



Richland County Council  
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 5, 2019 – 1:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Chair; Paul Livingston, Jim Manning, Dalhi Myers and Chakisse Newton

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Yvonne McBride, Allison Terracio and Joe Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Bryant Davis, Kimberly Toney, Christine Keefer, Edward Gomeau, Erica Wade, Cheryl Cook, Quinton Epps, and Tiffany Harrison

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: December 4, 2018** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Jackson and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. Jackson stated the agenda needs to be amended to add the Election of the Chair.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to amend the agenda to add the Election of the Chair.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton and Myers

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston to move Item 4 until after Item 13.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**ELECTION OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to elect Mr. Jackson for the position of Chair by acclamation.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to add the following item to the agenda: “Approval of

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 5, 2019**

Project Funding Authorizations for Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk Project, Three Rivers Greenway Project and Blythewood Area Improvements Project”.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- 3b. **Approval of Project Funding Authorizations for Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk Project, Three Rivers Greenway Project and Blythewood Area Improvements Project** – Dr. Thompson stated this item is to authorize that additional funding be appropriated for the Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk and Three Rivers Greenway Projects. The Magnolia Schoolhouse Sidewalk Project will still be under the ordinance amount, even with the additional amounts requested by the PDT. The PDT has worked aggressively on these particular projects. There are some surplus dollars in other projects, so we want to shift those dollars so we do not hold up progress, in terms of construction. With the Three Rivers Greenway, with the amount the PDT is requesting, we could potentially go over the ordinance amount by \$366,000. However, he had a conversation with Mr. Beaty, and he is going to assure us that we do not exceed the ordinance amount of \$7.9 million for the Three Rivers Greenway Project.

Mr. Beaty stated the referendum amount for the Three Rivers Greenway had approximately \$7.9 million. They are managing the project to stay within that amount. However, what they are bringing to your attention is, at the end of every fiscal year, the PDT, in consultation with County staff, balances the accounting records about how much of our contractual amount is applied to an individual project. They allocate their expense across projects. That is rebalanced at the end of the fiscal year depending on all the projects that were done in the previous year. Right now, there could be an accounting method of how that final amount of money is allocated to one project or another. It is rectified at the end of the fiscal year. Although the number in front of you shows \$300,000, we will continue to manage the project to stay under the \$7.9 million referendum amount.

Ms. McBride thanked the PDT for the work that is being done on Magnolia/Schoolhouse. She visited it and it is coming along well.

Ms. Newton stated the documentation says staff recommends an additional \$550,000 for the Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk and \$350,000 for the Blythewood Area Improvements. She inquired if approving these recommendations alone, as stated, take us over the cap without additional management or is there additional funding being requested.

Dr. Thompson stated something that is going to go over the cap will not be recommended, that is at your pleasure as policymakers.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, staff's recommendations address Magnolia/Schoolhouse and Blythewood Area Improvement, but they do not have a recommendation for the Three Rivers Greenway.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated since these amounts are recommended to be moved from other existing budgeted projects, which will not expend all budgeted amounts, which projects and what amounts.

Dr. Thompson stated accounting staff is looking into that. The bottom line is PDT was budgeted \$117 million for the current fiscal year. They may clear about \$90 - \$95 million, so we have surplus dollars to be able to sweep those dollars without impacting other projects.

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee  
March 5, 2019**

Ms. Myers stated but it will impact the overall shortfall, which is why she asking what projects. She inquired if they are all sidewalk and greenway projects.

Dr. Thompson stated not necessarily. They keep money within the pot, so all roadway dollars go to roadway projects. Any surplus dollars for bikeway, pedestrian pathways or greenways go to BPGs.

Mr. Jackson stated, although staff does not have a recommendation on the Three Rivers Greenway, we are expected to take action on that, correct.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative. The only recommendation that staff will offer is that we approve money to ensure that they do not go over the ordinance amount.

Mr. Jackson stated so the motion could be that we approve it contingent upon them not exceeding the amount allocated in the ordinance.

