TRANSPORTATION PENNY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015
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, Dorothy Sumter, Trevor Bowers, Derrick Huggins, Bobby Williams, Councilman Paul Livingston, J. T. McLawhorn, Elise Bidwell, Virginia Sanders, Jennifer Bishop, Todd Avant, and James Faber

OTHERS PRESENT: Rob Perry, Chris Gossett, Tony McDonald, Shawn Salley, Quinton Epps, Michelle Onley, Tony Edwards, Hack McGill, Cheryl Patrick, Brenda Parnell, Kristen Hutto, Ismail Ozbek and Gloria Tanner

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:31 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 23, 2015 – The minutes were approved unanimously.

SLBE UPDATE

Ms. Patrick introduced the employees from the OSBO Office.

Ms. Gloria Tanner stated she has been assisting with the development and implementation of the SLBE program. For the last few weeks, she has been identifying the pertinent items that need to be addressed and prioritizing those, in order, to prevent a delay in the construction schedule.

Ms. Tanner provided a report that outlining the activities of the OSBO Office for the last eight weeks.

The County’s program unlike any other programs in the State, such as SCDOT (DBE Program), the Governor’s Office (MWBE Program) and the City of Columbia (MWBE Program), the County could not do retro-processing.

🌟 The County’s program requires that the applicants are: (1) small business owners, (2) local (within Richland County) and (3) the program is race neutral.
The SCDOT’s Program, which is federally funded, is a race conscious program

The type of program an agency has is dependent on the type of funding they receive (i.e. federal or local)

Ms. Sanders inquired if the SLBE Office was endeavoring to certify a certain percentage of minority owned businesses.

Ms. Patrick stated the ordinance is race and gender neutral, therefore, businesses cannot not be certified based solely on race.

Ms. Tanner stated in most small local business programs 90% of the firms are minority/ethically oriented.

Mr. Faber stated they were under the impression the program would assist a certain percentage of African American businesses.

Mr. Livingston stated no one stated there would be a certain percentage certified because the law precludes the County from doing so. The consultant advised Council not to proceed with discussions of the DBEs until a disparity study was conducted. The disparity study cannot be conducted until a year’s worth of data has been collected. At that time, Council will proceed with the disparity study.

Ms. Tanner stated projects that are funded utilizing SCDOT funds will have a DBE goal added.

Ms. Patrick stated in 2013 – 10% of firms were MWBEs and in 2012 – 12% of the firms were MWBEs.

Mr. Livingston stated assisting minority owned businesses is a major concern for Council. The goal at this time is to build more businesses and prepare them to work.

Ms. Tanner stated prior to her coming on board, there were 2 firms certified. To date there have been 19 applications processed.

Mr. McLawhorn stated the citizens, TPAC members, staff and Council need to communicate more effectively and be in one accord.

Ms. Bidwell stated the SLBE program is presently setting up small businesses that are certified and ready to do the work. As far as the disparity study, Council needs to keep the TPAC members informed.

Mr. Livingston stated Council has considered the SLBE program a high priority and has done all they can do with the constraints they are working with.

What is the process to develop new businesses or to expand existing businesses into bigger businesses?

Ms. Tanner stated scheduled benchmarks have been put into place. With regards to construction, the County is looking to identify firms that can provide bonding services. In addition, a mentor protégé program is being developed. Through professional training and development, Ms. Tanner’s firm has
provided supportive services to assist and develop a new company. The services provided are: administration, technical, and training sessions that include marketing, website development, and estimating/scheduling education.

Ms. Patrick stated she has been working with Mr. Franklin Lee to draft the RFP for the disparity study. Once a year’s worth of quantitative data has been collected, the County can proceed with the disparity study. If the disparity study was conducted now it would be going backward.

Mr. Huggins inquired once the firms have been certified, how will the firms know which projects to apply for and if they are not awarded the contract will it be explained to them why they were not chosen?

Mr. Perry stated there is a sheltered market program would assist in building a platform to go after work. In addition, Ms. Tanner suggested instead of holding a mandatory pre-construction meeting to conduct a forum approximately a month out and require the contractors to attend.

Mr. Huggins requested a good faith effort component be added to the report.

Ms. Patrick stated the office has begun to conduct outreach sessions and the compliance specialists are to track the SLBE’s on the job to insure they are paid.

Ms. Tanner invited the TPAC members to the OSBO seminar on June 8th. Potential SLBEs are being invited to introduce them to what kind of projects the County has to offer.

Ms. Tanner stated at the outreach sessions it is suggested to the firms that they request to have their bids reviewed in order to identify where their shortcomings were.

Ms. Bidwell inquired as to what percentage of the firms certified are minority and/or women owned.

Ms. Patrick stated the firms are not tracked.

Ms. Patrick stated she and Ms. Tanner attended Small Business Week at the Chamber of Commerce and had a great response from those sessions.

Mr. McLawhorn requested the resumes/bios of Ms. Patrick’s staff.

Mr. Wiseman inquired if it would be appropriate to forward firms that may not be aware of the program to the OSBO Office to follow up on.

2015 TIGER GRANT

Mr. Perry stated Council approved submission of two grants. One is for Bluff Road and the other is for Clemson Road. Staff will inform the members when the application is submitted. The awarding of the
grant will be in September. There is $500 million in federal funding available nationwide; therefore, this is a very competitive process.

**GREENE STREET CONSTRUCTION UPDATE**

Mr. Perry stated there was a pre-construction meeting on May 7th with the contractor, the City of Columbia, University of South Carolina and the utility providers. A notice to proceed was issued. The construction trailer has been set up and the groundbreaking will take place on June 11th at 10:00 a.m. The project duration is approximately a year.

