



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
April 23, 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: Allison Terracio and Joe Walker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, John Thompson, Eden Logan, Kimberly Toney, Michael Niermeier, Allison Steele, Mohammed Al-Tofan, Nathaniel Miller, and Quinton Epps

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 PM.
2. **Approval of Minutes: March 26, 2019** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. Myers, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Jackson, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers, and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

4. **Discussion: Three Rivers Greenway CSX Railroad Condemnation** – Mr. Niermeier stated this item has previously been discussed in committee. It was stated that a section of the projected trail had been washed out resulting in the need to adjust the path. Options to build a bridge or construct a cover over the path were outlined. The recommendation was to entertain condemnation actions; however, discussion continue with CSX to come up with an amicable resolution where we would not have to move to condemnation and we would have permission to build the trail across their right-of-way.

Mr. Beaty stated they still recommend that Council allow the process of condemnation to proceed while they have further discussions with the railroad to avoid condemnation. The railroad did find out that they previously recommended, and Council had deferred it. When the railroad found that out, they became more receptive to working with us. He is optimistic the railroad will continue to work with them, but it would improve their chances if Council approved the ability to go to condemnation.

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
April 23, 2019

Ms. Myers inquired about the value of the property in question.

Mr. Beaty stated they have not had a formal appraisal done of the property, but based on other projects in the vicinity, it would be approximately \$10,000 - \$15,000 is what the real property would be valued at. Then, they have estimated the construction of the path and covered walkway at \$35,000.

Ms. Myers stated, if we condemn it, it will cost tons more. She inquired if this has been presented to Mr. Smith. She stated, for clarification, if we do not have an appraisal we are a step or 2 ahead.

Mr. Niermeier stated, if they are authorized to go to condemnation, that would start the process to obtain an appraisal.

Ms. Myers stated you get an appraisal and make an offer. If the person declines your offer, then you have no other alternative but condemnation. She stated maybe the County has a process that is different from the normal process. Normally, you make an offer, and someone says they will never sale it to it you. Then, you say the government must have it. If they still refuse to sale, then you go to condemnation. You have a fair market value of it before you move to that point.

Mr. Niermeier stated Mr. Smith is aware that this discussion is ongoing, and he has enlightened him on the condemnation process, which is why it was brought back for discussion.

Mr. Beaty stated his recommendation would be for Council to approve the County to move forward with condemnation, but no action would be taken immediately by staff or the PDT. That would allow them to tell the railroad that condemnation is going to happen if they do not negotiate with them. If the County does not move forward with condemnation, he would expect the railroad to remain silent.

Ms. Myers renewed her concerns that we have not done the steps that preceded condemnation, which is making an offer to buy based on an appraisal.

Mr. Beaty stated Ms. Myers is correct. They have not done a formal appraisal of this piece of property, but in their discussions with the railroad, that is irrelevant to them. Whether it is valued at \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$15,000; they are going to deny. They could go get an appraisal and come back to them in a month or 2, and the answer would most likely still be the same.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to move forward with the appraisal and condemnation consecutively.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, in this instance, we are approving the appraisal, which begins the process, but a condemnation is already approved in the wings.

Mr. Jackson stated, as he understands the motion, it would be that we would approve the appraisal, which would then allow them to make an offer. As Mr. Beaty suggested, whatever offer we make, the railroad will probably turn down. Then, rather than coming back to Council a 2nd time to request condemnation, we would have given staff authorization, once the appraised amount was turned out, to proceed with condemnation.

Ms. Newton inquired as to what the objections are from the railroad.

Mr. Beaty stated the railroad's typical response is that they occupied the right-of-way prior to the State of South Carolina and SCDOT. It is their property and they do not want anyone encroaching on their right-of-

way for any reason. It could be the smallest encroachment, but it could theoretically be the smallest amount of liability for the railroad, so their immediate response, to most things, is “No”.

Ms. Myers stated, like any landowner, the railroad may come back and counteroffer, but we have foreclosed that opportunity, once we say, if they decline our offer, then we are going to move to condemnation.

Mr. Livingston stated his is motion is to do an appraisal and make an offer. If the offer is rejected, you try to negotiate. If that does not work, you go to condemnation. The process is all there, so you do not have to worry about coming back.

Ms. Myers inquired if we are under a time crunch.

