



Richland County Council
Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
May 10, 2018 – 1:30 PM
Administration Conference Room
2020 Hampton Street, Columbia 29204

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvin “Chip” Jackson, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Bill Malinowski, and Norman Jackson

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Manning

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Tony Edwards, Nathaniel Miller, Melissa Watts, John Thompson, Michelle Rosenthal, Larry Smith

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. C. Jackson called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 PM
2. **Approval of the Minutes**
 - a. March 29, 2018 – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to approve the minutes as submitted. The vote in favor was unanimous.
3. **Adoption of the Agenda** – Mr. C. Jackson stated a discussion of the reimbursement policy with the PDT was inadvertently left off the agenda and needs to be added.

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

4. **Greenway Projects** – Mr. Beaty stated the Greenway Memo is included in the agenda. If you recall, there were 15 Greenways in the referendum. Once the PDT was under contract, they prioritized the greenways 1 – 15. To date, one greenway, Lincoln Tunnel, has been completed. The second, Three Rivers Greenway Extension, is under construction. A third greenway, Gills Creek Section A, is in the design phase.

There have been a number of issues with how we get the rest of the greenways under design. The PDT’s memo is a proposal to get the other 13 greenways moving to some stage of design. There were 3 groups; 2 were Smith/Rock Branch and Crane Creek Sections A, B, and C. So instead of studying each individual section alone, they are proposing to group them for the preliminary studies to expedite time and save money in the study process.

Another part of the recommendation is smaller greenway, Columbia Mall, which crosses Decker Boulevard. There is a current Neighborhood Plan with the Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood Improvement. They propose to add that small plan to the Decker/Woodfield Neighborhood Improvement to expedite time and money.

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee
May 10, 2018

The other significant recommendation they are making is Gills Creek Section 2. It is a section that runs behind Kings Grant neighborhood. There has been a lot of discussion with Gills Creek Section A to get us to the point where we are today. Gills Creek B has had some opposition from the Kings Grant neighborhood. They have expressed in attendance at public meetings for Gills Creek Section A. They have written a letter, which is included in the agenda packet. Since there is strong support for extending Gills Creek A, and a lot of opposition from the community for Gills Creek B, it is the PDT's recommendation to move the monies from Gills Creek B to Gills Creek A.

To summarize, the PDT's recommendations are to try to expedite the remaining design and move Gills Creek B to Gills Creek A.

Ms. McBride inquired if there were any legal issues in changing the priority of the projects. In addition, she inquired if the 15 greenway projects were stated in the referendum.

Mr. Beaty stated the 15 greenways were listed, but in no order. Council chose the prioritization. This has been a Council decision up to this point.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, he does not believe that was Ms. McBride's question. Her question was were the 15 greenways listed on the referendum. That is a yes or no.

Ms. McBride stated now there are requests to change how they were prioritized. That part was done by Council, correct?

Mr. Livingston stated Council approved the criteria for prioritization that went to the PDT. Before it went to the PDT, it went to the Advisory Council. They looked at it and made recommendations. Then it went to Council for a vote.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about the length of Gills Creek B.

Mr. Beaty stated he is not certain, but off the top of his head he believes it is 1 ½ to 2 miles.

Mr. N. Jackson the reason he is asking is because the costs of Gills Creek Section B is \$2,785,000 and then adding it Gills Creek Section A for an additional \$2,785,000. He inquired if Section B is the same length as Section A. He also inquired if when the interim plan was done was Kings Grant involved in the process or did we decided to put it in their community without asking.

Mr. Beaty stated he reviewed the original technical memos that were prepared by Parsons Brinkerhoff to assist in the referendum and a series of public meetings were held in the community, but not specifically with Kings Grant.

Mr. N. Jackson stated Kings Grant is saying they do not want it in their community now. We have to amend everything because of their refusal.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, it will require 3 Readings and a public hearing.

Mr. N. Jackson stated one of their concerns is there is no lighting or security. He inquired if there is something we can do to make it safer.

Mr. Beaty stated the County and the City have entered into a maintenance agreement for Gills Creek A. It will be lighted and security will be provided by the City of Columbia. What we could do is extend Gills Creek

A and update the agreement with the City. The intent, in discussions with the City, is that all of the greenways within the City limits would be maintained, and security provided, by the City. Another piece of information about Gills Creek B, there is an existing greenway/bikeway that goes through Fort Jackson. Part of Gills Creek B was going to replace that existing greenway and place it just outside of Fort Jackson, which was done without a lot of communication with the Kings Grant neighborhood. Once it has been more known publicly, they have come out requesting Gills Creek B not be constructed.

Ms. McBride stated she was looking at the date of the chart about the priority ranking. She accepted that Council decided to prioritize, rather than in the referendum, but she is sure there were some guidelines used with the prioritization. And looking at Gills Creek B that is probably the most expensive one on the chart. Then looking at the first 6 priorities are in the City of Columbia. The remaining are within Richland County. She stated the PDT has grouped them to help reduce some of the costs.