Ms. McBride stated this is not on here, but it is a part of the sidewalk projects and one she has spoken about almost every time she has attended the meeting. She stated we requested a sidewalk on Harrison Road, and it was approved in the referendum. She requested the status of the project because it is a very serious area.

Mr. Beaty stated the project is complete. They have received SCDOT authorization to proceed to construction. They have prepared the procurement package. The last technical thing they have to get through is, the project is within the County's Land Disturbance Permit Unit. They are expecting them to approve it any day now. Once it is approved, it can go through the procurement process and be advertised for construction.

Ms. Terracio stated, as she looks at these sidewalks, she sees there is landscaping and trees. She knows that we have had to deal with funds that we were not supposed to use for some of these projects. She inquired if we can use Penny Tax Funds to pay for landscaping, trees, flowers, etc.

Dr. Thompson stated, if we disturb landscaping, we have to restore it. He does not think that SCDOR is going to be favorable with us improving landscaping for the sake of it.

Ms. Newton stated, it is her understanding, one of our options is to vote to approve the increase in funding provided we do not exceed the cap. She inquired, if we got close to the cap, how are decisions then made if dollars run out.

Dr. Thompson stated there is no protocol in place. That is why we have a number of projects that have already gone over the ordinance amount. Since he has been here, he has kept a close eye on those projects. He wants to make sure we do not keep the same trend prior to him coming here.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval of the additional funding for the Magnolia/Schoolhouse Sidewalk and Blythewood Area Projects, and to approve the funding for the Three Rivers Greenway contingent upon the project not exceeding the amount allocated in the ordinance.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **Approval of Percival Road Sidewalk Service Modification** – Mr. Beaty stated Percival Road Sidewalk is a sidewalk job on one side of the road. It goes from Decker to Forest Drive. The OET is already under contract. They have performed a significant amount of the design; however, we did not include in their contract going out and identifying through subsurface utility engineering all of the utilities located underground. Once we got into the design, they realized there was a 50-year old City waterline that is most likely in conflict with most of the project. Therefore, we need to pay the sub-consultant to identify where all of the underground utilities are so the project, so the project can be designed to minimize conflict. The request is to approve the OET to do some subsurface utility engineering work.

Mr. Livingston inquired about the cost.

Mr. Beaty stated it is approximately \$77,000.

Ms. Newton inquired, since this was unanticipated, do you expect us to exceed the budget or is this covered in the general override.

Mr. Beaty stated he would assume this will help to bring our construction cost estimate come down since we will not have the contingency of potentially hitting utilities.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Approval of Decker Blvd/Woodfield Park Neighborhood Improvement Project landscaped medians and driveway closures** – Mr. Beaty stated they have held one public meeting where they presented the options in the plan. The public identified their preferences to include, as a portion of the plan, to provide median closure along Decker, which improves safety by removing the opportunity for left turns. The benefit is that you reduce the opportunity for accidents. The negative is you reduce opportunity for left turns. Additionally, to improve safety, we will be recommending consolidating drives. Everyone would continue to have access, but if it is a redundant drive, or is in an unsafe location, they are recommending closing those driveways. We will take this to the public a 2<sup>nd</sup> time and present the potential median and driveway modifications. Additionally, the SCDOT is in favor of these modifications.

Ms. Myers inquired if any of the proposed changes going to affect the schoolchildren's walkway.

Mr. Beaty stated the median closures would not impact that any. Separately from the project, they are proposing to widen sidewalks and replace broken and damaged sidewalks.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded Mr. Livingston, to proceed with the modifications, recognizing that the public will be informed and have input again.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Approval of Blythewood Road Widening Shared Use Path Maintenance Agreement with SCDOT** – Mr. Beaty stated Blythewood Road Widening from I-77 to Syrup Mill Road is being designed to go from 2 lanes to

5 lanes (2 in each direction, with a middle turn lane). It will also have a traffic circle at the entrance to the large neighborhood right off of I-77. To provide bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, we are designing two 10-ft. wide concrete shared-use paths. We are offsetting those, per SCDOT design requirements, 5-ft. from behind the curb, which provides the walkers and bicyclists a little bit more safety and more comfort being away from the traveling cars. The SCDOT requires that Richland County accept future maintenance responsibilities of the 5-ft. grass strip.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we are keeping up with our commitments to what we are going to be responsible for.