Mr. Beaty stated the gap, in the overall greenway, exists today, but the River Alliance has constructed access to Boyd Island. Therefore, a person could physically walk on the greenway, then they would trespass on railroad right-of-way for 100 ft. before getting back on the trail.

Ms. Terracio stated she was out there today, and she did witness a father take his daughter down toward the walkway. It is not an emergency, but people are making their way onto the paths.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

Opposed: Myers

The vote was in favor.

5. **Approval of the Broad River Corridor Neighborhood Improvement Project Executive Summary and Recommendations** – Mr. Niermeier stated there are few matters within the document that he wants to bring to your attention, so you are fully informed. Some of this goes back to allowables, under the SCDOT guidelines, such as beautifications. Based on the guidelines, and feedback from the attorneys, they have concerns about landscaped medians, burial of aerial wires, etc. In addition, this is a SCDOT maintained road, and there are certain aspects, if we build, they will not maintain, which drives operation and maintenance costs down the line for somebody else. For example, SCDOT will not maintain sidewalks wider than 5 ft., medians, and light poles with mast arms on them. It would be responsibility of the County to do. He does not have the costs of what that would be.

Mr. Manning inquired what other neighborhood plans have similar situations where the voters passed the money for the neighborhood improvement plans that had these light arrangements, medians, and moving utility lines.

Mr. Niermeier stated North Main is one which he is aware of, which may have been driven by movement of the road for relocation purposes. He believes there are 2 or 3 others.

Mr. Beaty stated North Main does have burying of the utilities. Although that was a separate widening category project. There were 7 neighborhood projects in the referendum. The Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood, Trenholm Acres/ Newcastle Neighborhood and the Broad River Corridor had a combination of potentially burying the utilities, landscaped medians, mast arms and lightening.

Mr. Manning stated, so there are 4 neighborhood plans, that the County Neighborhood Improvement Program and Planning Department did charrette meeting for, then they revisited it. The plans came to Council and were approved. Most of the plans did not have funding, to do what we are talking about today, so

Council put that before the voters. In 2012, the referendum passed, that had all of that included. Since that time, because there was not enough money to all “pie in the sky” projects that were in the plans, we have had people go back out and meet with the neighborhoods and show them what they had put in their neighborhood plans, and got feedback from them about how they would want the money to be spent, related to the plans they had worked to develop, Council had passed, and the voters passed in the referendum.

Ms. Newton inquired about the mandate for this project (i.e. road widening and beautification or just beautification). She stated when she looks at the recommendation, that requests that we approve the Executive Summary and authorize the advancement final design, she would like to understand what that specifically means because there are a number of unresolved questions that are presented in the document.

Mr. Beaty stated, in the 2012 referendum, there were 7 neighborhood projects that were included. Prior to 2012, the total value of the neighborhood plans was over \$100 million. At that time, County staff scaled each of those 7 down and removed items from the neighborhood plans (i.e. pools, parks, etc.) to get the cost down to \$63 million. That did include transportation related items, specifically turn lanes and sidewalks. Then arguably, landscaped medians and lighting, because one could make the argument whether or not that is directly related to a road. When we went to the public, we identified what the neighborhood plan included. The public gave input on what was important to them. On Broad River Corridor, they presented to the public these 3 intersections, which would have roadway improvements, and could have lighting, burying of utilities, and landscaped medians. Based on the public’s input, the majority of the respondents would prefer to see these 3 intersections improved from a traffic standpoint, and include landscaped medians, mast arm light poles and lighting at the intersections.

Mr. Niermeier stated staff is recommending is to approve the Executive Summary, as presented, with the exception of the areas in question, such as landscaped medians, which there is a question about whether it is allowable or not. They would recommend undergrounding of utilities, if they are a result of the intersection improvements. He stated they can proceed with mast arm light poles, but there is a consequence to that with operation and maintenance funds in the future.

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to proceed with the Executive Summary, and, if at any point, the SCDOR, puts in writing, that there are any elements that are not allowable by State law, they are removed, at that point.

Mr. Livingston stated can we just move forward on those things that our attorney, based on his understanding, and not include those things that are considered not permissible.

Ms. Myers stated, from reading the documents, everybody wanted lighting, which is a safety issue. There are questions about some of the sidewalks areas, and whether or not we can improve them in the way that we would like to. She stated we know that SCDOT will not maintain flora and fauna, so anything other than grass, we have to have plan for long-term maintenance. She does not think the County wants to be in the business of maintaining SCDOT’s roads.