Mr. Beaty stated on p. 20 of the agenda packet under "Maintenance" he has listed which ones are within the City and which ones are without the City. The first 3 are within the City and we have agreements. The next 5 are within the City and the remainder are outside the City. The County would be required to maintain those greenways. The recommendation is to combine Smith Rocky Branch A, B, and C and do the preliminary study together. Once we get the details worked out, we could implement them in order of priority. So that way we have one public meeting, but if one is lower in the priority let's go ahead and knock out the public meeting, expedite the process and save money. The recommendation is still that each greenway will be cost constrained, with the exception of Gills Creek B.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, the recommendation is for the greenways to remain cost-constrained. He inquired if we have enough funds in all of these referendum costs to cover what is listed in all of these projects, at this point and time.

Mr. Beaty stated very few of these can we build the entire termini for the referendum amount because costs have gone up. If we proceed with cost-constrained, we simply build shorter amount of the greenway. Now, Three Rivers Greenway Extension is going to come in under the \$7.9 million. Lincoln Tunnel came in right at the amount. The others we have not developed any final plans for us to say, with certainty, but with likelihood we will not be able to build the complete termini.

Mr. Malinowski stated it seems to him then that rather than one particular project benefit, to the exclusion of the others. If someone does not want their project and it is decided to eliminate it, then those funds should be shared equally to make them all stretch as far as they can.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about what type of material is used to construct the greenways.

Mr. Beaty stated where it is not going to flood often they construct the greenways out of concrete, which is the cheapest. Where it does flood, the greenways are boardwalks that are made out of pressure treated lumber. The City of Columbia's greenway width requirements have changed since the referendum. For instance, since they are maintaining it, they are requiring that Gills Creek A be 14 ft. wide. Three Rivers Greenway, which is under construction, is 8 ft. wide. So, the City's requirements are urban greenways shall be 14 ft. wide, which has contributed to the costs.

Mr. N. Jackson stated then the City is altering the plan and driving up the costs.

Mr. Beaty stated the plan never specified the width. The referendum said from Point A to Point B, but the standard in Columbia, at that time, was 8 – 10 ft.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the money allotted, at that time, was X amount, right? So, they are increasing the costs. He has a concern with the County adding to the costs because the City decided to change the standards.

Mr. Livingston stated, based on what he heard Mr. Beaty say, if you stay within the amount of costs for each project how are you increasing costs? You might get a shorter greenway, but you are certainly not increasing the costs.

Mr. N. Jackson stated then you would not achieve the length you wanted, so anything extra would be an additional costs.

Mr. Livingston stated you are not going to achieve the length you want on any of them because of the costs.

Mr. N. Jackson stated this one specifically because they changed from 8 ft. to 14 ft. The length may be shorter because the costs were driven up because of the City's new design.

Mr. Beaty stated there are 5 more located in the City. The understanding has been the City will maintain those, but their understanding is we are going to design it to their standards. The total costs does not change. It's just if you build it twice as wide, you are going to build it twice as short.

Mr. Malinowski stated so the City has snookered the County from the referendum till now by saying let's make it bigger and better.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is just one of his concerns. It was designed a specific way. Money was allocated a certain way. And then the City says it needs to be so much wider. It is going to drive up the costs or shortened the project.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Mr. Malinowski's point is a critical point. If almost \$3 million is one greenway and they do not want it, rather than rolling it over to another greenway how does benefit if we took that \$3 million and spread it out among the remaining greenways that are being installed.

Mr. Beaty stated we have not conducted the public meetings on the other groups.

Mr. C. Jackson stated so there could be another King's Grant out there somewhere waiting.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we are trying to tie these trails together.

Mr. Beaty responded they are where they can. We have already shortened A from its original termini in the referendum, per public input and Council action. By moving the money from B to A, you have the opportunity to create connectivity. If we had enough money to go all the way to Ft. Jackson to the Devine area and connect it to Timberlane, where of the flooding is taking place, we could combine funds with the flood recovery efforts and provide connectivity to there. Hopefully, we can extend it closer to Shop Rd. Where it will widen it and provide bike/pedestrian accommodations. You would provide better connectivity if you extended A.

Mr. Livingston stated his perception of the greenway, the City and the width. He stated let's keep in mind the referendum was passed. There are a lot of things that have changed since that particular time. Residents of the City of Columbia pay this penny also. They also have elected officials who represent them in the City of Columbia, so it does not bother him if the City of the Columbia if they want to widen it or whatever because they will be maintaining the greenway and they have a right to make decisions for the City of Columbia.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is fine with shortening the length and/or extending the length, but he is concerned with adding money to the project because of the change of the design.

Ms. McBride stated, going back to her earlier point, the \$2.7 million that could fund 3 other projects that are located in Richland County. The top ones are located in the City of Columbia. She inquired as to how many of the 15 greenways the County will be able to fund.