Mr. Beaty stated they are documenting all maintenance agreements and commitments.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

7. **Approval of Blythewood Area Improvements: Town of Blythewood Priorities Resolution** – Dr. Thompson stated the resolution from the Town of Blythewood does not conflict with the Penny Projects. Ordinance 039-12HR gives them the liberty to weigh in on their projects. Staff recommends approval of the resolution.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the input was not to change the dollar amount.

Dr. Thompson responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, on pp. 76, we have that there was an original \$33.1 million allocated, and now we have \$61.5 million.

Dr. Thompson stated we are looking at different projects.

Ms. Myers stated the Town of Blythewood has asked that we do Blythewood I and do something else with the money for Blythewood II. Do we know what the something else is?

Mr. Beaty stated what they originally had was 5 smaller projects and had them prioritized. Their desires have changed recently, and they want to reprioritize. The #1 project is improving McNulty Street, which is on the agenda later. Then they reprioritized the #2 job, which is the Creech Connector. It is no change to the money, just the order in which they would be developed.

Ms. McBride stated her comment is based on us having the same issue with a different project last year, in terms of changing priorities. It was stated that it was in the referendum and we could not go back and switch priorities, so how does this apply to this issue.

Mr. Beaty stated this one unique case was in the original referendum. The original referendum said the Town of Blythewood can do this on that one project, which was identified as Blythewood Widening II.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **Approval of Atlas Road Widening SCE&G Utility Agreement** – Dr. Thompson stated staff recommends entering into an agreement with SCE&G so they can do their utility relocation on Atlas Road. We understand that PDT is well underway with working with the other contractors so we can begin to break ground on this particular project.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **Approval of Shop Road Widening Termini Change from South Beltline to Mauning Drive** – Dr. Thompson stated for this particular project the termini for Shop Road Widening is from George Rogers Boulevard to South Beltline. They are recommending that we reduce the termini to Mauning Drive right before the railroad tracks. We have 5 lanes from the railroad tracks to the intersection of Shop Road and South Beltline. That will not have a significant impact, in terms of traffic flow. The impact would be us widening from the railroad tracks all the way to the George Rogers Boulevard, which will be a savings of approximately \$3 million.

Ms. Myers stated this is the one she has been concerned about. She does not have in her packet any explanation of why the cost is nearly doubled, and she would like to understand where we are. The referendum was \$33.1 million. The current estimate is \$61.5 million, minus the \$3 million, if we shorten the termini.

Mr. Beaty stated nearly all prices have increased from 2012. Back in June, we had a discussion with Council, and we talked about the entire program. The program had \$750 million for roads. The current estimate today is we need \$900 million. However, you can immediately recognize the savings of the I-20/Broad River Road Interchange, which is going to be done by the SCDOT as part of Carolina Crossroads. Now we are down to \$850 million, when we have \$750 million. What we identified back then was reducing the scope of Bluff Phase II, Pineview and partially Spears Creek Church Road. If you went to the other widenings, including Shop, the referendum had \$30 million, and the current cost estimate is \$60 million.

Ms. Myers stated she understands that the program itself is short almost \$200 million. What she is asking, in this particular project, the referendum amount was \$33.1 million. We are now at an estimated cost of completion of \$61.5 million. What she is asking, is what has driven the cost to double.

Mr. Beaty stated there are 2 primary items that drive up the cost of Shop Road. Drainage is one. The whole area is relatively flat. There is a lot of paved areas already. When you touch a road, you have to pick up all the other associated problems. So, we are going to have extensive drainage improvements. The 2<sup>nd</sup> thing is the number of utilities along Shop Widening are greater than many of the other projects. For instance, you have additional fiber optics going to Williams-Brice providing feeds to ESPN. He stated he could provide the exact amount that goes into that.

