TRANSPORTATION PENNY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2014
2020 HAMPTON STREET, 4TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

TRANSPORTATION PENNY

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, a copy of the agenda was sent to radio and TV stations, newspapers, persons requesting notification, and was posted on the bulletin board located in the lobby of the County Administration Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hayes Mizell, Bill Wiseman, Robert Williams, Dorothy Sumpter, J. T. McLawhorn, James Faber, Carol Kososki, Paul Livingston, Todd Avant, Norman Jackson, Trevor Bowers, Jennifer D. Bishop,

OTHERS PRESENT: Rob Perry, Chris Gossett, Tony McDonald, Ismail Ozbek, Greg Pearce, Michelle Onley, Justine Jones

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 13, 2014 – Mr. McLawhorn moved to approve the minutes as distributed. The vote in favor was unanimous.

CITIZENS’ INPUT

No one signed up to speak.

Mr. Mizell proposed that the meeting location be changed if the 4th Floor Conference Room is not available on the date and time the TPAC meeting is scheduled.

Mr. Mizell read into the record a letter from Chairman Jackson to the TPAC Committee outlining their duties and addressing their request for participation as non-voting members on the Engineering Consultant Selection Committees.
The following is the aforementioned letter from Chairman Jackson:

Dear Transportation Advisory Committee:

First and foremost, thank you for all of your effort over the past several months as members of the Richland County Transportation Advisory Committee (TPAC) which has served as a “Watchdog Group” for the Transportation Penny Program. I can’t begin to explain the importance of this committee or the program as a whole. As many of you know, a lot has been accomplished over the last six months to put our great county in a position to begin constructing projects in the near future. However, we still have much to do before we begin work on our first Transportation Penny funded project.

Over the last few weeks Council has fielded multiple questions regarding what role the TPAC has in this immense program. Additionally, we have recently fielded a request to have some members from the TPAC serve as non-voters on the On-Call Engineering Teams Selection Committee. At this point I think it would be best to specifically identify what Council’s expectations are for program involvement by the TPAC.

As you have gathered thus far, the relationship between County Council, staff, and the TPAC has been a somewhat evolving relationship due to the nature of the program. I am encouraged that this relationship has been predominantly positive and has exhibited the level of professionalism we all expected it should. At times it has been an arduous task to move information through the Ad Hoc Transportation Committee, the TPAC and then full County Council. Keeping all three groups informed without delaying progress is one of the major obstacles we face. Having said that, Council intends for the TPAC to continue its focus on the tasks below:

- Review and discussion of individual project rankings per category
- Modification of project names or descriptions that don’t amend the original intended project purpose and need
- Quarterly reports to respective jurisdictions represented by TPAC members
- Review and discussion of any proposed scope of services included in any solicitation for Engineering Consultant Services
- Recommendation for financial review and audit
- Conduct a singular, annual “State of the Penny” address
- Recommendations to the CMRTA Board, and to any other governing body with regards to the Transportation Penny
Based on these tasks, it may be prudent during the next TPAC meeting to agree upon a process for moving recommendations from the TPAC to County Council. So far it’s been a pleasure working with each one of you on this immense program. If you have any questions don’t hesitate to contact me.

A discussion took place regarding the letter from Chairman Jackson.

DISCUSSION OF TPAC REQUEST FOR NON-VOTING MEMBERS ON CONSULTANT SELECTION COMMITTEES

Mr. Livingston recommended that the County Council Chair should bring this request to the full Council for action at the next scheduled Council meeting.

RECEIPT OF COMMENTS FROM REVIEW OF SCOPE OF SERVICES FOR RE-SOLICITATION OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TEAM

- Mr. Williams and Ms. Bishop are interested in the criteria scoring/grading.
- Mr. Wiseman suggested that the ranking not be done numerically, but in another format.
- Mr. Mizell requested that the process be clearly delineated and described for the public.

DISCUSSION OF CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS IN RE-SOLICITATION OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TEAM AND ON-CALL ENGINEERING TEAMS

TRANSPORTATION PENNY UPDATE

- Closing on Program Mitigation Bank: Ms. Kosoki congratulated County staff on a job well done on the purchase of the mitigation bank property.

Mr. Perry stated that the first credit release will be in August 2016.

- Executed IGA with SCDOT: Mr. Perry stated that the IGA was executed on February 7, 2014, but supplemental agreements will need to be executed for Hardscrabble and Leesburg Roads.

- Draft SIB Application: Mr. Perry stated that the City of Columbia, Lexington County and Richland County are filing a joint State Infrastructure Bank application to assist with funding the Airport Phase II – Lexington County; completely streetscape Assembly and Huger Streets – City of Columbia; Innovista projects and Assembly Street Railroad project. They will be requesting $820 million for these projects.

- Audit of the COMET and Transportation Penny Program: Mr. McDonald recommended that roll the Transportation Penny audit into the routine annual audit. If additional information is requested the auditor can conduct a higher level look or engage a separate independent auditor.
Mr. Mizell requested the quarterly report received from the State detailing what the penny has earned be provided to TPAC Committee. He further requested that the auditor be available to make a presentation to the committee regarding his findings.

DISCUSSION REGARDING HOLDING A SECOND STATE OF THE PENNY PRESENTATION IN LOWER RICHLAND

It was recommended that the Second State of the Penny Presentation take place in Lower Richland.

OTHER BUSINESS

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Mr. Livingston stated he has never been involved in a process that has been more citizen-driven and open as this process. He extended kudos to his colleagues who were willing to accept recommendations from the citizen committees involved in the process.

Mr. McLawhorn stated that he echoed Mr. Livingston’s comments.

REMINDER—NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, MARCH 17, 2014 AT 5:00 PM

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:58 PM.