Mr. Beaty stated the proposal is that we fund all of them within their referendum amount. The question would be how short or how far we can get for the money. The County will be able to do them all, with the exception of B, but at a different length.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the recommendations were to move the money from B to A and to initiate the design of the remaining projects at one time.

Mr. Beaty stated the design would only go through 30% and then it would come back to Council for guidance on continuing.

Mr. Malinowski stated he can support the one where the projects are all funded within the referendum amount.

Mr. Beaty stated his recommendation is that each one individually be funded within its individual referendum amount.

Mr. Malinowski stated, to take B out and move it to A, we are far exceeding the amount given. He believes if it is removed it needs to be held back until all of the projects are completed. The pot of money left over should be equally shared among the projects, so they can all achieve the greatest length.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there may have been some areas that got left off because there were no funds. We could look at those areas also to see where we could put some greenways.

Mr. C. Jackson stated Mr. Beaty noted they had not done all of the public community forums yet, there may be some other discussion in the upcoming ones that might impact us.

Mr. Beaty stated he is certain there will be.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, for clarification, the recommendation would be to approve the request for the design work and exclude the obligation of funding for B.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve the request to design all of the projects at one time and exclude the obligation of funding for Gills Creek Greenway Section B. The vote in favor was unanimous.

5. **Greene Street Tract 61** – Mr. Beaty stated Greene Street Tract 61 is a tract that requires a small amount of right-of-way for Greene Street Phase II. There is no available deed for the property that the PDT, or the property owner, has been able to locate. In order to move forward with the project, they are recommending that it go to condemnation so that public notice can be issued. That way Richland County knows who they can cut the check to for this small amount of right-of-way.

Mr. Smith stated this matter was sent to his office a couple weeks ago. He requested, at that time, they

provide him with a copy of the attorney's title opinion. Obviously, we need to know who is the record owner of the property and if there are other lien holders we would have to name them as a party, even if we were going to condemn. If we can get a copy of the title opinion, that may assist with moving forward.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to who would have the title opinion.

Mr. Smith stated we have a group of lawyers that assist Mr. Beaty and the Right-of-Way personnel to do the title work on any property that we are going to acquire. He assumes the attorney and/or firms working with the PDT would be responsible for getting that information.

Mr. Beaty stated they have been in contact with the property owner. He acquired the property about 40 years ago. He cannot physically find his deed. He is okay with a condemnation of the piece of property and being paid for it. They actually went back to the property owner after the last ad hoc committee meeting to double check on the deed. The property owner owns multiple properties. He has looked multiple times. He has been paying taxes for 40 years, but he does not have the physical deed.

Mr. Smith stated even if he does not, if he is the property owner it should be at the Register of Deeds. If you get a title opinion, it would show us the chain of title.

Mr. Beaty stated it is not at the Register of Deeds.

Mr. Smith stated we still need the title opinion to see exactly how and who he acquired it from.

Mr. Livingston inquired as to how you get a title opinion.

Mr. Smith stated the attorneys do it.

Mr. Beaty stated there is no title to give an opinion on. It is not at the Register of Deeds.

Mr. Smith stated he may not have his deed, but he had to have acquired the property from someone. So, there is a chain. You usually do a title search back 20 years and that will show us the chain to see whether or not he is the owner. We have to condemn the property based on who the titleholder is and if we cannot find a deed on record, and he does not have a deed, then that does complicate the matter because we do not know that he is the titleholder.

Mr. Malinowski stated he sees a conflict in the terminology on p. 33 of the agenda, "The County Assessor's Office currently shows ownership of this property as follows: Columbia Outdoor Adv Inc...." then it states "When we cannot determine ownership..."

Mr. Beaty stated the Tax Assessor shows this person as the owner and paying taxes, but there is no physical deed.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if we have went through the complete process to allow the County to take the property.

Mr. Beaty stated they have researched all of the available data. They have gone to the courthouse. The Tax Assessor says, "Yeah, this gentleman has been paying taxes for 40 years." And this gentleman says, "I just cannot find my title." Neither can our attorneys.

Mr. Smith inquired if there was anything in the agenda documentation from the attorneys about this piece

of property before this gentleman purportedly became the owner.

Mr. Beaty stated the Tax Assessor shows that the property was acquired in 1976 and who he bought it from.

Ms. Heizer inquired if there was a deed prior to 1976 that shows the prior owner.

Mr. Beaty stated there is not and that is the problem.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation for approval contingent upon the outcome of the conversation between the attorneys. The vote in favor was unanimous.

6. **Shared Use Plan** – Dr. Thompson stated legal has reviewed the documents for the Southeast Richland Neighborhood Project, the Clemson Road Project and the Polo Road Project. The information has been submitted to the SCDOT for review.

Mr. Smith stated this came before Council a couple weeks ago because there was concern about whether or not we wanted to do this. He believes Council voted to go forward with it, which prompted us to finish the review of the contract.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to what the projected date of construction is.