Ms. Myers stated, for her, she would like to see it. This is one of the roads that she thinks is eating up money that we are going to, at some point, need for some of these projects. There is going to be 200 miles of Richland County road that does not get touched, but all the SCDOT roads will be finished. We are going to have the people that voted for this referendum living in places where we have no money to touch their

roads. She is deeply concerned with what is driving the costs upward, and if there are ways to ameliorate that. She would like specifics as to what those drivers are.

Mr. Beaty stated they update the entire program quarterly, so he can provide specifics of the utilities that drive that number, as well as the construction and design.

Mr. Jackson requested that Mr. Beaty provide that to the entire committee.

Mr. Beaty stated they have reviewed the current proposed design at the intersection with George Rogers. It has been designed and they have gone through the public involvement process, but the PDT did an internal review and they think they can modify the intersection with George Rogers and save the project approximately another \$5 million and still meet the intent of the project and SCDOT criteria.

Ms. Newton stated, when you look at how costs have almost doubled, what is the process for that. Do we just keep going into the hole? What happens?

Dr. Thompson stated that is a policy matter. His job as a staff member, as a steward of taxpayer dollars, is to make sure that we adhere to the ordinance.

Mr. Jackson stated, so the public is clear, when we use the term "go in the hole"...let's clarify that, in terms of where we are now financially versus what will eventually happen if we continue down the path.

Dr. Thompson stated we are not in the hole. People are still being paid. Again, it is a policy matter, in terms of how we decide to construct these projects or whether we narrow a particular project. We will have that conversation. We have other municipalities who want us to construct their projects, but the fact of the matter is their Cadillac budget is not what we have. We must operate within the ordinance, so that we can touch more of the 200 roads so people across the county can benefit from this program equally.

Mr. Jackson stated there has been on more than one occasion recommendations made to address the issue. The Council has failed to act on those recommendations. We have kicked the can down the road each time it has come up.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, Mr. Beaty said they think there is another \$5.1 million in cost savings that you can realize with a design change, but that is not before us in approving the recommendation for this termini improvement. For her, she could make a better decision if she was looking at numbers that said we were to the good by approximately \$10 million, rather than where we are now. She inquired when that information is going to be made available.

Mr. Beaty stated it can be made available at the next Ad Hoc Committee meeting. He stated there are 2 separate issues, 2 different termini. At the George Rogers end, the design up to this point, if you are coming towards Columbia, you make a free flow right. It would be better if you did not have to slow down and make that right. When Shop Road is 5-lanes, it just tied right in to Assembly at 6-lanes, so that the through movement never stops. The return movement would not have to make a left turn. To do that, the current design shows acquiring 2 businesses to the right of the light by straightening out the road. It is a nice design, but is not necessary design. The intersection functions just fine as it is today, and will function just fine in 20 years. Up to this point, the design had been a nicety. It would be an improvement, but it is not a necessary improvement. They have reviewed the traffic report, and they have done some preliminary cost estimates, but he is not ready today to say whether it will be \$4.6 or \$4.8.

Mr. Jackson inquired about how much additional traffic is anticipated with new student housing on Shop

Road, and when it is projected to be completed.

Ms. Myers stated initially they told us they wanted to be open for business this Fall.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval, but would request the additional information about cost savings be provided immediately.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **Approval of Service Orders:**

- a. **Clemson/Sparkleberry Intersection** – Mr. Beaty stated the Clemson Road/Sparkleberry Intersection is one of the most unique designs in the entire program. Because it is so unique, Council only engaged the On-Call firm to design the project through 70% complete plans. Because there is so much iteration back and forth with the SCDOT on this unique design it would not been to a detailed analysis of what the final design would be, so the designer was only contracted to complete 70% plans. They have and we almost have the approval in hand from the SCDOT. This will allow the design to go from 70% to 100%.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