Ms. Myers made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Newton, to move forward with lighting and safety features of the plan, and to continue addressing the questions that are raised by the document, so that we can keep the plan moving.

Mr. Livingston inquired, if the lighting is permissible.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not know if lighting is permissible by SCDOR, but he does know that transportation projects typically have lighting because it provides a safer environment for both vehicles and pedestrians. He

believes there is a way to accomplish both goals simultaneously. Instead of carrying the design forward to 100% design, if we could engage the consultant to design it to 70%, so they could design a median, and there is no additional effort, at this point, to make it concrete or landscaped. They would only design where you would have a closed median. They could move forward with the lighting studies, traffic counts, and any additional preliminary design. It would not cost any additional money, if, and when, this decision is made later.

Ms. Myers inquired if the design would have to be revisited when somebody got ready to do the work.

Mr. Beaty stated they would do the traffic studies and preliminary design. They could draw the outline of where a closed median needs to go and stop. Then, Council could direct them to complete the design later, and, at that time, they could show the median being landscaped or concrete.

Ms. Myers stated we would design 70% now, and conceivably design 30% later. Because you are revisiting the design it may or may not be the same company, and they may or may not want to pick up these designs and use them. Her concern is, knowing that this design is not ready to go full-bore, but there are pieces are ready. She does not know why we would pay to have someone put placeholders in those spaces, knowing that we have to come back and somebody is going to start from scratch and we are going to pay that cost too. She would like to see the money used on designs for things that we are definitely do rather than a template for a later design. If we know that we do not have answers to a lot of questions, she does not know how wise it is to spend money on a design to design, and then spend money on a real design later.

Mr. Beaty stated there are 4 topics that could be a question: lighting, landscaped medians, mast arm light poles, and undergrounding of utilities. He believes lighting is allowable for transportation projects. Putting in a concrete median is a safety feature to prevent left turns in or out. According to SCDOT policy, if Richland County chooses to landscape that median, they will allow you to do so, but you will have to maintain it. Typically, most signals are put up with steel poles with wires. A mast pole is a straight pole and a cantilevered arm that looks better. There is some greater cost for a mast pole, but it is not a lot percentagewise. There is very little, to no, maintenance of these poles in the future. The risk would be if the pole got hit by a car. Then, the County would have to pay for a new pole. To his understanding, undergrounding utilities is an allowable expense if the roadway project requires it. It is not an allowable expense if it purely for aesthetics.

Mr. Livingston stated, if you are only talking about design, how do those things effect the design.

Mr. Beaty stated the design work to show the landscaped median or mast arm would be between 70% and 100%. There would be minimal, to no, risk to the County having to pay additional money. He sees Ms. Myers' point. If a different designer were to pick up those plans, they would have review them and assume some liability, and that would come at a cost.

Mr. Livingston stated, his concern is, if you chose not to do anything, and you wait to try to get these things resolved, there is no telling how long it will be before you do a design because we do not know when we will get resolution of these things. That is why it is important to him to at least go ahead and do the design.

Mr. Manning stated, in terms of if a car hits a pole, the County is self-insured and has a risk account to cover that, so that is very different than monies to maintain. The concern that he has is that an element of Richland Renaissance was not only dealing with getting rid of blight, but also doing things in regards to beautification, a historic trail, and gateways signs. It seems like on the one hand we are trying to look at how long-term we do some things to make our County look better, and here they are built into plans that our citizens had input, and we can at least get paid for upfront with the Penny funds, but we are going to make a decision that we do

not want to make these things pretty, like our citizens told us 10 – 15 years ago, when they put together the plan while we are looking at plans to go other places, and spend County money that will require County maintenance.

Ms. Myers stated, her issue with the maintenance is, the County planted beautiful flowers on Olympia Avenue, but it is a SCDOT road. She gets calls because we are not allowed to go and maintain it, so SCDOT comes in and they clear cut it. For things like this where we know there is going to be a conflict, we can do it in a way that does not cost us to throw money down a hole because we know we are not going to be allowed to go out and maintain those roads. There is liability associated with it, and other things that go with maintaining stuff that belongs to someone else. She would like to see us do the non-controversial stuff.