Mr. Beaty stated the Clemson Road Widening Project is scheduled to be advertised for construction in July, which means construction would begin in September. The Polo Road Project would go to construction late this calendar year. The Southeast Richland Neighborhood they are trying to get the FEMA permit for the project and final approval from the SCDOT. That project should go to construction late this calendar year. The temporary pipes have been placed under Rabbit Run and the project will place permanent pipes under Rabbit Run.

7. **Atlas Road Widening – AT&T Utility Design Authorization** – Dr. Thompson stated this item is for AT&T to begin their design work for relocation of their utilities on Atlas Road. They will not begin until we make a written commitment to them. There is no information included in the agenda packet on this item. If the committee agrees, the Transportation Department will provide a draft of what will be submitted to them.

Mr. Beaty stated the costs will be \$125,000.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if we have done anything like this with AT&T on any other project.

Mr. Beaty stated they have not. As more and more construction is going on across the State, the utilities are getting busier doing their design and relocating their utilities. And as projects begin, stop, and get delayed, AT&T wants to make sure they are going to get paid for the work they do.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired if this is a firm number or will it change.

Mr. Beaty stated they give us a not to exceed. They have estimated \$125,000 and they will bill us up to that point.

Mr. N. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to forward this to Council with a recommendation for approval. The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. **Additional Design Authorizations**

Mr. Beaty stated there are a group of projects across the entire referendum where no design has been started, to date. The proposal is to allow the PDT and the OET to initiate the designs to get the project started. All of them would only go through 30% design. At which point, they would come back and request to continue the design.

- a. **Shop Road Extension Phase 2** – Shop Road Phase 1 is under construction. Phase 2 would extend a new location over to a new tie in at Trotter and Garners Ferry. Recommend going forward with 30% design.
- b. **Spears Creek Church Road** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- c. **Lower Richland Widening** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- d. **Polo Road Widening** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- e. **Blythewood Widening Phase (associated projects)** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- f. **Trenholm Acres/Newcastle NIP** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- g. **Broad River Corridor NIP** – Recommend going forward with the 30% design.
- h. **Gills Creek Greenway Section C** – This project was covered in the previous greenways motion.
- i. **Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A, B and C** – This project was covered in the previous greenways motion.
- j. **Crane Creek Sections Greenway A, B and C** – This project was covered in the previous greenways motion.
- k. **Columbia Mall Greenway** – This project was covered in the previous greenways motion.
- l. **Polo/Windsor Lake Connector, Woodberry/Old Leesburg Connector, and Dutchman Blvd. Connector Greenways**

Mr. Livingston inquired if the 30% design will give us a good idea of the estimated costs.

Mr. Beaty responded affirmatively. He stated that is part of why they build a 30%. We can do a cost estimate today, but as we do more design the estimates get more accurate. They have estimates for all of the projects, but they have not done any surveying, mapping, or detailed studies.

Mr. Jackson inquired as to what is included in the 30% design.

Mr. Beaty stated they would be do traffic studies, using an airplane they would fly the project corridor to prepare electronic mapping, use controlled surveys for the flying, do alternate studies, estimate costs and impacts to come up with a 30% plans.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the company that did Shop Road Extension Phase 1 was involved in some preliminary plans for Phase 2 some years back when he was with the SCDOT.

Ms. McBride inquired once we receive the 30% design what happens after that.

Mr. Beaty stated after they get 30% design plans they would have a public meeting. They would go to the public and present the concept plan and get their buy-in. They would come to the County with an Executive Summary, which would include what the public said and the recommended design. Council would agree or direct that it should look this particular way. Once, they get Council's buy-in then they could assign the

continued design to the design firm. Then they go from 30% to 70% design, which the design finishes all the drainage, so they know the new right-of-way that needs to be purchased. They will then approach the public to let them know how much property the County is going to need to acquire. The project buys the right-of-way while the design goes to final design. That is a 3-4 year process from 0 to final design.

Ms. McBride stated at the end of the design we will get an estimate of the costs.

Mr. Beaty stated Council will get an estimate at 0%, 30%, 70% and 100%.

Ms. McBride stated, once that is determined, we may discover that we can only do 5 of the 12. So, we may lose money by doing all the design upfront.

Mr. Beaty stated the proposal is for the greenway projects and Shop Road Extension Phase 2 to be designed and built within their referendum amount. The widenings are a little bit different; therefore, they are another agenda item.

Ms. McBride stated so we are assuming we would have the funding.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if Shop Road Extension Phase 2 was in the STIP.

Mr. Beaty stated he believes it is.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired if we would be reimbursed from SCDOT for the portion that was approved in the STIP.

Mr. Beaty stated he does not know for certain, but he would not count on the SCDOT giving Richland County any money.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his understanding of the agreement was that we use Penny Tax funds to build the project and any money SCDOT received for that project would be reimbursed.