Mr. Jackson stated the item that deals with safety and warranty talked about there being some concern with regards to not having someone directly responsible for insuring the issue of safety. As you know, that is very heavily traveled thoroughfare. He inquired if that is an issue of concern.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not believe it is.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. **Broad River Road Widening** – Mr. Beaty stated the Broad River Road Widening, in the Irmo area, is currently under design by 1 of the 5 On-Calls, CECS, and they have identified 2 alignment shift, which will reduce the impacts of the project. Typically, when we widen a road we widen it equally about the center line. Sometimes one side may be more developed than the other, or one side may have more environmental impacts than the other. The designer has identified, as you pass the beginning of the project, at Royal Tower, there is a number of businesses on the left. They can develop the project to widen more to the right and avoid a number of parking spaces and right-of-way impacts. It could be some pretty heavy impacts to these businesses. Further on down the project, as you approach Koon Road, there is a historic farm on the left. It is called the Koon Family Farm. To avoid impacting this historic farm, and it does improve the geometry, the consultant needs to redesign that portion of the project. Essentially, by paying the consultant to redesign a couple of portions of the project you will receive a net savings in impacts and construction costs.

Mr. Jackson inquired if it extended the time of the project.

Mr. Beaty responded it does not.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

11. **Approval of Award Letter Recommending to Award Bid:**

- a. **Broad River Neighborhood Improvement Project** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. **Dirt Road Package I** – Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Newton requested a copy of the list of roads in Dirt Road Package I.

Ms. Myers inquired about how many roads are include in the dirt road package, and the mileage it includes.

Mr. Beaty stated there are 7 roads for a total of 1.2 miles.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. **Southeastern Neighborhood Improvement Project** – Dr. Thompson stated for this particular project we had 5 bids, and the lowest responsive bidder is McClam & Associates for \$3.6 million, which is 22.12% below the engineer’s estimate of \$4.7 million. McClam has made a commit of 17.5% utilization of SLBE.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

12. **Approval of Calhoun Road Diet Executive Summary and Recommendations** – Dr. Thompson stated the project is worth more than \$1 million, but in the ordinance we have \$88,000.

Mr. Beaty stated in the referendum there were 87 individual bikeways, which are broken down into 4 broad categories. One of the categories is a road diet where you take four 9-ft. lanes and it take it to three 11-ft. lanes. Under this scenario, to accommodate bicyclists, we would recommend removing on-street parking from the South side. The project would begin at Wayne, near the Lincoln Greenway. From Wayne Street to

Park, we would only be painting sharrows (little triangle with a bicycle). From Park to Pickens, we would be removing parking on the South side. In that area, we would be milling and repaving about 1 – 2 inches to give a smooth appearance and improve the riding surface. That is where the cost really is. Then, from Pickens to Harden, we would do the sharrows again. You would provide bicycle connectivity. The City has other bikeway projects that would intersect Calhoun. In the bikeway category you had 87 bikeways, and the funding level was approximately \$22 million. Some of the 87 bikeways have dropped off because the SCDOT has said we may not modify those. Even if you spent up to a \$1.5 million on Calhoun, your total would remain under the \$22 million. This has been presented twice to the public, in coordination with the City of Columbia. City Council has been supportive of the project, but they requested the 2 public meetings. Before we would go back to the City, we are providing a summarization of the 2<sup>nd</sup> public meeting to you. If you were to charge the PDT to move forward with this project, the PDT could design it in house with existing staff, but the cost would be approximately \$1.5 million.