In Favor: Newton and Myers

Opposed: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

The substitute motion failed.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion to proceed with 70% design. The motion died for lack of a second.

In Favor: Jackson, Manning and Livingston

Opposed: Newton and Myers

The vote was in favor.

Approval of Budget Transfers Between Penny Projects – Mr. Niermeier stated the item before you are the projects that require additional funding for them to continue and pay certain invoices. Most of the items were planned for, but were moving faster than anticipated and require additional funding. What is being present is the amount of money needed to make that whole, and move forward, as well as, the areas where the money can come from in the current budget. He was requested to provide information on the particular projects that are over referendum. Those projects are highlighted in red, and the amounts are on the right side of the document. The projects are as follows, and equates to \$17.4 million:

- Blythwood Widening - \$7.8 million
- Screaming Eagle/Percival Road - \$2.1 million
- Alpine Road Sidewalk - \$3.9 million
- Harrison Road Sidewalk - \$1.3 million
- Sunset Sidewalk - \$2.1 million

Ms. Newton stated, for example, the Shop Road Extension has the ordinance amount, the budget request, and the amount needed. The recommendation she sees here is that money would come from the Dirt Road Paving Project, correct.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Newton stated, if this specific example, were to be approved that means the budget available for the Dirt Road Paving Project is reduced and those funds are gone.

Mr. Niermeier stated you will see the amount needed is \$4.4 million, and the funding can come from the Dirt

Road Paving Program construction category that has a balance of \$8.3 million. In this fiscal year, they are not using that budget for the dirt roads. They have 2 dirt road packages coming out within the next 2 months, and that funding is available because they planned on it in FY19. They are not going to be executing the construction until FY20-21. The Shop Road Extension Phase I and II funding budgeted in the next fiscal year would then move back to the dirt road package to make them whole again.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, for every item here the proposal is to borrow money from this budget into the budget that is at a deficit. Then, at a specific point and time, we will return funds from that same budget, that temporarily needed the infusion of cash to the budget that it was originally borrowed from.

Mr. Niermeier responded in the affirmative.

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

Ms. Myers stated this is the list that full Council has been asking for. It might be wise to have a work session where the full Council is present to discuss the prioritization of these projects and any issues with moving the money because there are projects that are wildly over budget. So, moving the money, by default, says that we are recommending approval that we build these over the referendum amount. She believes that is a discussion that should be had by the full Council.

Mr. Jackson stated that one of the things full Council did, and we probably need to revisit before that conversation, is that when they heard the report of how the entire Penny Project could be brought back into alignment, by making some modifications and adjustments on 3 – 4 significant areas of funding. If he is not mistaken, we voted on and approved that. Then, for some reason we seem to have backpedaled from that decision because there was some heartburn in different districts about what was being proposed. The vote was to scale back projects, and with the scaling back of those projects, those funds that would not be expended for those projects would bring back solvency to the overall Penny Program. When he hears us say that budgets are out of line, but we are not acknowledging that the decision of Council was to authorize the approval of those adjustments. If this was to be revisited, and substantiated that it had been approved by Council and implemented, then the issues that we are dealing with now would be a moot point.

Ms. Newton stated what has been troubling for her is not necessarily transferring money, or budget approval, but that she feels like transferring that is making an interesting policy decision to allow things to go over budget. She inquired if it is accurate that we are approving the funds to go over, and then we are saying, "Please continue to exceed the referendum amount." She stated she understands that projects are moving forward and they allocated into different "pockets" and they need funds to continue, but is this the only way that we have to allow those projects to continue.

Mr. Jackson stated when we referred to referendum amounts in 2012, now 7 years ago, versus actual dollar amounts for projects in 2019, there was a conversation and discussion, in terms of the reality of 7-year-old estimates for projects that are now coming online. We also need to have a conversation about that, in terms of the reality of what we reference when we talk about referendum dollar amounts, and whether they are still relevant now.

Ms. Myers inquired if there was any harm with moving forward with the ones that in construction and leaving the others that are acquisition or design phase for a large discussion. If it is in construction, we have already agreed to build it, but, if it is in design or acquisition, the larger conversation with everybody might be helpful.

Mr. Beaty stated there is some harm with not moving forward with some that are not in construction. There

are some that are in design, where a designer has been working, and has provided the product, but because there is not enough money in the budget, staff cannot pay invoices that due.