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT**

Mr. Mizell stated monthly and bi-weekly progress reports are being shared with the committee members and Council. Mr. Perry has been requested to outline some of the major aspects of the reports.

- Notice to Proceed was issued to Cox & Dinkins for Atlas Road Widening
- Aerial surveys have been conducted for Bluff Road and Clemson Road
- Looking at partnering opportunities with SCDOT on Clemson Road
- Hardscrabble Road – SCDOT plans to open bids at the end of this year; construction will begin early 2016
- The construction costs estimate for Hardscrabble Road is $50 million, which doesn’t include construction inspections
- The 6 designable intersection bids will be opened July 1st.
- Shop Road Extension Phase I will be ready with construction plans in the summer, but the County has to procure a permit from the U. S. Corps of Engineers.
- Lincoln Tunnel Greenway – the bid document is ready to go, but the City of Columbia has to receive an encroachment permit from the SCDOT. The SCDOT has forced the City to change their plans a few times.
- Clemson Road Project is slated to begin in 2017

Mr. Perry stated one of the items being taken up by the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee is whether the County can engage the CMCOG to put some federal guide shares on some of the major projects, so they are developed to federal standards on the front end.

Mr. Perry stated the SIB application was submitted for Assembly Street, Airport Phase II (Lexington County), the Innovista and beautification of Huger Street. The State Infrastructure Bank did not like the Innovista or Huger Street Beautification, but were supportive of Assembly Street and Airport Phase II. The $46 million match funding was called into question.

**2015/2016 SIDEWALK AND BIKEWAY PRESENTATION**

- There is approximately $3 million in funding for bikeways and sidewalks this calendar year
PDT took the rankings for bikeways and sidewalks and evaluated how far $3 million would go. Some of the bikeways were on the City route, but the majority are on the SCDOT route.

Mr. Sonny Timmerman from the PDT gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the sidewalks/bikeways.

- Priority list was set in the referendum
- Council defined the criteria to rank projects
- PDT ranked the projects based on the criteria

Ms. Bidwell inquired if there were any sidewalks proposed for Lower Richland near the high school.

Mr. Perry stated the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Improvement, the County’s first NIP project, was presented $6.69 million for the NIP project. The master plan proposed landscaping and sidewalks on Garner’s Ferry Road, but no sidewalks up Lower Richland going to the neighborhoods. The citizens at the neighborhood meeting were not concerned with the landscaping on Garners Ferry Road. The citizens were more worried about sidewalks up Lower Richland and a multi-use path on Rabbit Run Connector; therefore, that it is the projects that are moving forward. Construction should begin in 2017.

Mr. McLawhorn inquired if there were any sidewalk plans for I-20 going north toward the Meadowlake Subdivision.

Mr. Faber inquired when projects will begin in the rural parts of the County.

Mr. Livingston stated he will forward a list of projects currently underway in the Lower Richland area.

Mr. Timmerman stated multi-use paths are typically 10X12 ft. asphalt or concrete paths that can be used for walking, jogging, cycling, etc. Sidewalks will typically be 5 ft. wide.

There will be several different kinds of bikeway improvements and numerous signs and pavement markings.

Public meetings will be held in the next few months to discuss the sidewalk and bikeway projects. The first meeting on sidewalks is to be held June 8th and the bikeways on June 15th.

DIRT ROAD PAVING PUBLIC OUTREACH RESULTS

Mr. Gossett stated the Dennis Corporation has been selected to lead the Dirt Road Paving Program. As directed by the Dirt Road Paving Ordinance, they held a series of public meetings. Certified letters were sent to every property owner that was on the list of roads to be paved. Their feedback was solicited on whether they wanted their road paved. If 25% of more did not want their road paved, the road was moved to the bottom of the priority list. Of the 138 roads identified in Years 1 and 2, there are 67 that have moved forward to the design phase and 31 have moved to the bottom of the priority list.
If the certified letter is not picked up, then an additional letter is sent via regular First Class mail. The citizen then has 2 weeks to respond. If no response is received, they are deemed to be in consent of the project going forward.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Perry stated the Department of Revenue has requested an audit of the Transportation Department. The County has forwarded them the Procurement Ordinance, actions taken by Council in regard to the Transportation Projects, and a list of projects.

None of the other County programs have been audited by the Department of Revenue, but Charleston County has been audited by the SCDOT.

Mr. McLawhorn requested the committee be informed of any major occurrences affecting the Transportation Penny Program.

Mr. Mizell inquired about the committee’s recommendation for a process with regard to changes in the Transportation Penny projects.

Mr. Livingston stated this item was taken up by the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee and forwarded to Council for discussion. As you are aware, the high priority projects were approved by the referendum. The medium and low priority projects were not a part of the referendum. Council and the committee recommend staff review any projects that may need to be considered if there is additional funding.

Mr. Mizell requested a written response from the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee and/or Council to any requests/recommendations from the TPAC Committee.

Ms. Bidwell inquired about how much flexibility Council has in spending transportation penny funding for items not identified by the referendum? If there is funding left after all of the high priority projects are completed, does Council have the flexibility to go through an approval process to take up the medium and low priority projects?

Mr. Livingston stated first a recommendation would have to be obtained by the TPAC Committee. The intent of Council was to cover the additional priorities if there is any additional funding.

Ms. Sanders requested a representative of COMET to be present at the TPAC meetings.

**NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, JUNE 22, 2015 AT 5:30 PM – 2020 HAMPTON STREET**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:54PM