Ms. Myers inquired if the Transportation Department has looked at our listing of projects, and looked at the projects that we can do within, or under, the budget, so that we can have a proposal to Council to prioritize those rather than continuing the way we are going, knowing we are overspending. She understands that in the whole bucket there is money, but in the whole project there is not. Her question is, “Where are the projects that we are looking at, that we know we can come in under budget?” For example, because the State has all this SCDOT money, and SCDOT may be putting money on some of the same roads that are on our list, we can realize cost savings. She is not getting the sense that we are looking at this program holistically. Her sense is that we are looking at it road by road, which means we are not analyzing it as a project that has this amount of dollars. It is, well, if we can do this one and grab some of the money from the one that did not get done. Yes, that is true, but overall that is “whistling past a graveyard” because we know there is a shortfall of money. She would like it to be looking at it more holistically. At some point, we have to sit down and rationalize this and say, “Here is what we are going to do with the money. And, here is what we know we cannot.” And, say to the public, “Do you accept this?” rather than this continuous this will blow the budget, but we can save it because we are not spending much here.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to what accounted for the significant difference in the price for this road diet project.

Mr. Beaty stated it is the milling and resurfacing the roadway. So, going back to the referendum, and how the original referendum amounts were applied, he can assume for \$88,000 they were only recommending that you paint the sharrows. That could probably still be done. We could go out there with a grinder and grind up the old markings and paint new ones. It would not look attractive, but it would fiscally work. The question would be, would you want to go forward with that approach and do it for the \$88,000 or would you want to mill and repave for \$1.5 million. In response to Ms. Myers, they do have the entire program cost estimated, and we could go through the program project by project, if you desire.

Ms. McBride stated she knows the referendum spelled out the different projects. All of the citizens in Richland County pay taxes, and it concerned her from the beginning that some areas got very little, and other areas got a lot. If we go now, and start cutting back on certain other projects that have not started, perhaps her district, which has not received very little, may end up getting nothing. She inquired if they can tell her how much money has been put into the various districts, in terms of equitable distribution. She knows it was based on priority, but she does not want to be shortchanged now, so that we can accommodate those other projects. She is interested in how we make it equitable and provide the services that are needed.

Mr. Jackson stated there were actually 2 requests. One was for Hampton Street, and the other was for Calhoun Street. Though the City was very enthusiastic about us doing them, there was no financial commitment made and we went back to the City and asked that they do that. It came back to us that we find

out how the public feels about it. As Mr. Beaty said, we have now went to the public twice. Of course, there are people who are in favor of it, but there are some that are not in favor it and feel the loss of parking spaces, particularly along Hampton Street, may be cumbersome for some businesses. So, we decided not to move forward with the discussion of the Hampton Street Road Diet. He stated he is certainly not in favor of a project of this cost. He totally agrees with Ms. Myers, that if we are looking at something that minimally we would do and cost us approximately \$80,000, and now we are talking over a \$1 million. He understands the quality of the road because he has seen how I-77 was stripped for a long period of time.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, the original item that was named and planned in the referendum was probably just painting and adding bike lanes that way. Now, we are here with something that is more expansive, outside of what was originally intended.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston inquired if we have done anything else with any of the other bikeways and got costs on those.

Mr. Beaty stated we have constructed some bikeway projects.

Mr. Livingston inquired if they were consistent with the budgeted amount.

Mr. Beaty responded, to this point, they have been. They have been able to piggyback on a couple of SCDOT resurfacing projects where we came to them with a restriping plan, that accommodated the referendum, and the SCDOT restriped it while they repaving it, at no cost to Richland County. Two Notch is an example of that.

Mr. Livingston inquired if they recommend getting rid of some of the locations in the City to try to accommodate for this.

Mr. Beaty stated they have had a lot of communication with City staff. He does not know that City staff has recommended that we remove any bikeways, but the SCDOT has told us of the 87 about 25 we physically cannot modify and accommodate bicycles. Those 25 free up funds, for lack of a better phrase.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to defer this item for the gathering of more information.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

13. **Approval of the Executive Summary & Recommendations for:**

- a. **Trenholm Acres/Newcastle Neighborhood Improvement Project** – Ms. McBride stated the Trenholm Acres was a part of the referendum. She thanked them for the community meetings that were held. She requested that the following streetscapes be put under contract for design: Two Notch Road, Fontaine Road and Parklane. Those 3 areas enter into the Trenholm Acres/Newcastle community. It is a bad area that needs some type of beautification. Of course, safety is of utmost importance.