Ms. Myers stated, if there are amounts in design work, or any other work, that has been done, those should be separated out and given to us, so we can approve payment of those bills. If they are months behind, they ought not be. Her question is to prospective work, and a decision of Council as to what our policy should be going forward on how we are spending this money, where we are prioritizing projects, and what we continue to design knowing where we are going to end up with 2020 money, rather than 2012 money. We should pay what we owe, and those projects under construction we cannot slow down. Where there are issues to allocating prospective funds, it is her opinion that full Council should be involved.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve the reallocation of funds for projects under construction and to take steps necessary to make payment to outstanding invoices for work that has already been done. In addition, to discuss the movement of other funds with full Council to arrive at a policy decision as to prioritization regarding any prospective projects.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, in terms of the full Council making policy decisions, does that not generally happen after a committee sends something to full Council. His experience on Council has been that there are committees. Committees meet, and make their best decisions. The decision is sent to full Council for vetting.

Ms. Myers stated her motion had a recommendation that the full Council be tasked to prioritize, as we have said previously we need to, this list as to where we are, and what projects are more important than others. We have tons of discussion about needing to do that, and she does not think her motion does any damage to the way this Council make decisions. It just recognizes the Penny Project is unique, and it is not like we are approving a \$50,000 - \$300,000 for a particular project. This is probably the biggest project that we have. The decision as to where money gets moved around, and what projects get the priority, knowing at some point we will not have enough money to finish all of them, is something she would like to hear from her colleagues on.

Mr. Jackson requested Ms. Myers restate her motion.

Ms. Myers stated for the items where there is construction underway that we recommend approving the reallocation of budgeted money for 2019 to the items, as suggested. Where there are items, as Mr. Beaty has stated, where design work has been done and people have not been paid for their work, that we are given an accounting of that, and Council make a decision to pay those bills in the FY19 budget. For the items that are under design and acquisition, those items be forwarded to Council, so that full Council can weigh in, with proposals from the Transportation Department. She stated these are just the ones that we have tasked the PDT with working on, and they may or may not have been put in the priority that Council would have approved. At the last Council meeting, the question was who prioritized these, and were some of them put before others.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, we are going to recommend a hybrid. We are going to recommend a portion of this for approval to Council. All the rest is going to Council without a recommendation.

Ms. Myers stated the recommendation would be that the full Council review this list, and a complete and a more fulsome list that will contain staff's recommendation, as to what priority projects there are, where the money should be put, and what ranking they should receive. This presupposes a ranking and a priority, and basically answers the question as to where the money will go before we discuss 2020 money vs. 2012 money.

Mr. Manning stated he is fine as long as he knows that he is going to be at a Council meeting and he is going to see all of this there, and not that some of this did not get to Council because of the way the motion was made.

Mr. Jackson stated, prior to this being presented at full Council, Mr. Niermeier and Mr. Beaty are going to have to show those areas that are not being listed today where funds need to be approved, and how much needs to be approved in those areas.

Ms. Myers stated this is something that needs a separate work session because it is a prioritization and reallocation of funds discussion.

Mr. Manning stated his concern is that the last time we had a work session, related to the Penny, we did not let Mr. Beaty or anyone with the PDT to address Council. Many of the questions that were asked, nobody had the answer to. The answers were provided on 21 pages, in the middle of the Council meeting, with no time to review. So, he has a real concern about work sessions now.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton and Myers

Opposed: Manning and Livingston

The vote was in favor.

7. **Approval of Dirt Road Package J** – Mr. Beaty stated they have opened and received bids on Dirt Road Package J. They had 4 bidders. The lowest bidder was Cherokee, Inc., at approximately \$830,000, which was below the engineer’s estimate. The recommendation is for approval of the contract for construction.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Jackson, to approve the recommendation to award the contract to Cherokee, Inc.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **Approval of the On-Call Engineering Services Agreement** – Mr. Niermeier stated Holt Consulting had come forward with a rate increase request to the rates they had put forth in their base contract in 2015. Upon review of their contract, there is no authority within the contract to allow a lump sum increase, which is what we primarily use.

Ms. Newton inquired if this is a normal process and allowed. She stated she herself is a vendor, and she has an agreement that she signs that she is going to abide to throughout the terms of the agreement. She is curious to know what the agreement was. Was the agreement that for “X” time period this will be your rate, and then you can renegotiate? Is this type of renegotiating common? How does it fit in? What kind of precedent does this set for others? And, what is the potential budgetary impact that we are looking at across the whole program?