Mr. Beaty stated they will check on the reimbursement for Shop Road Phase 2.

Mr. N. Jackson stated regarding the Lower Richland Widening. There were public meetings on widening from Rabbit Run to Air Base Road. He knows the funds were there from Garners Ferry Road to Rabbit Run. The design was shown to the community. That was included in the SERN to extend to build that road.

Mr. Edwards stated if we got the money from the Department of Transportation that would refocus the project to have to be designed to Federal standards, which may also affect the costs because it requires different permitting.

Mr. N. Jackson stated any State road or anything that involved SCDOT was to be built to their standards. When they send the request through the STIP, it is based on SCDOT design. Our agreement had to meet their design.

Mr. Beaty stated Shop Road was included in the referendum for \$71.9 million. We are proposing that both sections be constructed within that referendum amount. Shop Road Phase 1 is costing about \$30 million, so that leaves \$40 million. That would be our budget to design to. Except for the 4 widenings, the greenway, the neighborhoods and Shop Road Phase 2 would all be designed to the original referendum amount.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to forward to Council with a recommendation to allow the

PDT to initiate 30% design on the following projects: Shop Road Extension Phase 2, Spears Creek Church Road, Lower Richland Widening, Polo Road Widening, Blythewood Widening, Trenholm Acres/Newcastle NIP, Gills Creek Greenway Section C, Smith/Rocky Branch Greenway A, B and C, Crane Creek Sections A, B and C, Columbia Mall Greenway, Polo/Windsor Lake Connector, Woodberry/Old Leesburg Connector, and Dutchman Blvd. Connector Greenways. The vote in favor was unanimous.

9. **Proposed Road Diet Projects**

- a. **Hampton Street**
- b. **Calhoun Street**

Mr. Beaty stated, as you know, traveling Hampton Street is a 4-lane, undivided road, which means you have 2 lanes in each direction and there is no turn lane. All of the lanes are 9 ft. wide and have parking on both sides.

Mr. C. Jackson inquired as to what portion Mr. Beaty is referring.

Mr. Beaty stated Hampton Street is Main to Harden. The concept is, if you are driving most vehicles, you cannot drive next to someone in the same direction because you are worried that your mirrors are going to hit each other or your mirror on the outside will hit a parked car. You cannot have 4 cars pass at the exact same moment. Then whenever one car wants to turn left they block the lane, which means either the cars behind them have to stop or go around them to continue. A common approach across the country, but has not been done in Columbia yet, is to do a road diet. Hampton Street is already operating like a 3-lane road, which is one lane in each direction and a middle turn lane. The proposal would be to get rid of parking on one side (north), widen the 3 lanes and add a bike lane on each side. The plus side is you provide bicycle accommodations and improve safety for vehicles, but the negative is you lose parking on one side. They have partnered with the City. City staff is in agreement with this approach. The City is going to have this exact same conversation with their Council. Assuming both Councils were good with the concept, the City would lead a public meeting to educate the business owners and do public outreach. The PDT would assist them, but the City would lead the public involvement. Depending on the public reaction on losing over ½ of the parking places, both Council would need to agree for the project to move forward. The cost would be approximately \$100,000 per road. The existing markings would be painted over. There would be no resurfacing or new asphalt. The drainage grates would not have be raised. The City would remove the meters and if needed, move the signals to line up with the new lanes. It would be a true partnership between the City and County to provide bicycle accommodations and improve safety for vehicles, at the expense of on street parking on one side.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about what the level of service is now and how will affect the level of service.

Mr. Beaty stated widening the lanes to 11 feet and providing a left turn lane, they feel, and previous studies have shown, that the level of service will actually improve along the roadway.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there are 2 lanes in both directions, except one is turning, you can always switch to another lane. It has the capacity to hold more vehicles.

Mr. Beaty stated they have not done the detailed study to know the level of service today versus the level of service in the future. It is probably operating at a very low level of service.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that is the process they use as a Transportation Planner. They do the level of service first before they consider it.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Mr. Beaty is mixing and matching.

Mr. Beaty stated they are proposing losing one lane of the 4 travel lanes. What you would end up with physically, you would take away parking on the north side and have a bicycle lane. You would have one lane going to Columbia, continuous middle left turn lane, and one lane coming back with parking.

Mr. Malinowski inquired as to why Richland County has to give an approval if this is part of the City's Penny Tax projects.

Mr. Beaty stated it is part of the City's bike plan and this project is on the Penny referendum as a bicycle route. So, they have studied and there are different ways to accommodate bicycles. You can have a shared for cars and....

Mr. Malinowski stated he was wondering because it is within the City and he thought they would have the say on it.

Mr. Beaty stated they are proposing they do have a say. In the next few weeks, they will be meeting with City Council to have this exact same conversation. If both bodies are in agreement then we will go to the public.