Mr. Beaty stated Trenholm Acres/Newcastle was 1 of the 7 neighborhood projects. We did have a public meeting, and presented the opportunities and their preferences to the community. In today agenda, they listed the first 7, which are 7 different streets that will include sidewalks, and maybe some tree plantings. And, then there were 3 that were lower in priority, based on the public's input.

Those would be the landscaped medians along Fontaine, Two Notch and Parklane. What they could easily do, with your direction, is have the On-Call Design Team move forward with drafting the scope of work where they study the 7 sidewalks, and the 3 landscaped median locations, and provide cost estimates. At about the 70% complete level, we could come back to the committee and update you on the cost estimates, the designs and impacts. Depending on those, if there are enough funds to build all 10, great. If decisions need to be made at that time, we could do that. If this body amended the recommendation to allow us to include those 3 in the design studies, then we could come back to this body for final design.

Ms. McBride stated this is one of the reasons she said what she said earlier. This is an area that has been given little attention, and she knows they were prioritized. Again, these constituents pay taxes just like everybody else. She is kind of frustrated that other parts of Richland County are receiving a lot of funds, and this is unincorporated Richland County and they are receiving limited to no funds.

Ms. Myers stated she supports Ms. McBride and she agrees that unincorporated Richland County, as a whole, have been overlooked with Penny Projects. She would suggest the projects that have taken priority are the ones that circle University property, the Vista and heavily traveled Clemson Road area. The road widenings in the larger areas have taken priority. Some of it is a function of timing, and some are less profitable than others. She is frustrated with Penny Projects overall, and she would hope that in the next phase we start looking to projects that touch people where they live, rather than where they eat or shop.

Ms. McBride does not want it said that she is frustrated with the Penny Projects because she thinks a lot of progress has been made. She wants to ensure there is equality hereon.

Mr. Jackson stated the prioritization of the projects was done before Ms. McBride, Ms. Myers and himself were here, and they were a part of that. He would like to commend Dr. Thompson and Mr. Beaty for taking the prioritized list they were given and working as hard and diligently as they have worked to implement.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the Trenholm Acres/Newcastle Project and to include the design model requested by Ms. McBride.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. **Shop Road Extension Phase 2** – Mr. Beaty stated the public meeting was held in December. They presented Shop Road Extension 2, which will go from the current termini under construction at Longwood and tie into Garners Ferry at Trotter. The public provided input on the 4 alignments presented. They have done engineering studies to identify wetlands, streams and costs. Alternative #4, which is the least impactful and costly, is the recommended alternative. With Alternative #4 you would crossover Longwood Road and cross Mill Creek with a bridge. So, they tried to locate the alignment to shortening the bridge length, minimize how close they are to homes, and use existing right-of-way where they could. They are proposing a bridge over Norfolk Southern Railroad, which is busier than the CSX Railroad. This budget would allow a 2-lane road to be built, not 4-lanes. They would buy the right-of-way for 4-lanes, in case it every needed to be 4-laned in the future. The total referendum amount for Shop Road Phase I and II was approximately \$72 million. Based on the money being spent on Shop Road Phase I, the estimates show there is enough money remaining to

build Shop Road Phase II within the original referendum amount. The request is to approve the engagement of the design team to move forward with the design of Shop Road Phase II.

Ms. Myers stated Shop Road Phase II is the phase that intersects most closely with residents. She does not see anything that ameliorates all of the concerns that were heard at the public meeting. She inquired as to what was being done to address the concerns that were raised at the public meeting.

Mr. Beaty stated, as a result of the public meeting, they moved the alignment as much as they could away from the neighborhoods. It is going to be an engineering judgment of do you move it this close or that close. They have slightly modified the alignment, and will be further studied in the final design.

Ms. Myers inquired about the backside which empties out into a neighborhood, which will be the cut through for trucks to get to Garners Ferry.