Mr. Niermeier stated all 5 of the OETs contracts are very similar. They propose their own rates, so they were set for lump sum fee service orders. There was no language that says you can go back and request escalation of those rates. The only language that suggests they could do that applied to fix cost, plus portion of a service order should that have been let to them.

Dr. Thompson stated this type of request is not standard and consistent with the terms of the original agreement with the vendor.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to deny the request.

In Favor: Jackson, Newton, Myers and Livingston

Opposed: Manning

The vote was in favor.

9. **Program Summary Update** – Mr. Beaty stated 2019 has the potential to be a good year for roadway widenings.

- Atlas Road Widening – Should be advertised for construction in May
- Bluff Road Phase I – Complete
- Blythewood Road Widening – Could be advertised in October/November 2019
- Blythewood Area Improvements – OETs has started to do further design work
- Broad River Road Widening – At 65% plans; once they are 70% the right-of-way can start to be acquired, which will take approximately 18 months to 2 years
- Clemson Road – Under construction
- Hardscrabble – Under construction
- Leesburg Road – Managed by the SCDOT; advertise for construction in September 2019
- Lower Richland Boulevard – In design
- North Main Street – In construction; approximately one year of construction left
- Polo Road – In design
- Shop Road Widening – In right-of-way acquisition

Mr. Jackson inquired if a 2nd public input meeting been scheduled for Polo Road.

Mr. Beaty stated they are engaging the On-Call firm to move forward with design to go from 30% to 100%. Once they get to the 70% design a 2nd public input meeting will be scheduled.

Mr. Jackson inquired, if we will make them aware of their feedback and comments, and how we responded to them, at that meeting or prior to the meeting.

Mr. Beaty stated it would be done at that meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated it makes him a little nervous, if it is going to be done at that meeting, it presupposes that what we are going to do we are going to do whether they like it or not.

Mr. Beaty stated this is the normal process, not just for the Penny Program, but for SCDOT Transportation projects. An initial public meeting is held. The public provides input, and then the governing body makes a decision. This body made a decision to move forward with a 3-lane widening of Polo Road and 10 ft. Shared-Use path on one side. The designer will design for 9 – 12 months, and come back with a 2nd public meeting. Mr. Jackson is correct that the public may find out for the 1st time what Council's action was. That is a common part of the process. An alternative could be, that they reply to the citizens that came to the public meeting, with a standard letter, telling them the path forward, and inviting them to the 2nd public meeting. This would educate those that came to the meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated we do not want to show up at the 2nd meeting with the group being made aware of the outcome of their last comments for the 1st time.

Mr. Manning inquired as to how the “public information” would be paid for (i.e. Is this one of the things SCDOR said we could not use Penny funds for?)

Dr. Thompson stated he considers this “public information” and not “public relations”. Based on that, SCDOR does not frown up public information.

Mr. Walker inquired if email addresses were collected.

Mr. Beaty stated oftentimes they were collected.

Mr. Walker stated electronic correspondence could be an option, as it pertains to public awareness.

Mr. Beaty stated there were 15 intersections in the referendum. As of today, 8 have been constructed, 2 are under construction, and 4 are scheduled to go to construction this calendar year. That leaves the major intersection of Clemson/Sparkleberry, which would be scheduled to go to construction in 2020.

Mr. Beaty stated, of the Special Projects, the only 2 that have not had any work done on them, to date, is Commerce Drive Improvements and the Kelly Mill Road. Spears Creek Church Road Widening is the only other project that has had no work done on it.

Mr. Jackson stated, in regard to Spears Creek, we are apparently waiting on a decision because this item went through 1st Reading in October and we have not taken any additional action on that. He would like to have this put back on the Council agenda.

Mr. Beaty stated:

- Shop Road Phase I – Under construction, approximately 2 months until completion
- Shop Road Phase II – Completed 30% design and moving forward with scoping the remaining design
- Greene Street Phase I – Complete
- Greene Street Phase II –Preparing to be advertised to go to construction next month
- Crane Creek Neighborhood – In design
- Decker/Woodfield Park Neighborhood – In design
- Broad River Neighborhood – Begin construction in the next month
- Candlewood Neighborhood – 50% complete construction; other 50% has begun
- Southeast Richland Neighborhood – Begin construction in the next month
- Trenholm Acres/Newcastle Neighborhood – In design

Ms. Newton inquired if this is the complete list of dirt road for the Penny Program.