Mr. Malinowski stated he has to agree with Mr. N. Jackson. If you have not done studies yet to know your level of service, it seems you could be going from an A to a C.

Mr. Beaty stated this falls into the Engineering judgment, the experience, and the National studies. The level of service is going to do nothing but improve. We could go and spend the money to do a detailed traffic study, but we are confident, and the City staff is confident in the answer you are going to get.

Mr. N. Jackson stated currently there is not a problem. The objective is to eliminate some lanes to accommodate bike lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated that is one of the objectives. The other objective is to reduce accidents (i.e. knocking mirror off on a parked car).

Mr. N. Jackson stated he is just concerned about spending extra money to accommodate the bike lanes. He is told there are certain places until some many accidents happen they will not take care of anything. He had a discussion recently in regards to the SERN on Garners Ferry Road and they said until so much happens they won't spend the money to do it.

Mr. Beaty stated it is a philosophy of making a city more bike friendly. It is an approach. It is a choice from the leaders and members of the community. You may be giving up revenue from on street parking. You could, potentially, decrease vehicular capacity, but you are increasing bicycle capacity. In addition, the referendum had 87 bike lanes identified. There are 6 that are candidates for this road diet. We are proposing to go to the public with 2 before we even approach the other 4.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was watching "Nightly News" the other night and their story from Seattle. This very exact design was showcased.

Ms. McBride stated we are planning the new Judicial Center on Hampton Street. She wondered about the impact with that facility. She knows South Carolina is leading the nation with pedestrian fatalities, so whatever we can do to make it safer. She was just wondering if Hampton Street would be the most

appropriate place given all of the traffic involved if the Judicial Center is located on Hampton Street.

Mr. Beaty stated his opinion is that it would be still be a good candidate. Again, we are not adding any pavement, so we are staying within the width of the existing Hampton Street.

Mr. C. Jackson stated he was parked a building down below the AT&T Building on Hampton and lost my side mirror while he was inside.

Mr. Beaty stated what they are asking the committee to do, and what City staff is asking City Council, is if they can move forward with this approach and conduct a public meeting. Then after the public meeting, they will give you the results of the public meeting and ask if we can take the next step.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to forward to Council with a recommendation to move forward with this approach and conduct a public meeting. The vote in favor was unanimous.

10. **Widening Memorandum** – Mr. Beaty stated the total referendum amount, excluding the COMET, is approximately \$767 million. The PDT updates the estimate quarterly and right now the estimate is approximately \$140 – 143 million. The current estimates are over the \$767 million. The PDT's recommendation is to construct all of the projects, with the exception of the widenings, within their referendum amounts. The 15 intersections were lumped in as a group. The widenings are the high dollar projects. If we are approximately \$140 million over the referendum amount, how do we make up that difference?

The recommendation has four legs to the stool, if you will. As the SCDOT constructs "Malfunction Junction (Carolina Crossroads)", which is fully funded by the legislature, they are going to have to construct the I-20/Broad River Road interchange. That project is in the referendum at \$52.5 million. That could be recognized as a savings to Richland County.

Bluff Road Phase I has been partially constructed. Bluff Road Phase II would go from National Guard Armory, on the other side of Williams-Brice, to about South Beltline. Bluff Road Phase II currently has 4 lanes of traffic. And at the lights, it has left turn lanes. To improve that, and add the continuous 2 way left turn lanes and shared use path, would cost \$40 million. You would not be adding any traffic capacity and would only safety more by spending the \$40 million.

Pineview Road, coincidentally, the cost estimate is right at \$40 million. However, when Shop Road Phase II is constructed to Garners Ferry that will act as essentially a bypass. So, people coming from the Sumter area would get off on Shop Road Extension to come into Columbia. They will quit traveling down Garners Ferry to turn left onto Pineview and then turn right on Shop. That traffic model has been prepared by the Central Midlands Council of Government.

If we were to recognize the savings of the I-20 Broad River Road interchange, indefinitely defer Bluff Road Phase II and Pineview. We are approaching that \$140 million mark. We will recognize a little bit of savings on Spears Creek Road. Spears Creek Road really goes from Percival over to Two Notch. If we began the Spears Creek Road project on the other side of I-20 instead of Percival, and did not replace the interstate bridge, we are right at \$140 million. If we recognize those savings, all of the other widenings could be constructed to their referendum amount. So, Lower Richland Boulevard, Polo Road and Spears Creek Church Road, etc. get built. The thought is that SCDOT is going to take care of I-20/Broad River Road interchange. You will actually lose traffic on Pineview. In 20 years there will be less cars on Pineview than there are today. Why spend \$40 million when traffic is decreasing?

Transportation Ad Hoc Committee

May 10, 2018

-12-

Dr. Thompson requested Mr. Beaty to quantify the amount of traffic today and in the future.

Mr. Beaty stated traffic today is approximately 16,400. When Shop Road Phase II is built it will decrease to about 16,000.

