Pkwy and Summit Ridge Rd.             | 1,362 | 63    | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 1,424  |
| Wilson Blvd. and Pisgah Church Rd.           | 0     | (0)   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -      |
| Wilson Blvd. and Killian Rd.                 | 0     | (0)   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -      |
| Clemson Rd. and Sparkleberry Ln.             | 4,343 | 357   | 1,288 | 4,876 | 1,691 | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 12,555 |
| Bull St. and Elmwood Ave.                    | 240   | 917   | 2,084 | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 3,241  |
| North Main St. and Monticello Rd.            | 0     | (0)   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -      |
| Hardscrabble Rd. / Kelly Mill Rd./Rimer Pond Rd. | 0    | (0)   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | (0)    |
| Garners Ferry Rd. and Harmon Rd.             | 325   | 223   | 836   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 1,385  |
| North Springs Rd. and Harrington Rd.         | 301   | 333   | 741   | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 1,374  |
| Screaming Eagle Rd. and Percival Rd.         | 322   | 429   | 2,297 | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     | 3,048  |

**TOTAL INTERSECTIONS:** 17,816 3,555 7,245 4,876 1,691 - - - - - - 35,184
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-20 / Broad River Rd. Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INTERCHANGE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Resurfacing Program</td>
<td>16,992</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt Road Paving Program</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Management &amp; Complete Streets Initiative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Wide Corridor Improvement Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Wide Thoroughfare Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Wide HOV Lane Study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ROADWAY PROJECTS</td>
<td>30,296</td>
<td>27,890</td>
<td>15,960</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE PED GREENWAY PROJECTS</td>
<td>197,280</td>
<td>89,707</td>
<td>103,906</td>
<td>81,575</td>
<td>39,684</td>
<td>51,556</td>
<td>31,094</td>
<td>31,598</td>
<td>22,646</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>681,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers Greenway Extension Ph. 1</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Tunnel Greenway</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Creek A Greenway</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith / Rocky Branch Section C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Creek Section B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith / Rocky Branch Section B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith / Rocky Branch Section A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gills Creek North Greenway Section C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Creek Section A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Creek Section B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Mall Greenway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo Road/ Windsor Lake Boulevard Connector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury / Old Leesburg Connector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Creek Section C (Crane Forest)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchman Boulevard Connector</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GREENWAY</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Intersection Upgrades Program</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INTERSECTION UPGRADES</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S2</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S3</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 OET Sidewalks</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Package S10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo Road Sidewalk</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Sidewalk</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and Cash Flow Plan Summary 2019 to 2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PENNY PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior</strong></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>2022</strong></td>
<td><strong>2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>2024</strong></td>
<td><strong>2025</strong></td>
<td><strong>2026</strong></td>
<td><strong>2027</strong></td>
<td><strong>2028</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIC - Capers Sidewalk</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder Sidewalk Program</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>9,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SIDEWALK</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,399</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,469</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td><strong>26,926</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Program</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>22,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BIKEWAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>22,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BIKE PED GREENWAY PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,151</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>7,268</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>7,413</td>
<td>71,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,822</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>735,934</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNTP</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland County</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>27,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland County OSBO</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>(1,052)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland PDT</td>
<td>5,668</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,478)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,699</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITIGATION BANK</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10,044)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,134</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10,044)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>4,089</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>234,491</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,656</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>772,723</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Reimbursements (REMOVED)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Road Ext. Ph 1 - Richland Co. Economic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing Program - CTC</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Tunnel Greenway PRTM Grant</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Tunnel Greenway - City of Columbia</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Road Shared-Use Path Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival Road Sidewalk (CTC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad River Neighborhood TAP Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker Boulevard Neighborhood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Road Widening (Shared Use Path) TAP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Road Shared-Use Path TAP Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Rd Widening Ph 1 ($1M Federal, $800K)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Road Widening (Federal Safety Funds)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street Widening (Tiger)</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main Street Widening (Earmark)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main St Widening (City)</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,936</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>39,031</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALES TAX PROCEEDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>320,359</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,416</strong></td>
<td><strong>94,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,832</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,070,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL FUNDING (OUTSIDE SOURCES)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,936</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>39,031</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOND REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>175,000</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>175,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVAILABLE FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>241,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>236,685</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,718</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,965</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,716</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,271</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,372)</strong></td>
<td><strong>789,636</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARROVER FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,943</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>146,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,943</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$'s in 1,000's