Mr. Beaty stated he believes it is. The Dirt Road Program Manager is not in attendance tonight, but he will be at the Dirt Road Ad Hoc Committee meeting.

Ms. Newton stated the 269 roads are the complete list of dirt roads covered by the Penny Program.

Mr. Beaty stated, that are actively being worked on, at this time. He does not know that there will be more after these.

Ms. Newton inquired, for clarification, if there are other roads that were on the original referendum that are not being worked on and not represented here.

Mr. Beaty stated there were some that were originally unfunded, so those have not been worked on. There may be some shown here where they have been removed through the consent/denial process.

Ms. Myers stated, for clarification, this is not the complete list of the roads that were on the list. This is the list of the roads where we have made progress and we expect to pave them.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Myers stated, with the roads they have determined we do not have funding for, they are not even under discussion, because there is no listing of roads lacking funding, how did we decide which ones would get paved.

Mr. Beaty stated County staff took all the dirt roads in the County and listed them by district and then ranked each of them within the district. Therefore, each district had #1, #2, etc. and the funds were prorated across each district. So, if a district had twice as many dirt roads, it got twice as much money. Staff come up with a years 1 and 2, and a years 3 and 4 dirt road list. There were more roads than could be funded. Over time, due to price escalation, even some of the roads in the funded category will not get done. As the original Dirt Road Program Manager and staff worked through the funded lists, some fell off. Now that the PDT is involved, we are continuing the process. He does not know that staff, the Dirt Road Program Manager or PDT selected dirt roads that would not be paved. They went down the list and went through the consent/denial process. If it dropped off, per that process, they went to the next road.

Ms. Myers stated those decisions predated her, but she thinks she gets more questions about this than anything else. She would like to request the committee take action to get the entirety of the list of road, so that we can tell people which roads have fallen off the list, or which ones are not going to be paved.

Mr. Jackson recommended the Dirt Road Ad Hoc Committee take this matter up.

Ms. Myers stated she does not want to give the public the impression that the Transportation Ad Hoc Committee is prioritizing some roads over their roads, and we have decided that we can handle the widenings, but we are going to farm out the dirt roads. She thinks, given the number of those roads, the 2 Council members on that committee are inadequately staffed and do not have the information or purview to handle the whole.

10. Pending Approvals

- Procurement
 - Resurfacing Package Q – Complete by PDT; with County staff for review, upon review can be advertised
 - Resurfacing Package R – Going through permitting process with County staff
 - Polo/Harrison Shared Use Path and Sidewalk – Has been advertised
 - North Springs /Harrington Intersection – Has gone to DHEC
- Greene Street Phase 2 (May 2019 advertisement)
 - County/City Intergovernmental Agreement – City and County staff need to execute IGA
 - Railroad Agreements – Need signatures from Railroads; County and City have signed
- Atlas Road Widening (May 2019 advertisement)
 - Conditional letter of Map Revision (floodway impacts) – FEMA

**Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
April 23, 2019**

- 100% Construction Plans approval – SCDOT
- Chatsworth Connector Land Disturbance Permit and Determination of Maintenance – County staff
- Spears Creek Widening start Authorization – County Council
- Garners Ferry/Harmon Intersection and Screaming Eagle/Percival Intersection 100% Construction Plans approval – SCDOT
- Items approved by Council at 3-5-19; awaiting staff signature – County staff
 - Percival Sidewalk SUE Service Order
 - Atlas Road Widening SCE&G Utility Agreement
 - Clemson Sparkleberry Intersection Design Service Order
 - Broad River Widening Design Service Order
 - Construction contracts for the SERN, Dirt Road I, and Broad River Neighborhood
- Items approved by Council on 4-2-19 awaiting staff signature – County staff
 - Decker/Woodfield NIP AT&T Utility Agreement
 - Letter to SCDOT requesting closure of Gadsden Street as part of Greene Street Phase 2 project
- Bluff Road Widening Phase I R/W transfer to SCDOT from County (as part of project closeout)
- Garners Ferry/Harmon Intersection design approval for minor waterline

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