Mr. Beaty stated the PDT's memo include other options. Another option is to cost constrain each project. There is not enough money on a number of these projects to do a meaningful project. You could not build ½ of a project. It would not have logical termini. There is not enough money in the referendum for Atlas and Pineview to stay within the budget and build anything. If you took that approach on Atlas or Pineview, and started at Garners Ferry, they could not even get over to Shop.

Mr. Livingston stated we would have roads to nowhere.

Mr. Beaty said you could do spot improvements, but you would be getting little return on your investment. He reminded Mr. Malinowski that Broad River Road has had its termini shortened.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired about what was recommended for Pineview Road.

Mr. Beaty stated it was recommended to be 5 lanes from Garners Ferry to Shop Road, and then, 3 lanes from Shop Road to Bluff Road. During the first public meeting, the public wanted it further reduced, so the plan was to only improve Pineview Road from Bluff Road up until Metal Park Drive as a 2 lane, and then, go to 3 lanes from Metal Park Drive up to Shop Road.

Mr. N. Jackson stated, for clarification, from Garners Ferry Road to Shop Road would be 3 lanes.

Mr. Beaty stated it was proposed to be 5 lanes, but in this scenario they would build nothing on Pineview.

Mr. N. Jackson stated there are a lot of factories on Pineview Road and the tractor trailers are turning.

Mr. Beaty stated there is a lot of existing 3 lanes in that part.

Mr. N. Jackson stated the other part he talked about was Wildcat Road, which Ft. Jackson had approved. The entire length had to have a secure fence. At the time, it was \$3 million for the fence and bridges. He would like for the PDT to look into this.

Mr. Beaty stated they are going to look at the STIP for the Shop Road Extension monies and they will inquire with the SCDOT about the potential to bring the Wildcat Road project back to life.

Mr. N. Jackson stated that he and Ike McLeese met with Garrison Commander at Ft. Jackson and they agreed to do it. We just did not have the funding to do it. He feels it would be a tremendous help for the area and provide a connection to the National Cemetery.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if Mr. Beaty is saying because of the other projects there is no longer a need to do any widening on Pineview Road and Bluff Road because traffic will be reduced greatly and what is there will accommodate the traffic.

Mr. Beaty stated, in so many words, the answer is yes. Today, Bluff Road has 4 lanes, so you would not be greatly benefitting traffic capacity or safety by improving Bluff Road. And, the same thing with Pineview Road. Pineview Road traffic is going to be decreasing. Obviously, this will be a Council action to re-prioritize these 2 projects.

Mr. Malinowski inquired if the PDT was going to do any public meetings on the deferral of Pineview Road and Bluff Road. He stated he does not know how many people voted for the referendum because they saw these projects in there and now we are going to say, "Hey, forget it."

Mr. Beaty stated he had not planned to, or thought of that, to be honest. He would offer that this falls under Council's purview of re-prioritize. Council prioritized to begin with. Council can re-prioritize. Again, he does not think we will have the money to get there, but we might. There are opportunities for Federal grants. They are working on a Build Grant now. All of the estimates include a 10% contingency in construction, so \$20 million of the \$140 million is a contingency. There is a chance that a portion of them can be built.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the scenario that was recommended was scenario #3.

Mr. Beaty responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. C. Jackson, to forward to Council with a recommendation to approve scenario #3 to defer the Bluff Road Widening Phase 2 and Pineview Road Widening and to reduce the project termini on Spears Creek Church Road Widening. The vote was in favor.

11. **Release the \$250 Million Bond Proceeds from Escrow** – Ms. Heizer stated the County was approaching a deadline to issue the debt pursuant to the authorization in the referendum and the Supreme Court decision was pending. We were particularly concerned about the mandamus issue and whether SCDOR could potentially hold the distribution of the penny. One thing that was good in the Supreme Court opinion is that they upheld the mandamus, which clearly indicates the SCDOR cannot withhold the penny from distribution. The County is now free to move the money from escrow. She stated she would be glad to do a resolution and recite why the funds were held in escrow and the reason has been eliminated.

Moving the funds from escrow means it is available to be spent, but none of the money is spent until Council authorizes it pursuant to a budget and appropriation. The County Treasurer will continue to hold funds, but he will be notified that the hold on them has been terminated.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. N. Jackson, to forward to Council to authorize the release of the \$250 bond proceeds from escrow. The vote in favor was unanimous.

12. **PDT Reimbursement Policy** – Mr. Smith stated the County and the PDT have been in discussions regarding a portion of the PDT contract that relates to reimbursable items. Both sides have exchanged correspondence, as it relates to that, and Council has been privy to the correspondence. The attorney for the PDT, Keith Babcock, and Mr. Smith have been in discussions about a way to move this issue forward. They have agreed a way to move this forward is by way of mediation. Mr. Babcock has presented the County Legal Department with names of mediators. The Legal Department is in the process of reviewing that and getting back to him. What he anticipates will occur at this point, is we are going to make a decision about the mediator. Then we will determine when we will schedule a date, time and place to conduct the mediation.