Mr. Beaty stated, as a part of the final design, which will be put in the scope of work, the engineer will be instructed to work with the SCDOT to identify how that can be mitigated. They have already had conversations with SCDOT about what they can and cannot do. Right now, SCDOT owns Longwood Road, so the County could take ownership of the road thereby having more say in what we do. They asked the SCDOT about putting in speed humps, and they will not allow it. If the County had ownership they could do what they wanted to do.

Ms. Myers is concerned with approving the go ahead, with no consideration of what we are going to do with Longwood might be short-sighted. She would like some proposal that says, "This is what needs to be done with Longwood first."

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to defer this item to the next Transportation Ad Hoc Committee meeting, with instructions that we come up with some suggestions for a solution regarding Longwood Road.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. **Blythewood Area Improvements (McNulty Street Improvements)** – Mr. Beaty stated they recently had a public meeting in the Town of Blythewood. The McNulty improvements would go from where you get off of I-77 onto Main Street through the commercial area and tie into the termini of Blythewood Road and Main. They offered 2 alternatives to the public. One was a wider typical section that allowed on street parking. The other did not offer on street parking and was a narrower. The request is to approve the typical section overwhelming supported by the public at the meeting, so they may engage the design firm to move forward with design of this road.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

14. **Approval of Jushi Letter Request for Extension** – Dr. Thompson stated the request from China Jushi to delay the opening of the Shop Road Extension has been before the committee twice. He has met with the PDT and they do not anticipate opening the road until the end of April due to rain delays. At this time, China Jushi has not received the necessary permit from SCDOT. It his understanding, they may receive it by the end of this week. If the request is approved, China Jushi will pay the County \$30,000/month for the inspector and administrative costs, if we have to delay the opening of the Shop Road Extension.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to forward this item to Council with a recommendation for approval.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **Discussion: Project Status Update** – Mr. Beaty stated, in 2019, we could have 5 – 6 widenings under construction.

- Completed 8 of 15 Intersections; 2 are under construction and 4 others are scheduled to go to construction this calendar year;
- Ready to advertise another package of dirt roads;
- Polo/Harrison ready to be advertised in the next week;
- North Springs/Harrington Intersection is less than a month away
- In another week, a resurfacing package will be ready for advertisement. That will commit, or have completed, approximately \$36 million of the \$40 million in the referendum.
- Another dirt road package (10 -12 roads) is scheduled for April
- Atlas Road and Greene Street Phase II are scheduled to be advertised for bid in May

Ms. Newton requested a list of the dirt road in the dirt road package scheduled to be advertised in April.

Ms. Myers inquired about how many dirt roads are in the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated the referendum did not include specific dirt roads. There are over 200 roads on the list they have provided, and there are approximately 600 dirt roads in the County. He stated they are going to be able to do about 120 dirt roads with the Penny Tax funds.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, 38 – 39 of the roads were done before the PDT was brought on board.

Mr. Beaty stated, he believes, 30 were developed, but they were constructed after they came on board.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, since the PDT came on board they have done approximately 13 roads.

Mr. Beaty stated about 30 dirt roads were done by County staff. While the Dirt Road Program Manager was employed, approximately 16 went to construction. Then, there was a year gap where none went to construction. And, then, the PDT began managing the program in July 2018, and were scheduled to do 35 between July and April. Package K, that should come out in a month, will push the number to 35 that the PDT has designed.

Dr. Thompson stated he and Mr. Gomeau have discussed this item. We understand there is not enough money in the ordinance to complete all dirt roads; therefore, this is another policy decision. If you allow staff

to move forward, how do we get more money so that we can be able to pave more of those County maintained dirt roads.

Mr. Jackson thanked Dr. Thompson and Mr. Gomeau for working hard to try to come up with a strategy. We keep saying there is not enough money, but he is not sure we are grasping it. There are not enough dollars to complete the projects that have been prioritized, and have been approved in the referendum. So, we have to make a decision to make sure that Council's concerns are addressed.

16. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:37 PM.