Mr. Livingston inquired about how long it will take to get to the mediation.

Mr. Smith responded he does not know how long it will be. They have not had a discussion about the timeline.

Ms. McBride inquired about how mediators are selected.

Mr. Smith stated, traditionally, both sides will give some names of mediators. In this case, Mr. Babcock has sent him several names. We may send him some names. Then they will mutually agree on a person.

Mr. N. Jackson inquired as to what this mediation is specifically about.

Mr. Smith stated what items under the contract are subject to be reimbursed, pursuant to the contract. This was something we went through with the PDT and Council.

Mr. N. Jackson stated his understanding is the firms did the work and were supposed to be reimbursed, but there is a problem with the billing or invoice. In the past, how was it handled that is different now? Why are we going through this process?

Mr. Smith stated it was not handled pursuant to our understanding of what the contract calls for.

Mr. N. Jackson stated he has had people calling him about not being paid since July. Some have not been paid since September.

Mr. Smith stated this item has to do with a specific part of the contract that deals with reimbursable items, not necessarily work that has been done where a vendor has not been paid. This is a specific part of the contract related to what items/things under the contract are subject to be reimbursed.

Mr. N. Jackson stated maybe he needs to ask another question about the vendors that have not been paid. In November, he asked about reimbursement for some vendors who have not been paid since July and September. We were told it was taken care of. Now 5 months later, they still have not been paid. He wants to know what is going on with the others.

Mr. C. Jackson stated the issue on the table deals specifically with the contract where there are funds being requested the County feels are not pursuant to the rules and requirements of the contract. Mr. Smith, along with the lawyers for the PDT, have agreed to have a mediator to sit down with the two of you and determine some middle ground.

Mr. Smith stated to help us facilitate so we can come to a mutual agreement about how we are going to resolve the issue.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, in the meantime, both the PDT, SLBE, whomever have requested reimbursements from the County, which have not been paid because there is a discrepancy in the contract.

Mr. Smith responded those are two separate issues. The narrow part that he is dealing with has to do with a specific section of the contract that deals with what things are reimbursable pursuant to the contract. He is not talking about work that has been performed where contractors have not been paid.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, his understanding is, the PDT has requested funds under that portion of the contract. Those funds have not been released because of the disagreement about whether they are entitled to that.

Mr. Smith stated there are a series of letters, which have been sent to us, where they continue to say to the County their position is still the same regarding this particular issue. The County has said their position is still the same, as it relates to those items that we believe are not reimbursable.

Mr. C. Jackson stated mediation is different from arbitration, in that the person is not going to issue any ruling that says we have to pay or we do not have to pay.

Mr. Smith stated the mediation will not be binding, but hopefully it will give both sides an opportunity to see whether or not we can find a path forward to get it resolved.

Dr. Thompson stated we are talking about is between \$400,000 and \$500,000.

Mr. C. Jackson stated, to the point Mr. N. Jackson made, he is sure Mr. Livingston, Mr. Manning, Ms. McBride and himself have gotten calls. Mr. N. Jackson is right, he raised that issue at a meeting and was told that nothing was being held up, but he still gets phone calls saying that is not the case that there are some vendors who have submitted invoices and have not been paid for those invoices.

Dr. Thompson stated he is not aware of any vendors who have not been paid. If you have specific vendors, he will be happy to reach out to them.

Ms. Watts stated all of the OSBO invoices are up-to-date.

Mr. Livingston stated he wants to make sure that all these decisions we are making, in terms of our ordinance, as it relates to the penny, because he does not want to come back and say none of these things makes a difference because it is not consistent with our ordinance. He needs to make sure it is clear, in terms of how these things fit into our ordinance, or what we need to do to change the ordinance to make sure what we have done is consistent with the ordinance.

Ms. Heizer stated one of the things Council will hear on Tuesday, at the work session, is the concern that when you make decisions, that change the list from 2012, it should be done by an ordinance. One of the concerns Mr. Smith and she have had is making a change through the committee process. In terms of some of those changes, they need to be made to the ordinance. If in the discussions on Tuesday, the consensus on Council is that one of the ways to deal with the projected shortfall is to move projects down to the bottom of the list, so you wait to see if there is other money or if they do not ever get done then Council can make that decision. Ultimately, the ordinance you will give 3rd Reading to will incorporate any of those new decisions.

Dr. Thompson stated, on Tuesday, it includes those projects the termini has been changed, as well as, the dollar amounts.

Ms. Heizer stated the last time the "amending ordinance" came up it was deferred until next Tuesday. The working group (lawyers, Transportation Department, Administration) discussed that Council will make some decisions Tuesday at the workshop. There may be some decisions that takes you longer than Tuesday to make, so it may not be realistic to give 3rd Reading to the ordinance on Tuesday.

13. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 PM